STUDIA UBB SOCIOLOGIA, 63 (LXIII), 2, 2018, pp. 93-116
DOI: 10.2478/subbs-2018-0013

TRANSLATING JOHN V. MURRA'S 'THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION OF THE INCA STATE' INTO ROMANIAN AS 'OBRA DE AMOR'

MARIAN VIOREL ANĂSTĂSOAIE[1]

ABSTRACT. This paper addresses one of the first translations of a US anthropological monograph into Romanian. Its author, John V. Murra (1916–2006), born into a Russian-Jewish family in Odessa, grew up in Romania, where he studied and became involved in the Communist movement before his departure for Chicago in 1934. His 1956 PhD thesis in anthropology at University of Chicago on the Inka state was a first step towards turning Murra into an influential figure in the field of Andean anthropology. His sister Ata Iosifescu lived in Romania and translated his PhD thesis into Romanian, published in 1987 as *Civilizaţie inca: organizarea economică a statului incaş* (Inka Civilization: the Economic Organization of the Inka State). Based on their correspondence kept at the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, DC), I propose to reconstruct this translation's story: the context, the constraints and the process of translation itself. I am also addressing the question of the book's reception in Romania.

Keywords: translation, John Victor Murra, Inka civilization, Andean anthropology, anthropological texts in Romanian

Introduction: The importance of translation in anthropology[2]

The reader opening the book *Civilizaţie Inca* by John Victor Murra (1987) could hardly guess the identity of the translator and the story behind this translation.[3] The invisibility of the translation work decried by Lawrence Venuti

[1] New Europe College, Bucharest, *e-mail*: *viorelan@gmail.com*.

[2] I am indebted to László Fosztó, Maria (Măriuca) Iosifescu, Ioana Măgureanu, Anca Oroveanu, Mihai Popa, and Iuliu Raţiu for their helpful comments on an earlier draft. They are not responsible for my remaining errors of fact or interpretation. Constantin Ardeleanu helped me in getting in contact with Corina Buşe, the book editor of *Civilizaţie inca*. The research on which this essay is based was supported by a New Europe College fellowship.

[3] Both 'Inca' and 'Inka' are accepted forms in modern English. The second form uses the orthography of Quechua, the language of the Inka. Murra used the first form in his PhD dissertation, but later on adopted the second form. In this paper I use 'Inka', but keep 'Inca' for the title of the dissertation.

(2008) is here even more remarkable since the author and translator are siblings – a fact which is not obvious to the reader, as there is no name coincidence and there is no mention of it in the book. Ata Iosifescu was the younger sister of John Murra or Isaak Lipschitz, his birth name. They were both born in Odessa, in a Russian-speaking Jewish family who later moved to Bucharest in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution. Their life trajectories were marked by the major events of the 20th century: the Russian Revolution, the Spanish Civil War, WWII and the Cold War, making even more extraordinary this case of a physicist from socialist Romania translating the book of one of the most accomplished US anthropologists working on the Andean cultures. Based on the rich correspondence kept at the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, DC) between John Murra and Ata Iosifescu, this article reconstructs the process of this translation: the context, logistics, the constraints and the process of translation itself (finding Romanian equivalents for technical terms, explaining native terms, clarifying inconsistencies and errors in the text and providing visual illustrations).[4]

In spite of the importance of translation practices for the discipline of anthropology, the translation of anthropological texts has rarely been addressed in the history of the discipline. However, translation is a crucial process in the larger circulation of anthropological ideas, theories, and ethnographies across national research traditions and between sites of research and teaching. Moreover, the labor of translating anthropological texts is essential for training students and for popularizing anthropology beyond the confines of the academia or specialist circles. Translation, at least that of literature, functions in a regime of fluency, whereby a translated text should be read fluently, 'insuring easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning' (Venuti, 2008: 1). This requirement of fluency leads to a certain invisibility of the translator – in fact, the less the translator's work is felt by the reader, the better the illusion of the transparency of the text and its closeness to the original. This invisibility has been questioned recently in translation studies, especially after the work of Lawrence Venuti (2008). A related discussion in translation studies has dealt with the relation between the original and the translation: is the translation derivative, secondary to the original, as it is commonly thought, or is the translation the continuation, the 'after-life' of the

