



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Jon Silkin as Anthologist, Editor, and Translator*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/92139/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Munday, JS (2016) Jon Silkin as Anthologist, Editor, and Translator. *Translation and Literature*, 25 (1). pp. 84-106. ISSN 0968-1361

<https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2016.0238>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Jon Silkin as Anthologist, Editor, and Translator

Jeremy Munday

In his seminal book *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, André Lefevere makes the claim that ‘the same basic process of rewriting is at work in translation, historiography, anthologization, criticism, and editing’, though ‘translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting, and ... it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image and author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin’.¹ Anthologization controls what is available to the reader, and, through the selection, presentation, or omission of texts, makes an evaluative judgement on the relative importance of different writers with competing claims, while the act of translation, and its editing and revision, is intimately bound up with the manipulation of text through the adoption of specific translation strategies and procedures that are the product of the poetics of the translator/editor and the context in which s/he operates.

In this essay, I shall investigate the interaction of anthologization, translation, and editing in the work of poet-translator Jon Silkin (1930-1997), one of the major and most committed promoters of poetry translation in Britain in the second half of the twentieth century.² This analysis is made possible by the availability of draft manuscripts and personal correspondence related to translation contained in the Silkin papers and archives of *Stand* magazine at the University of Leeds.³ As well as furthering the understanding of the processes of rewriting and raising Silkin’s profile as a translator, my aim is that it should also contribute to a ‘microhistory’ of translation, to appropriate Carlo Ginzburg’s term, through which a micro-level study of an individual’s day-to-day actions and decision-making can reveal macro-level historical and cultural trends and the power relations operating in the social system.⁴ Significantly, the analysis gives further insights into the concept of agency in

translation, focusing on those agents (translators, editors, reviewers) who have effected changes in translation norms or have played a cultural or political role in translation.

Jon Silkin was born in London in 1930 to a Jewish family of Lithuanian extraction. After a turbulent schooling, he worked at a variety of jobs (insurance clerk, journalist, grave filler, gardener). He turned to poetry at the age of fifteen, and it was shortly after his National Service that he published privately his first volume of poems, *The Portrait, and Other Poems* (1950). He launched the little magazine *Stand* in 1952 with £5 in redundancy pay from a job as a cleaner, with the objective 'to found a magazine which would "Stand" against injustice and oppression and "Stand" for the role that the arts, poetry and fiction in particular, could and should play in that fight'.⁵ From 1960, at a time when Silkin was Gregory Fellow in Poetry at the University of Leeds (1958-60), it was published as a quarterly magazine of the arts with support from the West Yorkshire business community.⁶

The Gregory Fellow in Poetry scheme was a writer-in-residence programme, the first of its kind in the United Kingdom, instituted at the University of Leeds in 1950. With its help the University began to attract a number of important poets and poet-translators, such as James Kirkup (the first Gregory Fellow), Geoffrey Hill, Tony Harrison, and Ken Smith, in addition to Silkin.⁷ After taking a first-class degree in English literature at Leeds, Silkin moved in 1965 to Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where, supported by the North-East Association for the Arts, he continued to edit *Stand* as well as founding Northern House, a small publisher of poetry pamphlets he set up with colleague Andrew Gurr from Leeds. At various times Silkin also worked as a visiting lecturer at universities abroad, notably in Israel, the United States, and Japan. For his collaborator Rodney Pybus, Silkin 'was first and foremost one of the most distinctive and distinguished of those British poets who began to publish in the 1950s'; he was a prolific poet and performer/reader of his own poetry, a teacher of creative writing, and an 'acute, incisive, and creatively illuminating critic of others' writing'.⁸ His criticism most

famously centres on the poetry of the First World War⁹, but it is also reflected strongly in his sterling work as a translator and editor of modern foreign-language poetry, combining the two in the case of his co-translations of war poems by Giuseppe Ungaretti, Aleksandr Blok, Georg Trakl, and Uri Zvi Greenberg that appeared in *The Penguin Book of First World War Poetry* (Harmondsworth, 1979).

Internationalism and support for translation (of verse and other material) were central to *Stand*'s identity. The first issues of the magazine as relaunched at Leeds included translations of poetry by Pablo Neruda (*Stand*, 4.4, 1960), Luigi Pirandello's one-act play *The Dream* (5.3, 1961), and Jean-Paul Sartre's famous essay on Negritude, *Black Orpheus* (5.4, 1961 and 6.1, 1962). The translation of modern Russian poetry became a feature.¹⁰ Significant poet-translators figuring in *Stand* from that time include Robert Bly, Michael Hamburger, Christopher Middleton, and Edwin Morgan, while Silkin himself regularly contributed translations. In the well-known 1973 *Stand* anthology *Poetry of the Committed Individual* (London, 1973), edited by Silkin, no fewer than twenty-seven of the fifty-seven featured poets appeared in translation, while six of the thirty-three *Northern House* pamphlets were translations. Pertinently here, the latter included pamphlets devoted to Israeli poet Natan Zach (*Against Parting*, translated by Silkin in 1967), to Japanese writer Osamu Dazai (the novella *The Schoolgirl*, translated by Lane Dunlop in 1992), and, in what turned out to be the last issue, to Silkin's partner, the Japanese poet Toshiko Fujioka (*Calling 'Fish' in the Evening*, translated by Fujioka, Silkin, and Kazuya Honda, 1995).

In his editor's introduction to the *Stand* anthology, Silkin stresses the impact of American verse and translated verse on the range of poetry published in the United Kingdom. For Silkin, art needed to be placed centre-stage, and fulfil a constructive role as a social and shared process that can 'learn, teach, and move to action, or at least modify those human actions which at present threaten us with extinction'.¹¹ Faced with the possibility of global

nuclear catastrophe, Silkin saw the cultural and political role of translation as enabling us to listen to other cultures and respond to them, allowing ‘the closer, more intimate sense of coexistence ... through having the poems in our language, notwithstanding that some readers may be able to follow the work in the original’. In a critique rooted in the political and social conflicts of the day in Communist Europe, the Middle East, and Vietnam, Silkin saw the potential of translation for us ‘to learn, in however limited a way, something of what the sensuous powers and moral entrapment feel like in Iowa, Teeside, or Prague (quite apart, that is, from what Amman, Jaffa, and Hanoi can tell us)’. The artistic upshot would be ‘a continuingly vigorous and changing culture’ (pp. 20-1).