[4] John V. Murra's personal papers are part of the National Anthropological Archives of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC. They include manuscripts, personal documents, diaries, and correspondence. In the correspondence section, there is a folder titled 'Economic Organization of the Inca State, Romanian Translation – Ata' containing 103 items, mainly letters from Ata Iosifescu to John V. Murra. Murra kept only copies of some of his letters he sent to his sister. I thank the NAA staff, especially its reference archivist Adam Minakowski, for their amazing support during my research visit in June and July 2014.

source text, as Jacques Derrida (1985a), on the footsteps of Walter Benjamin (2000[1923]), argues? In anthropology, too, there have been critical discussions on the place of translation practices within the discipline, in fieldwork and in writing (Rubel and Rosman, 2003; Leavitt, 2014), and their importance for the epistemology of the discipline (Hanks and Severi, 2014). However, little attention has been given to the after-life of anthropological texts in translation. This article is an attempt to fill this gap, by providing a detailed description of a translation of a US anthropological text into Romanian in the late socialist period.

The author: John Murra (Isaak Lipschitz), 1916–2006

John Victor Murra was born Isaak Lipschitz on August 24, 1916 in Odessa, into a Jewish family. His only sibling was Beatrice (Ata), born in 1920. Their parents decided to move to Bucharest in 1921 to avoid the hardships of the Civil War in Russia. Murra studied at the Lutheran School in Bucharest and at the prestigious Gheorghe Lazăr high-school, from which he was expelled in 1932 because of his left-leaning political sympathies. He did, nevertheless, obtain his baccalaureate in 1933 as a privately educated pupil. According to his testimonies, he was briefly imprisoned on political grounds after he got in contact with the Communist underground movement through the mediation of his older friend Petru Năvodaru (Peter Fisher), a very influential figure for Murra. In a context of growing anti-Semitism and persecution of the Communists, Murra's parents sent him at the end of 1934 to Chicago, where one of his paternal uncles worked as a professional musician.

In Chicago, Murra enrolled at the University of Chicago, where he obtained a BA in sociology in 1936. He also remained involved in political activism and took part in several anti-segregation rallies. At the beginning of 1937, he volunteered for the International Brigades in the Spanish Civil War, returning to the US in 1939. He used John Victor Murra as his *nom de guerre* in the Spanish Civil War, a name he later adopted as his civil name. He was wounded in the Ebro offensive in 1938. Participation in the Spanish Civil War was a maturing experience for him, boosting his self-confidence, but also causing a disenchantment with politics. As a translator assigned to the headquarters of the International Brigades he witnessed how decisions were taken by the political commissars under the control of the Comintern, and the propaganda and bureaucratic red tape under the Soviet influence.[5]

[5] It is worth mentioning the importance of language proficiency in Murra's professional life. Besides being a translator and interpreter during the Spanish Civil War, he also translated French historical documents on Native Americans to make ends meet as a student in Chicago. Later on, he co-translated from Russian a series of articles from the Soviet press on N. Y. Marr's linguistic theories, including Stalin's criticism of the latter's interpretations of Marxism (Murra, 1951).

When he returned to Chicago in 1939, Murra enrolled in the MA program in anthropology at the University of Chicago, with renewed energy after giving up political activism. Trained in the four-field approach of the US anthropology (cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeology and linguistics), in 1941–42 he worked as assistant researcher for an archeological team of the Field Museum in Ecuador. This first fieldwork experience in the Andes was decisive for Murra's lifelong interest in the study of Andean cultures. After successfully defending his MA thesis, he obtained a fellowship from the Social Science Research Council to pursue PhD fieldwork in Ecuador. However, he could not travel to Ecuador because of difficulties in obtaining the US citizenship, which he eventually obtained after long years of legal battles, as the authorities denied his naturalization because of his involvement in the Spanish Civil War and previous political activism.