Silkin gives a revealing insight into his conception of the artistic role of translation in a written interview conducted in December 1983 by Lyuben Lyubenov for the Bulgarian magazine *English for Everyone*, eventually published in May 1992:

Translation requires the subservience of one’s ego – not one’s art – to the poet whose work one is translating. It requires a projection of one’s own imagination to try and a) understand his or her ‘original’ and b) the capacity to ‘recreate’ that original in your/one’s own language.¹²

In this same interview Silkin briefly notes having read Walter Benjamin on translation, which may have influenced his goal of imaginative re-energizing of the source text. Silkin had a personal and profound belief in what he called ‘artistic translation’, in which a connection is made by the translator to the source:

The stages of deciphering another person’s work is to do with forming a connection with it. This happens in all reading, of course, but here there is the added (hopeful)

expectation of being able to connect and re-create. It is AKIN to one's own writing...
 an uplifting of the psyche.

For Silkin, the connection is one of affinity with the source author, but the process of composition of the translated text also occupied him. Describing the nervous energy of the re-creative process, Silkin refers to the term 'pre-lyrical tension', which he assigns to Nadezhda Mandelstam, Osip Mandelstam's widow. The goal, Silkin told Lyubenov, conscious of translation's power of enrichment through the strength of its language, was that 'a good translation should read like a good original. But not like an original in one's own language.'

Silkin was at the same time a prolific anthologizer and editor of others' work, as we shall see in the context of Hebrew and Japanese poetry. Discussing the challenges raised by anthologization, poet and critic Charles Bernstein projects a strong comparatist view of poetry as a 'social field whose meaning comes, in part, from the relationship among poems'; we should not, he urges, restrict our reading merely to outstanding poems, filtered out from lower-ranked contemporary work.¹³ If individual poems are not to be read in isolation from the literary and cultural context in which they are produced, they must be accompanied by other poems, and the crucial question for an anthology then becomes one of criteria for inclusion. As Bernstein states, 'you can only acknowledge the social field by very precise selections; indeed, judgements of quality not only are a required part of this activity but also are given a more active role. More, rather than less, judgement, articulation of preference, is required' (p. 132). The articulation of preference represents the evaluation of the editor and determines what the audience receives. In the case of translation into languages and fields with which he was not familiar, Silkin depended on collaboration from local specialists such as Natan Zach and Tomoyuchi Iino to assist him with the selection of poems and their initial translations. In what follows, I shall use archival material to discuss what this meant for

Silkin in his attempts to publish collections of modern Hebrew poetry and an anthology of modern Japanese poetry. That neither came to full fruition does not invalidate the process that went into their construction; indeed, the interaction of these projects with others, more successful, emphasizes that publication is not always in the anticipated form.

Silkin's Jewishness was central to his identity, and from early in his career he wrote critically on, and worked with, other Jewish poets who lived both in London and in the recently created state of Israel. Even though he did not know the language well himself,¹⁴ he had a keen interest in translating from Hebrew: in 1958, he corresponded with Israeli poet David Rokeah (1916-1985) about his translations of six of the latter's poems; in 1965-6 he visited Israel for five months, meeting a number of poets and starting to compile and co-translate an anthology of modern Hebrew poets in translation. Although the idea attracted the interest of the publisher Jonathan Cape,¹⁵ Silkin's anthology was never published. However, four of his translations were included in the anthology *Fourteen Israeli Poets*, edited by a friend and contemporary of Silkin's, the London-born, Jerusalem-based poet Dennis Silk, and published by André Deutsch in 1976. Silk's volume included Silkin's translations of poems by Shlomo Zamir, Silkin working in collaboration with the poet Bat-Sheva Sheriff. A secondary school teacher in Tel Aviv at the time of Silkin's visit to Israel, Sheriff also helped Silkin with his first translations of the leading poet Amir Gilboa, five of which were published in *Stand* 9.4 (1968). This collaborative role was then taken over by an emerging poet, Natan Zach (b. 1930), who worked with Silkin on a collection of twelve of Zach's own poems which appeared in Silkin's Northern House pamphlet series in 1967, and on a selection of Arabic folk songs, published in the 1968 *Stand* issue.¹⁶ Gilboa (1917-1984), who was born in the Ukraine and emigrated to Palestine in 1937, is still considered, alongside Zach, to be one of the most original and innovative Hebrew poets, and a strong influence on younger poets of the 1960s and 1970s. He published some ten books of poetry in Hebrew, the

first in 1942. Silkin managed to negotiate a contract for Gilboa for the prominent Penguin Modern Poets series, on which he worked when back in Newcastle, as well as a contract for Zach with Chatto and Windus.¹⁷ The Penguin publications were originally conceived as a sub-series of two, later three, volumes, which, had they all proceeded as planned, would have raised the profile of modern Hebrew poetry in the United Kingdom.

The collaboration between Gilboa, Silkin, and Zach during 1970-1 is particularly interesting for the dynamics involved and what they reveal about the role of different agents in the translation process. Zach, a lecturer in Hebrew literature at Tel Aviv University, was by then studying for a doctorate on modern English Imagist poetry at the University of Essex. His role, as requested by Silkin in the same letter of 21 April 1970, was to select and produce literal translations of Gilboa's poems for Silkin to work up. However, his studies and other concerns seem to have given him little time for his translation of Gilboa. The project therefore proceeded at a frustratingly slow pace for Silkin, but Zach offered to travel to Newcastle to go over the drafts once Silkin had had time to revise the first two batches of poems.¹⁸

Silkin's outward appreciation of Zach's contribution is seen in his draft introduction to the projected Hebrew poets collection. The draft ends with Silkin's translator's note:

These translations were done with the Israeli poet Natan Zach, and could not have been done without him. Despite almost five months in Israel I have no Hebrew; but this is not the only reason for my saying that these translations could not have been done without him. I mean that Zach not only provided more than literal translations but constantly worked to give the sense and impulse of the poems, quite apart, that is, from consulting Gilboa himself.¹⁹

This last point turns out to be less than accurate. While Zach may have had the responsibility of mediating with Gilboa, it was not successful. Gilboa's reaction when he finally received a copy of the draft translated poems from his friend Aharon Megged, cultural attaché at the Israeli embassy in London, was unexpected. His trenchant criticisms, expressed in a letter sent in April 1971 to the editor of the Penguin Modern Poets series, Nikos Stangos, concerned the selection of poems, which he did not find representative of his work since most of them were from the 1940s, and what he perceived to be inaccuracies in the translation, due, he says, to an inadequate draft that must have been supplied to Silkin - an implicit criticism of Zach.²⁰ Gilboa's suggestion was for a new translator to be employed, and he proposed the writer Amalia Kahana-Carmon. Gilboa's choice of a writer of fiction may perhaps have been indicative of a wish to avoid a translator with the poetic 'baggage' of Zach and Silkin.