Unable to travel for fieldwork to South America, Murra turned to a library-based dissertation on the economic organization of the Inka state, plodding through 16th century historical accounts of Spanish missionaries and soldiers. He found theoretical inspiration in the British anthropological works on African states and their political organization (E. E. Evans-Pritchard, Max Gluckman, Hilda Kuper, Siegfried Nadel) and in the 1953–1954 intellectual exchanges of the Karl Polanyi's group at Columbia University on pre-capitalist economic forms. He defended his thesis in 1956 under the title *The Economic Organization of the Inca State*. Until its publication in Spanish in 1978 and in English in 1980, his thesis circulated in microfilm among a limited circle of specialists. It acquired the status of a classical contribution to the elucidation of the nature and functioning of the Inka statecraft. For centuries, the nature of the Inka state (*Tahuantinsuyu* in Quechua, meaning 'Realm of the Four Parts') has fascinated the Europeans due to its technological and material achievements and its degree of organization. Labels such as 'totalitarian' or 'socialist' were employed to explain the centralized administration through which the Inka sovereign controlled a huge territory, built an advanced infrastructure and distributed surplus products to its subjects. Murra dispelled such ideological labels: even though at first he entertained the idea of an Inka 'feudal' state, he discarded it in his thesis after assimilating the literature on pre-colonial African states.

The importance of published sources of first contacts between Native Amerindians and the Spaniards for Murra's doctoral work made him a life-long practitioner of archival work and an advocate of the importance of editing administrative reports, legal documents, census, and chronicles buried in the rich archives pertaining to the Spanish colonial period in Cuzco and Seville. He edited a series of important documents from the 16th and 17th centuries, enriching the sources of ethno-historical research in the Andes.

Building on insights from his PhD thesis, subsequent fieldwork research and archival materials, Murra elaborated the model of the vertical archipelago or ecological complementarity of the Central Andes in order to explain how such a grand civilization as the Inkas could emerge in the difficult physical and climatic conditions of the Andes, where large populations were living at 4,000 meters and above (Murra, 1972). Andean communities created a system of management of environmental resources and productive agro-pastoral practices in diverse and contrasting ecological zones, from the coast of the Pacific Ocean and from tropical forests to the high-altitude cold and partially arid climatic conditions. Spatially, these communities functioned as 'vertical archipelagos', with settlements in distinct ecological zones exchanging products and raw materials through reciprocal links in a complementary way.

John V. Murra had a long commitment in building up and strengthening institutions of anthropological research in Latin American countries. He advocated for collaborative projects of US academic institutions with scholars and universities from Mexico, Peru, Chile, Ecuador, and Bolivia. He helped students from these countries secure financial support in order to study in US universities. He taught and wrote in Spanish, relishing contacts with Latin American intellectuals and students, building transnational networks and research projects. His genuine commitment to fostering the field of Andean studies gained him public recognition and lasting friendships in Andean countries on a scale rarely experienced by an anthropologist. It was in Latin America where his first authored book appeared (Murra, 1975), followed by the translation of his thesis (Murra, 1978).

The translator: Beatrice (Ata) Iosifescu (1920–2007)[6]

Ata Iosifescu, born Beatrice Lipschitz, remained in Romania with their parents (Murra's father died in 1935). During the war, she went with her mother through a difficult period, as a consequence of the anti-Semitic laws adopted by the Goga-Cuza government in 1938 and the persecution of Jews during WWII. Even though they were not deported, Ata and her mother were evicted from their house, which was confiscated. During the war, she became involved in underground activities carried out by the Communist Party and met, through common friends, her future husband Silvian Iosifescu (1917–2006), later a literary critic and professor of literary theory at the University of

[6] Throughout the paper I will use Ata and Murra when I will talk about the two siblings and their exchanges in the translation process. Both were nicknames used in the family and with friends. In Murra's case, he adopted his childhood name as a civil name when he applied for the US citizenship.