Silkin flatly rejects interference from a new party: 'I don't know this other woman and I don't want to work with her.'²¹ His reply to Stangos questions Gilboa's ability to judge the translation linguistically: Silkin recalls his single meeting with Gilboa, in which 'I don't believe that we managed to exchange more than five words in English.' On the critical question of the choice of poems, Silkin emphasizes that he trusted Zach's judgement; Zach might have been at fault for the delay in translation and for not sending the poems to Gilboa, but Silkin trusted him on the selection. Caution is the watchword for Silkin, suspicious of Gilboa's judgement, but with one possible solution being to 'persist with the poems we have and try to have Megged produce Gilboa's suggestions in Hebrew into English so that I can work on them, cautiously'.²²

On the other hand, Silkin's letter to Gilboa himself is virulent and condemnatory, full of the anxiety of the translator and stress of the project. First, he objects to the corrections to these translations: 'You don't know English though you have on that basis made ... a

multitude of corrections to the translations I've done.' He goes on to articulate in the bluntest terms the dilemma of the translator, attracted by the poetry but frustrated to breaking point by the difficulty of the person:

I write to tell you that after three years of difficulty I am sick of the whole business with you. Not alas with your poems. You're a good poet but an impossible person and I really am sick of your wretched vanity.²³

This boiling discontent continues in a second letter, dated three weeks later (10 July 1971), which commences with the threatening phrase 'A few facts'. Here, Silkin gets to the core of what it means to translate, to work at, 'someone else's poem'. The 'facts', in Silkin's view, are as follows:

Translating someone else's work is a pretty selfless occupation, and to sustain it over a period of three years, with Zach's problems, etc. going all the time, and yours as well ... you must surely see that it was not my interest, I mean self-interest, in the matter that sustained the work on your poetry. The fact is that despite your behaviour in this matter I believe in you – AS A POET. I also sustained the work because I wanted through my own to permit Israel to contribute something else to society in general other than continual conflict – agreed not all Israel's own making. It was this wish to see a cultural contribution, through YOUR work, that sustains my effort.

For a poet such as Silkin, translation is a dangerous and energy-sapping activity, which takes away time from his own writing. The repetition of the verb sustain, which appears four times in the above quotation, reflects the struggle and determined effort which Silkin considers he

has put in over a lengthy period of time. Motivation is not principally financial for either Silkin or Zach, but is rather centred on Silkin's expressed desire, political and cultural, to improve Israel's ethical standing internationally, and his intense energy in pursuing this goal. Scarcely four years since Israel's triumph in the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967, and two years before the war of October 1973, Silkin, as a self-defined Jewish poet, is desperate to make a more positive contribution through translation and the promotion of an Israeli poet in the medium of English.

In the event, the difficulties inherent in the arrangements led Stangos at Penguin to cancel the contract at that point, though it is clear that Stangos did not hold Silkin to blame for this, even allowing him to keep the advance as a small consolation for the time he had spent.²⁴ Gilboa had refused to countenance publication in a joint volume since he felt he was entitled to the same treatment as Yehuda Amichai, who was being published in a single-authored work.²⁵ But this was not the end of the story. Silkin's tenacity and belief in Gilboa's work was such that, despite the setback, and despite the difference of opinion between the two men, which even caused Gilboa, in a letter of 30 June 1971, to forbid Silkin any use of the translations he had completed, the project was resurrected. Renewed contact was made in 1980, a year after a selection of Gilboa's work had appeared in a small Menard Press edition translated by the American poet–translator Shirley Kaufmann, based in Jerusalem, and the Israeli academic Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan.²⁶ Silkin and his wife, the writer Lorna Tracy, had been invited to stay as guests of the Mishkenot Sha'ananim cultural centre in Jerusalem for three months. In April 1980, Silkin met Gilboa in person, and they discussed how to proceed, noting their conclusions in writing in order to avoid the kind of problems that had arisen a decade earlier. Thus, Silkin was to finish a book of translation of poems from Gilboa's Blue and Red volume, supplemented by some of the previously completed translations, and was to seek a publisher. Silkin requested a formal note from Gilboa agreeing to this.²⁷ In the

meantime, translations of thirteen of Gilboa's poems appeared in *Stand* later in 1980. The whole process was facilitated by the presence of a young Israeli novelist and academic, Anat Feinberg, editor of the English magazine of the Institute for the Translation of Hebrew Literature.²⁸

Silkin also met Nilli Cohen of the Institute in Tel Aviv in April 1980, where she told him that she was happy for him to offer eight poems for publication in English abroad. Two thorny issues soon arose in correspondence over the spring and summer: copyright, and, more prominently, payment. Cohen told Silkin that the Institute was the legal copyright holder and that these poems had in fact been paid for by the Institute fourteen years previously as part of the aborted anthology project.²⁹ Silkin's additional complaint was about the discrepancy in the amounts paid by the Institute and the rates offered to him by ACUM Ltd (the Israeli society for authors and composers) for publication of his own poems. In correspondence with Ran Kedar, Director General of ACUM, Silkin stated that 'I want to be paid at same rate that you will be paid by me for poems that we might use in *Stand*', which at that time was five pounds to the translator for a poem that would be published in 4500 copies.³⁰ Kedar had objected to Silkin's accusation that ACUM was 'haggling like a souk'.³¹ Silkin, who bluntly commences one response with the words 'I dunno. – I'm getting fed up with this correspondence', increases the pressure by threatening simply not to use the Israeli poems.³²

Although a selection of Gilboa's poems was published in *Stand* later that year, once again the main project with Gilboa foundered, not only for financial reasons but also because of the difficulties of convincing publishers that the undertaking would be viable. Thus rejections came from Routledge and Kegan Paul, explaining that 'translations are notoriously difficult to sell';³³ from Oxford University Press ('publishing translations is very difficult, they don't sell at all well');³⁴ and from André Deutsch ('the market would be so restricted').³⁵ Nor did Silkin have better luck on the other side of the Atlantic, despite writing to the Jewish

Publication Society of America, which was about to launch a Jewish poetry series. Silkin presents himself as ‘a Jewish poet, if I may describe myself’, and he offers ‘my translations of one of Israel’s finest living poets’.³⁶ He is also turned down by Indiana University Press for the different reason that it was about to publish a large anthology of modern poetry that included the work of Gilboa.³⁷

Even though nothing concrete emerged from these efforts, Silkin’s persistence was extraordinary. In September 1997, seventeen years later and just two months before his death, he was negotiating with Anthony Rudolf at the Menard Press to bring out a collection of thirty Gilboa poems, and seeking subventions to make this possible, first from the Israeli embassy, and second from the Institute for the Translation of Hebrew Literature, now run by Nilli Cohen.³⁸