Bucharest. She studied German, French and English in school, in addition to Russian, which she knew from home.[7] After the war, she trained as a physicist and worked as a researcher at the Institute of Nuclear Physics. In 1975 she was diagnosed with breast cancer. She was cured after surgery and radiotherapy. She started to learn Spanish once she retired in 1975, in order to be able to read Murra's work published in that language, as well as Latin American writers whom she highly admired, such as Gabriel García Márquez or José María Arguedas.[8] She enrolled in a three-year course of Spanish at the Open University (*Universitatea Populară*) in Bucharest. Already in her second year of Spanish classes, she wrote letters in Spanish to her brother as well as to some of his friends and former students. It is in these years of studying Spanish that she began contemplating the idea of translating Murra's *Formaciones* into Romanian, a project which elicited the encouragements of her brother. Ata nourished a deep love and admiration for her brother since childhood. Her admiration for his work grew as she was able to read his books and articles. In April 1976, after reading one of the chapters from *Formaciones* she wrote to him that he shared with poets the ability to see the profound meanings beyond the everyday and banal appearances of things.[9] In May 1982, she wrote to Murra, referring to his retirement from teaching, that 'at least your consciousness is clear, since in all these years you have spread not only knowledge, but you also have ignited in lots of people the desire to know and search further. This is a big achievement.'[10] For Ata, translating his book into Romanian was *una obra de amor* (a work of love), as Ana María Lorandi, a friend

[7] Ata didn't speak Yiddish, but knew and employed many words and expressions in this language (interview with Maria Iosifescu, Ata Iosifescu's youngest daughter, June 2014), something which comes out here and there in her letters. In 1985, she wrote to Murra that she started to read books written in Yiddish (in Hebrew script), and that she also started to learn Bulgarian words in order to be able to watch Bulgarian TV, which provided better entertainment than the austere and highly ideologized Romanian TV in the 1980s. After her eldest daughter immigrated to Israel in 1984, Ata started to learn Hebrew.

[8] José María Arguedas (1911–1969), Peruvian novelist, poet and anthropologist, explored in his novels the conflicts between indigenous populations and the dominant groups in the Andes. He and Murra were very good friends and had a fruitful intellectual and personal exchange, as their correspondence shows (Murra and López-Baralt, 1996). Ata Iosifescu knew about Arguedas from Murra and first read one of his works in a German translation, before reading the original in Spanish, together with other of his works she received from Murra and Ana María Lorandi (see footnote 10).

[9] It was the chapter on maize, potatoes, and agrarian rituals of the Inkas (Murra, 1975: 46–57).

[10] My translation from Romanian. Letter of Ata Iosifescu (AI) to John V. Murra (JVM), May 5, 1982, National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, John V. Murra (JVM) Papers, Folder '[Economic Organization of the Inca State, Romanian Translation]–Ata'. All letters between the two mentioned in this paper are from the same folder.

of Murra, put it in a letter to her.[11] Despite the fact that she was not a historian by training, Ata became familiar with Inka history through her readings of Murra's work, through her discussions with him and other Andean specialists, and through letters exchanged with some of his former students working on Andean issues. She applied her energy and dedication to her translation, carried out in a very professional way. Before examining the translation process, it is informative to look at the publishing context of the 1980s Romania.

Murra and Ata in New York, 1968 or 1969. *Photography courtesy of Irina Zahan.*

The institutional and political context of publishing in late socialist Romania

In order to understand the process of this translation it is useful to have a glimpse at the institutional context of publishing in Romania during the late 1970s and 1980s. We still lack a comprehensive study of the field of translations in socialist Romania, in spite of earlier attempts to map out this field (Ionescu,

[11] Ana María Lorandi (1936–2017) was an Argentinian archaeologist and ethno-historian.

1981). The post-1989 histories of publishing during socialism have focused almost exclusively on the complex issue of censorship (Corobca, 2014; Vianu, 1998), but they are insufficient for the understanding of the overall institutional framework for publishing and the everyday life of working with and within publishing houses during the socialist period. Ioana Macrea-Toma's (2009) historical reconstruction of the literary field in socialist Romania (1947–1989) is the most ambitious endeavor so far, but the issue of translations is not comprehensively treated in her work, since this wasn't its main focus. Moreover, the domain of non-literary translations, especially in social sciences, is completely ignored.

After the death of Romanian Communist Party's First Secretary Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej in March 1965, Nicolae Ceaușescu was elected as the new General Secretary of the Party. A period of liberalization followed as a strategy of gaining legitimacy, especially among intellectuals and technocratic elites. The moment that epitomized this period was Ceaușescu's opposition to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. Many intellectuals, including some who had been critical of the regime, joined the Communist Party at that time. These years were characterized by a more tolerant censorship, a selective rehabilitation of historical figures who had until then been seen as suspect, and renewed contacts with the West. Intellectuals who were forbidden to publish or who had been convicted during the 1950s repressive campaigns were allowed to enter cultural and academic institutions. This period of liberalization ended in 1971, when Ceaușescu issued new 'theses' or principles for the political-ideological activity, signaling a return to a tighter ideological control in the cultural sphere. Another significant development was the restructuring of censorship in 1977 by abolishing the Committee for the Press and Printing (*Comitetul pentru Presă și Tipărituri*), the organization in charge with censorship. This didn't mean the end of censorship in Romania. On the contrary, it meant that censorship was now the direct responsibility of publishing houses, newspapers and cultural magazines. Editors had to verify manuscripts, before asking for the official approval for publishing from the Council of Culture and Socialist Education (*Consiliul Culturii și Educației Socialiste*). In fact, by decentralizing some of the control mechanisms in publishing, the decision to abolish censorship created more bureaucratic hurdles for potential or even well-known authors (Macrea-Toma, 2009: 212–228). Adding to these bureaucratic difficulties, a principle of economic efficiency was introduced into the publishing sector, following administrative measures for decentralizing the publishing sector in 1969 and 1973 (Macrea-Toma, 2009: 169–172). The publishing houses had to partially cover financial losses with publishing translations and even expect authors to financially contribute to the publishing of their books. In the 1980s, subsidies for the publishing sector were

reduced, while the pressure from above was to publish saleable titles in order to avoid producing on stocks. This requirement for economic efficiency within cultural institutions translated into the issue of self-financing (*auto-finanțare*) in the 1980s, when cultural institutions were required to partially cover their expenses through income-generating activities. For example, scientific journals included pages of advertising for state firms, and cultural magazines published reportage articles on factories and collective farms as forms of advertising.[12]

Katherine Verdery's (1991) classic analysis of the intellectual life under Ceaușescu offers astute observations on the role of translations as part of larger intellectual strategies of forming 'a *cognizant public*, that is, building an audience (or maintaining one already in existence) that recognizes and supports the definitions of value upon which the cultural status of a given group of intellectuals rests' (Verdery, 1991: 294). Translations were, therefore, 'part of creating a larger public for culture, a sort of raising of the spiritual standard of living, parallel to the state's claims to raise the material standard of living.' (Verdery, 1991: 295). Moreover, by making available fundamental classical texts or more recent ones, translation projects could be 'a form of political action', in Verdery's formulation (1991: 295), in the hand of intellectuals in their struggles with the official culture and/or symbolic competition with other intellectual groups. Much of these struggles were infra-political (Scott, 1990), that is, acts, gestures and thoughts of undisclosed, undeclared resistance against the dominant group. In a context where open contestation or dissidence was risky, the acts of resistance took mundane forms such as poaching, stealing, gossip, character assassination and others under the cover of kin/friendship networks. In the domain of publishing and academic life, such infra-political acts could include setting up and maintaining circles of discussions and intellectual production proposing alternative values to the official ones, circulating samizdat or manuscripts, publishing texts that contained veiled criticism of the political and economic situation, or even publishing articles and books, including translations, outmaneuvering the vigilance of the censor.