When it comes to explaining the verbal process of translation, Silkin also wrote some brief notes on his work with Gilboa, published in 1981 in a special issue of *Modern Poetry in Translation* devoted to translation theory and practice. Entitled ‘Working at Someone Else’s Poem’, in what appears to be a private intertextual reference to the virulent letter to Gilboa from ten years before, Silkin notes Natan Zach’s view that Silkin was attracted by Gilboa because of the affinity he had with his poetry.³⁹ Indeed, Zach had admitted to Silkin that he thought Silkin’s versions of Gilboa ‘amazingly good’, and Silkin clearly found working on Zach’s translations of Gilboa’s poems easier than working on Zach’s own.⁴⁰

For Silkin, one attraction of translation is ‘the possible enrichment of one’s own work at that point at which one’s own growth intersects with the character or aspect of another’s work’ (‘Working’, p. 37). Silkin says that he felt closest to Gilboa’s ‘Joshua’s Face’, a poem which he had described in the Lyubenov interview as his best translation. Six different versions of the poem are found in the Silkin papers, and their chronology is not entirely clear.⁴¹ What is evident, though, is that certain points in the text were problematic and much-

reworked. The first stanza of the only entirely handwritten version shows the process in ample detail:

overhead
 Joshua, from ~~above~~[^], looks at my face – his, beaten gold.

cold and
 A dream, ^ mummified ~~and cold~~. The sea
 at my feet beats incrementingly up the shore.

I am sick with its crying. ~~It seems~~ I shall die now.
 It seems shall

No. I must wait. ~~And live in endlessness.~~
 ~~and live-~~ must live ~~unendingly~~ without an end

My brother's face ~~rising~~ rises in a cloud, and foresees
 my foot-steps in sand
 washed by sea.

Silkin discusses some of the specific choices here, and the reasons for them, in his notes on his work with Gilboa. On his use of ‘incrementingly’ in line three, for example: ‘I get a charge each time I read that passage in particular’ (‘Working’, p. 38). The deletions and revisions can be classified into two main categories: the competition of synonyms and near-synonyms (‘above’ > ‘overhead’; ‘in endlessness’ > ‘unendingly’ > ‘without an end’) and the change of structure or order (the position of ‘cold’; ‘rising’ > ‘rises’). In all these cases Silkin seems to be seeking a formulation that works rhythmically in the target text. One deletion (‘It seems I shall’), which is then replaced by the same words, both shows the translator’s doubts and suggests that everything is potentially open to challenge and change. That process of change is never complete: there are even small differences between the version published in Stand, 21.4 (1980) and the version referred to by Silkin in these notes of 1981. The constant reworkings of the last stanza support Silkin’s contention that it is the most problematic of all. The handwritten version gives the following:

~~In me~~ My end murmurs in me
 beating my death onto
 my feet –
 a wave, and ~~another wave~~.
 then another.

On the faces of many lives may he
~~may he~~ be raised and magnified.

The version published in *Stand* differs slightly, the first line of this ending being ‘Inside me murmurs the end in me’, and the penultimate line adds ‘many lives more may he’. But other, presumably earlier, drafts show substantial reworking, particularly for the last two lines. One gives all the following alternatives:

In the faces of many may he | be raised and magnified
 Over the many faces may he
 faces
 On these ^ and many more ~~faces~~ he shall
 On these, and on many more faces than these, he will
 Over the faces, and ~~the~~ lives more
 many
 Over many faces and ^ lives | more than these may he | be raised and magnified.

The lexical choices are quite fixed (‘faces’, ‘many’, ‘he’, ‘be raised and magnified’); it is the structures, stresses, and rhythms that are tested and worked out.

In his commentary, Silkin refers to the ‘summary exultation’ of these two lines, stating that he deliberately borrows this phrase from Geoffrey Hill’s description of Silkin’s

own work. Affinity between Silkin and Gilboa is explicitly underlined in this way. But Silkin is also clear that there must be a limit to this process of assimilation:

What I knew I had to beware of, for Gilboa's sake (and for my own), was subsuming his helpless text into my poetics. I had to be careful that similarity, affinity, or even link, did not get confused in my mind with synonymity. I had to be careful when I encountered a force I might feel unhappy with – 'beaten gold', 'beating my death' – I was not reacting against it because it was a forcefulness of a kind I would not especially want in my poetry. For after all, it was not my poem.

('Working', p. 38)

* * *

A second major translation project which absorbed Silkin was an anthology of modern Japanese poetry. Silkin's interest in Japan was of long standing. The first Gregory Fellow at Leeds, James Kirkup (1918-2009), whom he had met in London in the 1950s, had published three poems in the second issue of *Stand*, had held university posts on and off in Japan from the 1960s until 1989, and had translated and edited an anthology, *Modern Japanese Poetry*, 1979, which Silkin consulted in preparation for his own work. Between 1991 and 1994, Silkin was mostly living in Japan, where he taught English and American literature at the University of Tsukuba and where he lived with his new partner, the poet Toshiko Fujioka. Silkin's time in Japan afforded him the opportunity to collaborate with a series of different translators, both Japanese academics and poets and established English-language poets and translators (Dennis Enright, Peter Robinson, Lane Dunlop, Leith Morton).

The crucial process was again the selection of poems suitable for the anthology, and the provision of literal translations for Silkin to work on. Fujioka was able to help with this,

but Silkin sought additional collaborators. Two were key: Yukio Kato, of the Institute of Literature and Linguistics at the same University of Tsukuba, and Tomoyuki Iino, Tokyo-based academic, critic, poet, and translator of an experimental ‘polyphonic’ poet, John Ashbery. Iino, who had studied under Karl Shapiro at the University of California, Davis, had been in contact with Silkin in 1986, offering translations and an essay on postwar Japanese poetry. These had been published in *Stand* in a special issue in 1988 featuring eight Japanese poets, including Iino, translated by Lane Dunlop and Iino himself.⁴² Even here, collaboration had been sensitive. Silkin liked the material but had problems with Iino’s English. He hired an English-language copy editor, reducing Iino’s fee by half.⁴³ Iino had also suggested ideas to publicize *Stand* in Japan, and helped by distributing flyers to the British Council in Tokyo.⁴⁴

Collaboration between Silkin, Iino, Kato, and Fujioka on the new anthology did not work out as Silkin had anticipated. Kato’s first communication, from the beginning of May 1992, apologizes for his unavailability for a meeting. The key question for the anthology at this early stage relates to the selections of poems and the speed of translation. Kato is currently translating at a rate of one or two poems a week and estimates that he will manage only fifty in a year, so he urges Silkin to encourage Fujioka to translate too.⁴⁵ Kato also soon indicates that he is unhappy to be the sole recommender of poems for the selection and for Iino to be sole judge; he is keen for these roles to be shared with both Iino and Fujioka.⁴⁶ The relationship between the group members was evidently a grave problem for Silkin, who becomes exasperated and does not handle the situation well. With Iino, to whom he is indebted for facilitating his coming to Japan, Silkin becomes frustrated at what he sees as a lack of commitment to ‘our’ project: ‘I’d like to work with you, if I can get some kind of CONTINUING response from you (I am serious on the anthology).’ He asks for some selections and translations and ‘editorial input’ from Iino too.⁴⁷ Five days later, Silkin writes

again in an even blunter vein of his ‘silence’ and ‘non-input’.⁴⁸ Yet Silkin, who acknowledges that he himself is unknown in Japan, needs Iino in various ways: for his status as a well-known critic, which will add to the collection’s reputation and rigour, for his contribution to the translations themselves, and for his nomination of potential poems and evaluation of the translations. These letters do prompt Iino into action. But differences of opinion persist, perhaps in part because no common translation strategy seems to have been discussed by the different contributors. For instance, Iino writes on 5 May 1992 that Kato’s translations are always accurate, but, in his opinion, sometimes too literary. Iino’s recommendation is for a bolder translation strategy, for the translator to work with more licence.

The selection of poems is, however, the main bone of contention, and the real problem revolves around the disagreement between Iino and Fujioka. Silkin had sought to include the translation of Fujioka’s ‘Under’, which is rejected by Iino (6 May 1992) because he feels it does not achieve a sufficiently high level, and that Fujioka does not achieve a distinctive poetic voice. By the end of the same month (25 May 1992), Iino is also rejecting Fujioka’s suggestions of other poems for the anthology, and he laments the lack of congruence in taste between the two. Indeed, Iino even begins to doubt that the four-way editorship – Silkin, Fujioka, Kato, and Iino – will ever be able to function. Given the strains between the collaborators, it is not surprising that the arrangement fails to endure past the summer vacation of 1992, which Silkin and Fujioka spent in England. By 29 September, back in Tsukuba, Silkin is informing Iino that Kato has left the project because he felt he was not respected by Iino. This is partly true, but in his letter Silkin makes no mention of the disagreements between Kato and himself that were developing over another collaborative project – an introductory textbook of English language poetry entitled *An Anthology of Modern English Poems* and contracted to Kenkyusha Publishers. Ironically, this sees the roles

reversed, Silkin editing and selecting the poems, Kato and a colleague vetting the selection and providing annotations for the student audience. Over the course of 1992-3, at a time when he was beginning to include individual poems translated by Kato and Iino in issues of *Stand*, Silkin increasingly regards this parallel project as an unwelcome distraction because, he says, of the stress induced by his medical condition (angina and diabetes); arriving back in England, where Kato is also undertaking a research visit, Silkin refuses to correct the proofs in the summer of 1993 without extra payment. This leads to Silkin's haggling over royalties and to the unfortunate demise of the friendship with Kato.⁴⁹

As with the Hebrew projects, Silkin's ignorance of the source language meant that he depended absolutely on his co-translators to provide a reliable literal for him to work on. But this type of arrangement was common in the translation of Japanese poetry. Thus, in an interview conducted a few years previously, the renowned Japanese poetry translator Hiroaki Sato noted, perhaps too self-deprecatingly, the problems that such a collaboration produced:

A sizeable number, or probably a great majority, of translators of Japanese poetry are people like me – Japanese who translate into English with the help of English or American people, or who provide them with their own translations for transformation. The lapses in the translations done through either arrangement are, I think, mostly traceable to the original translators, including me – their inability to come up with better translations of the English translations to improve on.⁵⁰

The question of authority and ownership of the English translation also proves crucial. Iino recounts a telephone call in late December 1992 with poet and editor Stephen Forster, in Tokyo. Forster had indicated an interest in publishing Silkin's translations of Tamura and Ibaragi and, in conversation with Iino, had apparently suggested revision of several lines. Iino

sent a copy of the revised poems for Silkin to look at; Silkin's immediate scribbled reply is incandescent:

Dear Tomoyuki,

I have just received your letter. I had thought 'your' changes were to do with the Japanese, but I find they are changes to MY English. Tomoyuki, that is NOT in OUR agreement ... They are almost all poor changes ... They are MY translations, not Stephen's.⁵¹

Silkin absolutely insists on the validity of his own phrasing, and elsewhere defends his fellow translator Lane Dunlop's translations of Nobuo Kuroda's poems against revision from Iino.⁵² Silkin openly praises Dunlop's translations: 'I like Lane's translations; he has a steadiness and care that add greatly to our efforts.'⁵³ Other criteria, rarely explicitly articulated, seem to be concision and appropriate idiom and register. For Silkin, non-native speakers such as Kato and Iino do not have the required level of nuance; in Iino's revision of Kato's translation of Noruko Ibaraki's 'When I am at my most beautiful', Silkin calls Iino's attention to the inappropriate use of 'nice' and 'awfully' ('awfully beautiful pictures'), the latter for its 'class connotation'.⁵⁴

Silkin worked with Iino on further translations throughout 1993. The various queries that appear in the correspondence are subtly indicative of the different roles of the members of the group. Occasionally there is a request for cultural information which Silkin lacks. For example, working on a literal translation of Shiro Murano's 'The Bridge', a poem which impresses him, Silkin queries what form the bridge takes, because he is thinking of including the words 'arched, curving bridge'.⁵⁵ On other occasions he writes to confirm the

appropriateness of his deviations from the more or less literal translation with which he had been provided by his collaborator:

I hope I have managed to render the tenderness of this lovely poem – to render it with your already tender translation.

I have made one significant change, which I believe may be justified. Stanza 2, line 1 – instead of ‘cloaking’ I’ve tried ‘cloacal’. It means an underground drain or sewer, hence darkened or cloaked by a sewer or even by shit. I believe the context with the pun justifies my change, and I hope you will agree. I rarely do this, and only when I feel the text provides (me) with a bit of licence. Is that OK?⁵⁶

This is a significant articulation of the relationship between translator, collaborator, and poem. For Silkin, the crucial consideration is the retention, or re-creation, of the overall effect, in this case ‘tenderness’. Yet in order to achieve this he stretches language, at the levels of lexis and imagery, and he is prepared to take a major semantic risk with the move from ‘cloaking’ to ‘cloacal’, so unusual that he has explain it for Iino. Silkin’s concern at this risk is palpable, and relates to what another contributor to the project, Peter Robinson, has called the ‘ontological ambiguity’ of translation: the translation both represents the source poem and stands as a new piece of writing.⁵⁷ Silkin feels that he must justify this distance from the literal translation, and he seeks Iino’s approval, both to make sure the relationship his version establishes between source and target is acceptable, and because Iino shares responsibility for what will be the final published version.