[12] Advertisement as such barely existed in Romania, since it had no market economy – which would have contravened to socialist principles – and the only competition imaginable among producers was who would be the first to reach (and go beyond) the production requirements set for the annual/5-year plan. As a result, when they existed at all, the ads had often an absurd ring to them. Sometimes the way different cultural institutions addressed the issue of self-financing achieved absurd-comical proportions comparable to the literature of Ilf and Petrov. In the late 1980s, the Opera House in Bucharest had an arrangement with the Vulcan Power Plant Factory whereby they offered ballet classes to workers of the factory. No worker enrolled in these classes, but the Opera received payment for such classes from the factory (personal communication, Alexandru Danga). It was a win-win situation in terms of complying with official ideology: the Opera House showed their self-financing effort, while the factory could report the cultural services they offered their workers.

The paucity of anthropological translations reflected the marginality of the discipline within the field of social sciences in socialist Romania. Both folklore studies and sociology had a longer local history and could claim their strategic importance in relation to the project of nation-building and consolidation of the nation-state (Gheorghiu, 1991). Until its emergence as an academic discipline in Romania in the 1960s, cultural anthropology could not claim a body of scholarship based on field research outside Romania. Actually, its main proponent, Vasile Caramelea had been a student of Dimitrie Gusti, the founder of the Sociological School of Bucharest. All research done under the label of cultural or social anthropology during socialist times had an exclusive focus on Romanian topics. No fieldwork was carried out outside Romania. This self-centeredness translated into little interest in translating anthropological works dealing with other areas of the world.[13]

A proposal for a translation had to be accepted by a book editor, in which case it was included in the publishing plan of the publishing house. The first mention of a contact with a publishing house appears in Ata's letter to Murra on November 2, 1978. She wrote to him that she had a conversation with the editor-in-chief of *Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică* (Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House), who was open to the idea of a translation of Murra's book to be eventually published in their *Popoare, culturi, civilizaţii* (People, Cultures, Civilizations) book series.[14] She asked Murra to send her another copy of the published Spanish translation of his thesis and of the English original. The editor preferred to have the English original, because it was easier to find reviewers for the English rather than the Spanish version of

[13] Until 1989, the very few translations of anthropological works comprised authors such as Julius Lips, Ralph Linton and Claude Lévi-Strauss. After 1989, the situation of anthropological translations slowly improved, but still with a huge deficit of translations of classics, as well as of recent contributions in anthropology.

[14] Using the online catalogue of the Central University Library in Bucharest, I found 23 titles published in this series between 1966 and 1987, 10 translations and 13 works by Romanian scholars. The translations are from authors such as Jacques Le Goff, Harald Zimmermann, Margarete Riemschneider, Henri Hubert, Robert Étienne, Peter H. Buck, André Bonnard and Raymond Bloch. The Romanian authors included Vasile Pârvan, Petru P. Panaitescu, and Andrei Oţetea. This publishing house was set up after the decentralization of the publishing system in 1969 and was specialized in publishing dictionaries, encyclopedias, scientific books, but also titles in social sciences, history, and philosophy. The director of the publishing house was Mircea Mâciu, a former copy editor and editor-in-chief of Editura Politică (Political Publishing Press), sociologist by training and author of several books on the history of sociology in Romania. He was director of the publishing house until 1987, when he was apparently forced to resign his position as his daughter applied to leave the country (Verdery 1991: 336; also letter of AI to JVM, January 18, 1988).

the book. The letter was sent to Seville, Spain, where Murra was spending his sabbatical year doing research in the General Archive of the Indies. On December 23, 1978 Iosifescu made a formal written proposal to the publishing house for the translation of Murra's thesis. She used the title of the Spanish edition as it was the only published version of the thesis at the time, while mentioning that there were three other publishing projects of the thesis: the English original in the US, the French translation (under negotiations with Payot or Maspero), and advanced discussions for the Italian translation. In her proposal, Ata mentioned that Murra kept 'friendly relations' (*relații cordiale*) with Romanian scholars, as he had already visited Romania in 1976, when he delivered a lecture at the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore on the Vertical Archipelago hypothesis concerning the pre-Columbian Andean societies. She also stated the intention of the author to write a new preface for the Romanian edition, and to add necessary footnotes for a public less familiarized with the Andean cultures. She mentioned that the translation will be made after the English original. A letter dated January 31, 1979 contains more details on the first contact with the publishing house. The discussions with the friendly editor made it clear that they were overloaded with other projects and that processing the translation proposal will take a while. Before approaching the publishing house, Ata consulted with Professor Dionisie M. Pippidi, historian and archaeologist, concerning the choice of a publishing house. The waiting period ended in June 1979, when the editorial board approved the publication of the translation. In September 1979, Ata contacted Mihai Pop[15] with the agreement of the publishing house, asking him to be the official reviewer (*referent*) of the book. In his report, Pop wrote approvingly on its translation and recommended it both for specialists and the larger public. Ata found Pop's report of little substance and stylistically undistinguished, and expressed her doubts that a preface written by Pop would be more interesting than a new preface written by Murra. The first official letter from the publishing house dates from March 1, 1980, when the director of the Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House wrote to Murra asking for his permission to proceed with the translation – planned to be printed in 1,000 copies at the end of 1981.