The project becomes even more complex as an array of new English-language collaborators is recruited by Silkin. These include Robinson himself, then a lecturer at Tohoku University in Sendai, Lane Dunlop (see above), and Leith Morton. Morton was

foundation Professor of Japanese at the University of Newcastle, New South Wales. He had been translating and editing his own anthology of Japanese poets for Garland Publishing,⁵⁸ and was put in contact with Silkin by Michael Wilding, Professor of English and Australian literature at the University of Sydney and the Australian editor of *Stand*.⁵⁹ The discussion between Silkin, Morton, and Iino around the translation of Murano Shiro's 'The deer' is further revealing of the interactions among the translating team. Morton's translation for his own anthology runs as follows:

At the edge of a wood a deer
 In the setting sun stood still
 He knew
 His small
 forehead was a target
 But he
 Could do nothing about it
 He stood **obediently**
 Looking toward the village
 His remaining time burned like gold
It was his home
Over the wood at his back the vast night.

Silkin was impressed by this poem, but homed in on the points highlighted in bold: the choice of 'obediently' for the Japanese 'sunnari', and the ambiguity of 'It was his home'. Having studied the translation in class with his Japanese students, Silkin's response to Morton identified these two areas as possible misreadings.⁶⁰ Both generated significant discussion in

the correspondence. For the adverb, Silkin's students suggested 'calmly', and Iino initially agrees. Morton's response quotes from the entry for 'sunnari' in the authoritative Shogakukan Nihon Kokugo Daijiten dictionary (1972-6), where the equivalents generated by the definition might be 'quiet, tranquil, amicable, offering no resistance, gentle, meek', or even 'elegant'.⁶¹ Silkin interprets this as implying that neither his students nor Iino have consulted an up-to-date dictionary, and he then suggests 'patiently'.⁶² Iino disagrees, since, he says, the central meaning as 'standing upright', with the implication of 'slender', 'elegant', 'dignified', as it is about to die. He ends by suggesting 'upright'.⁶³

For Morton, the ending of the poem is more problematic, and he acknowledges the deficiency of the first translation. His analysis stresses the importance of retaining the force of the line hanging on its own - stronger, he says, in Japanese than English, and he felt it essential to end with 'at his back'. The problem concerns structure rather than lexis. Morton suggests three possible solutions, with variants.⁶⁴ It is Iino, able to judge against the source text, who indicates a preference: 'The vast night over | of his forest at his back'.⁶⁵

The real problems of the collection, however, remain the selection of poets and poems. Silkin becomes increasingly convinced that Iino's taste is too restricted and dominant, and that the anthology will not be sufficiently representative of modern Japanese poetry. This realization had been expressed the previous autumn, in September 1993:

our anthology, from my perspective, is moving slowly but definitely towards the ARIDITY of modernism. I simply don't believe that the range of Japanese poetry is as narrow as your selections imply ... Please allow my taste to surface, as well. Currently, it is mostly yours.⁶⁶

The tension reaches a high point in January 1994 when Iino rejects Fujioka's poem 'Blossom' and asks Silkin not to send more of her poems. Silkin says he will ask for another opinion, adding: 'you are not the boss in our partnership any more than I am. I am entitled to send you Toshiko's poems'.⁶⁷ Two months later Silkin was similarly unimpressed when working on the poem 'Of the Wind' by Makoto Ooka, well-known for his popularization of *renshi*, or linked verse, poetry in collaboration with international poets:

I struggled for hours with the 'Wind' poem, and then I realised – it is wind, flatulence. It's empty meaning, it's mere words and tricks at that ... We need work that isn't narcissistically using modernism. We need some work, badly need some work that owes and repays the debt to the world in which it's living.⁶⁸

Two days later, he continues in the same vein, contrasting the 'narrowness' of their anthology with the Sawa/Shiffert anthology, published by Charles E. Tuttle:⁶⁹ 'This wretched narcissistic modernism partly makes me sick', he complains. Silkin's criticisms stem partly from his own translational poetics, which, as we saw with the Gilboa translations and with his appreciation of Dunlop's 'careful' work, decreed that the source text should not be distorted: 'My strictures regarding your "modernism"', he writes to Iino, 'consist of my sense that you make harsh and terse what IS NOT IN THE TEXT'. The upshot is that 'everyone sounds like Ashbury'.⁷⁰

Politically, the criticisms derive from Silkin's absolute conviction, from the very first number of *Stand* in 1952, that poetry needs to be directly related to social issues and the world we live in: 'The only self respect an artist can have', he says, 'is to be paid by the society he works in as a labourer is paid for his effort.'⁷¹ This may explain Silkin's desire to include a substantial number of 'Hiroshima poems'. A decisive clash between Silkin and Iino

came over the work of Hiroshima survivor Araki Yasusada, seven of whose poems were published in *Stand* in Summer 1996, presented by the supposed executor of the poet's estate, Kent Johnson, a teacher of English and Spanish at a community college in Illinois.⁷²

On publication, Silkin received a fax from Morton alerting him to the fact that Yasusada might be a fake.⁷³ Morton pointed to many oddities about the poet and the supposed translators, including the name of one of the latter, Ozaki Kusatao, which suspiciously was a combination of the two great haiku poets of the twentieth century, Ozaki Hosai and Kusatao Nakamura. Yasusada's work had also appeared in other publications, including fourteen poems in *American Poetry Review*. Silkin stood his ground. In the next issue of *Stand* there appeared correspondence on the issue between Silkin and Johnson. The latter's defence was that one of the supposed translators, Tosa Motokiyu, was the author of the writings, but had recently died, and had directed others never to reveal his identity. Johnson traded on questions of authorship and identity which appealed to Silkin:

For Moto, anonymity – and its efflorescence into multiple names – was a gateway into a radically sincere (I use that word with care) expression of empathy. Rather than being 'fakes', I would offer that the Yasusada writings represent an original and courageous form of authenticity – one that is perhaps difficult to appreciate because of the extent to which individual authorial status and self-promotion dominate our thinking about, and practice of, poetry.⁷⁴

Correspondence between Silkin and Iino shows an irreconcilable difference of opinion on this matter; Iino was suspicious of Yasusada's identity, already a growing controversy in Japan, and Silkin only offered to reduce the number of Yasusada poems, not exclude them altogether.⁷⁵ Silkin's extraordinary suggestion for resolving the impasse is to include

Yasusada's 'Big bang' poem 'with a note saying that Iino didn't want it and another from me saying I do trust Kent Johnson'.⁷⁶ Such trust in Johnson seems to have been misguided, given that later developments identified those poems as pseudo-translations.

In that same summer of 1996 Silkin had heard promisingly from Michael Hulse at Arc publications. However, Hulse had sought specialist advice from Roger Finch, a US-born academic and poet specializing in near-Eastern languages and literatures, who had been working in Japan since 1977. The criticisms of the proposed collection from Finch confirmed Silkin's concerns, namely that there were a number of obvious absences, an inclination towards a certain type of Hiroshima poem, and a tendency to confirm westerners' preconceptions about Japan.⁷⁷

For Silkin, the editor of such a compilation can be at fault in failing to represent the relative importance of each poet correctly, and also by neglecting to include a sufficiently broad range of material. He sends Finch's report to Iino, complaining:

What we have so far done is the 'famous' way of playing safe. If everybody gets a poem, no-one can grumble. But this way avoids making a judgment as to the likelihood that some poets are more interesting than others. Surely we as editors have to risk indicating that by giving some poets greater representation than others.⁷⁸

At the same time, Silkin acts to resolve the situation in his own way, enlarging the pool of poems by asking Morton to send more of his translations and asking Hulse if Finch will send fifteen of his. Silkin says he has indicated his preferences and asks Iino to do the same.

Nine months later, in one of the last faxes exchanged between them, Silkin reiterates the above criticisms from another possible publisher, Antony Wood of Angel Books. Silkin sees this as independent corroboration of his view that the collection should be broader, and

should include Ainu poems, Korean Japanese poems, and Yasusada; Silkin also says they should reject Iino's plan of a single poem from each poet.⁷⁹ Iino's faxed response the following day defends his position by saying he does not wish to lower the standards of the collection. Silkin reacts corruscatingly in a fax of 27 September 1997 which begins with an apology for having faxed the earlier message during night in a miscalculation of the time difference between Newcastle and Tokyo, which seems indicative of the distancing of the two editors. The question of control over selection is central to the argument: Silkin's interpretation is that Iino, and before that Kato and Toshiko, had had 'sole control' over the choice, and now he challenges Iino: 'without lowering standards you might consider including poems and poets with whom you have no affinity, but whom you nevertheless know others have some respect for'. Within three days, Silkin faxes again, asking for approval of recommendations from a Japanese specialist in the UK. Iino's same-day response (30 September 1997), the last recorded communication, is a simple but polite 'OK'.

<1 line #>

I have tried to provide some microhistorical insights into the day-to-day activity of Jon Silkin as he collaborated on, promoted, translated, and edited two long-term translation projects from the mid-1960s until his death in 1997. What emerges is a picture of an extraordinarily active and multi-faceted individual: a poet, editor, and translator who also had a deep awareness of the power of translation and a firm commitment to poetry's capacity to establish cultural bridges in a sometimes murky political landscape. But, while artistic affinity saw him persist with his promotion of the poetry of Gilboa, among others, the social and professional interactions that ensued were not always straightforward: egos came to the fore and sensitivities were tested, Silkin's perhaps above all. Silkin was directing these projects, negotiating the crucial poetics of inclusion in anthologies, or demanding the type of literal translation that both respected the source poem and afforded him the security for re-creation

in the target language. He was also negotiating funding, rights, and contracts with a large number of institutions, publishers, and poets. However, the fact that he was unable to read the languages of the poetry with which he was dealing meant that he depended crucially on his collaborators. When he felt that they were not as committed, were not working at the required level, or had a different conception of the project, frictions arose. Agency in translation, as in any professional activity, is not always cleanly delineated, nor does it escape the influence of personal traits. With Silkin, the confusion of roles he played, and the firmness of his convictions, sometimes alienated other agents whose assistance he needed to bring the projects to completion. The projects were unfinished at the time of his death; his papers remain to reveal the complexity of the processes at work.

University of Leeds

¹ André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London, 1992), p. 9.

² This is, of course, in addition to prodigious output of his own poetry. Jon Glover and Kathryn Jenner speak of Silkin's 'lifelong obsession with editing and being published and printed' in their recent 1,020-page *Jon Silkin: Complete Poems* (Manchester, 2015), p. xl.

³ I gratefully acknowledge the permission granted by the executors of Jon Silkin's literary estate for me to quote from Silkin's correspondence and papers, and to Jon Glover in particular for discussions about Silkin.

⁴ Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms*, translated by John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore, MD, 1980).

⁵ 'A Short History of Stand Magazine' <<http://www.people.vcu.edu/~dlatane/stand-maga/history.html>> (accessed 29 October 2014).

⁶ <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/20040/school_of_english/1265/stand_magazine> (accessed 29 October 2014).

⁷ See further Romana Huk, 'Poetry of the Committed Individual: Jon Silkin, Tony Harrison, Geoffrey Hill, and the Poets of Postwar Leeds', in *Contemporary British Poetry: Essays in Theory and Criticism*, edited by James Acheson and Romana Huk (Albany, NY, 1996), pp. 175-219.

⁸ Rodney Pybus, 'Jon Silkin: Obituary', *The Independent*, 1 December 1997.

⁹ Jon Silkin, *Out of Battle: The Poetry of the Great War* (Oxford, 1972); *Wilfred Owen: The War Poems*, edited by Silkin (London, 1994, rev. edn 1996).

¹⁰ Avril Pyman, 'Twentieth-Century Russian Poetry in Stand', in *Symbolism and After: Essays in Russian Poetry in Honour of Georgette Donchin*, edited by Arnold McMillin (London, 1992), pp. 217-31.

¹¹ Silkin, 'Introduction', in *Poetry of the Committed Individual: A Stand Anthology of Poetry*, edited by Silkin (London, 1973), p. 22.

¹² Silkin, Interview on translation, Leeds, Brotherton Library Special Collections, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/3/2. All subsequent references to the Silkin papers are to the same collections.

¹³ Charles Bernstein, *Attack of the Difficult Poems: Essays and Inventions* (Chicago, 2011), p. 132.

¹⁴ As a child Silkin received Hebrew lessons at home for two years. Much later he took a beginners' Hebrew course at the University of Newcastle.

¹⁵ Tom Maschler, letter to Silkin, 19 January 1967, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/2/1.

¹⁶ Zach was later to achieve considerable critical acclaim and, like Gilboa (1982), was to receive an Israel Prize for Hebrew poetry (1995).

¹⁷ Silkin, letter to Natan Zach, 21 April 1970, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/4/3. Unless otherwise stated, all subsequent correspondence cited on the Hebrew poets project comes under the same shelfmark. For a detailed account of the Penguin series, see Tom Boll's essay in the present collection.

-
- ¹⁸ Natan Zach, letters to Silkin, 15 July 1970 and 2 September 1970.
- ¹⁹ Silkin, draft introduction to Hebrew Poets, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/4, p. 9.
- ²⁰ Amir Gilboa, letter to Nikos Stangos, 22 April 1971 and 30 June 1971.
- ²¹ Silkin, letter to Amir Gilboa, 18 June 1971.
- ²² Silkin, letter to Nikos Stangos and Aaron Megged, 7 May 1971.
- ²³ Silkin, letter to Amir Gilboa, 18 June 1971.
- ²⁴ Nikos Stangos, letter to Silkin, 9 July 1971.
- ²⁵ Amir Gilboa, letter to Nikos Stangos, 24 May 1971.
- ²⁶ Amir Gilboa, *The Light of Lost Suns*, translated by Shirley Kaufmann with Shlomith Rimmon-Kennan (New York and London, 1979).
- ²⁷ Silkin, letter to Amir Gilboa, May 1980; Amir Gilboa, letter to Silkin, 7 May 1980.
- ²⁸ Correspondence between Anthony Rudolf and Nilli Cohen of the Institute in 1997 stresses the important role of Feinberg as a go-between for Gilboa and Silkin. Anthony Rudolf, letter to Nilli Cohen, 11 September 1997.
- ²⁹ Nilli Cohen, letter to Silkin, 8 April 1980 and 9 September 1980, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/2/4.
- ³⁰ Silkin, letter to Ran Kedar, 18 August 1980, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/4/4.
- ³¹ Ran Kedar, letter to Silkin, 27 July 1980, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/2/4.
- ³² Silkin, letter to Ran Kedar, 18 August 1980; Silkin, letter to Nilli Cohen, 29 September 1980, BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/4/4.
- ³³ Stephen Brook, letter to Silkin, 4 June 1980.
- ³⁴ Jacqueline Simms, letter to Silkin, 18 June 1980.
- ³⁵ Esther Whitby, letter to Silkin, 26 June 1980.
- ³⁶ Silkin, letter to Maier Deshall, 18 June 1980.
- ³⁷ Alvin H. Rosenfeld, letter to Silkin, 2 July 1980.

-
- ³⁸ Nilli Cohen, letter to Silkin, 22 September 1997.
- ³⁹ Silkin, 'Working at Someone Else's Poem', *Modern Poetry in Translation*, 41-2 (1981), 37-8 (p. 37).
- ⁴⁰ Natan Zach, letter to Silkin, 15 July 1970.
- ⁴¹ Silkin, drafts of 'Joshua's Face', BC MS 20c Silkin/2/1/4/2.
- ⁴² Dunlop was the translator of two volumes of Japanese short stories with North Point Press, and was eventually to contribute to the new poetry project.
- ⁴³ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 9 March 1987.
- ⁴⁴ Tomoyuki Iino, letter to Silkin, 22 November 1986.
- ⁴⁵ Yukio Kato, letter to Silkin, undated, BC MS 20c Silkin/8/KAT-2.
- ⁴⁶ Kato, letter to Silkin, 16 June 1992, BC MS 20c Silkin/8/KAT-2.
- ⁴⁷ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 26 April 1992, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/7. Unless otherwise stated, subsequent references to correspondence related to this publication belong to the same shelf mark.
- ⁴⁸ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 1 May 1992.
- ⁴⁹ Yukio Kato, letter to Silkin, 5 September 1993, BC MS 20c Silkin/8/KAT-2.
- ⁵⁰ 'The Translator's Voice: An Interview with Hiroaki Sato', *Translation Review*, 10 (1982) <http://translation.utdallas.edu/Interviews/HiroakiSatoTR_10.html> (accessed 29 October 2014).
- ⁵¹ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 14 January 1993.
- ⁵² Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 20 February 1994, 4 March 1994.
- ⁵³ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 21 May 1994.
- ⁵⁴ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 12 May 1992.
- ⁵⁵ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 26 September 1993.
- ⁵⁶ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 25 October 1992.

⁵⁷ Peter Robinson, *Poetry and Translation: The Art of the Impossible* (Liverpool, 2010), p. 50.

⁵⁸ This appeared as *An Anthology of Contemporary Japanese Poetry* (Garland Publishing, 1993).

⁵⁹ Leith Morton, letter to Silkin, 7 April 1992, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/8.

⁶⁰ Silkin, letter to Leith Morton, 17 December 1993, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/8.

⁶¹ Leith Morton, letter to Silkin, 17 January 1994, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/8.

⁶² Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 27 January 1994.

⁶³ Tomoyuki Iino, letter to Silkin, 7 January 1994, 4 February 1994.

⁶⁴ Morton, letter to Silkin, 17 January 1994, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/8.

⁶⁵ Iino, letter to Silkin, 4 February 1994.

⁶⁶ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 26 September 1993.

⁶⁷ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 27 January 1994. The poem was reworked by Peter Robinson and published in *Literary Review* (1 January 1996).

⁶⁸ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 2 March 1994.

⁶⁹ *Anthology of Modern Japanese Poetry*, compiled and translated by Edith Marcombe Shiffert and Yuki Sawa (2nd edn, Tokyo, 1989).

⁷⁰ Silkin, letter to Tomoyuki Iino, 28 September 1994.

⁷¹ Silkin, 'Editorial', *Stand*, 1 (1952), 2.

⁷² Araki Yukasada, 'Poems from Hiroshima', *Stand*, 37 (1996), 4-11.

⁷³ Leith Morton, fax to Silkin, 16 September 1996, BC MS 20c Stand/3/JOH-8.

⁷⁴ Kent Johnson, letter, *Stand*, 38.1 (1996), p. 38.

⁷⁵ Tomoyuki Iino, faxes to Silkin, 15 October 1996 and 1 November 1996; Silkin, fax to Tomoyuki Iino, 29 October 1996.

⁷⁶ Silkin, fax to Tomoyuki Iino, 4 November 1996.

⁷⁷ Michael Hulse, letter to John Silkin, 24 October 1996, BC MS 20c Silkin 2/2/6.

⁷⁸ Silkin, fax to Tomoyuki Iino, 26 November 1996.

⁷⁹ Silkin, fax to Tomoyuki Iino, 24 September 1997.