[15] Mihai Pop (1907–2000) was a Romanian ethnologist, with a background in literature and philosophy and with a PhD in Slavonic Studies from the University of Bratislava. He was professor of folklore at Bucharest University and director of the Institute of Folklore (1965–1974).

The book editor for the translation was Corina Buşe.[16] Ata developed a good rapport with her, according to her letters to Murra.[17] In a letter to Murra dated August 10, 1981, she wrote that she had succeeded at last in signing the contract with the publishing house, and that the book editor had been quite helpful, preparing the contract without having read the original in English nor the Spanish translation, doing this only 'based on trust and on the report of [Mihai] Pop because she (the editor) has no English or Spanish'. The editor had not yet seen the Romanian translation, because at the moment of signing the contract Ata was just starting the revision of her translation. Two years later, in March 1983, the book was still not published, and there was no firm commitment from the publishing house concerning its publication. All editorial projects were frozen. Ata wrote to Murra from Rome, where she was together with her husband and her daughter Măriuca, that she had had a meeting with the editor-in-chief of the publishing house. During the meeting, the latter invoked the fact that the allocated paper quota for the publishing house was insufficient, that new rules of 'profitability' were introduced, which meant that only those books that could produce profit could be published. In the same letter, Ata advised Murra to give up on the idea of searching for alternative funding for the publication of the translation as this would appear 'strange', even 'dubious' to the publishing house, besides the fact that the costs were very high. She proposed to wait for a more favorable moment, knowing that the signed contract between her and the publishing house bound them to publish the book by 1985.[18] In fall of 1983, Murra came briefly to Bucharest (most probably from Athens, where he attended a history conference) and he visited the headquarters of the publishing house. 'You made an excellent impression,' his sister wrote to him after a discussion with the book editor, but this visit was not sufficient to speed up the process of publication. The translation appeared only in mid-1987.

[16] After finishing her BA in History at the University of Bucharest in 1962, Corina Buşe worked as a book editor at the Meridiane Publishing House, specialized in the history and theory of art. She came to the Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House as a history book editor in the early 1980s (interview with Corina Buşe, November 27, 2018).

[17] This was confirmed by Corina Buşe.

[18] In the letter sent from Rome, Ata was more outspoken about the situation back home, complaining about the new measure forcing those who want to leave the country to pay in hard currency the costs of their education in Romania. She felt personally concerned by this new regulation as her eldest daughter, Irina, and her husband recently made an official request to emigrate. Ata writes that for the government those who want to emigrate are 'traitors'. She ends the letter asking Murra to be cautious in what he writes in his letters to her address back home about the situation of her daughter and the publishing house (letter of AI to JVM, March 16, 1983).

The process of translation

I reconstructed the process of translation from Murra's correspondence deposited at the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution. The correspondence between John V. Murra and Ata Iosifescu about the translation covers nine years, from 1978 to 1987, and it documents the translation process and its various operations, such as exchanges between author and translator, editing, corrections, clarifications in a pre-Word processor mode of operation, hard to grasp in our digital world.[19] It was also a period with significant events and changes in the siblings' lives. Since the mid-1970s, Murra benefitted from a number of invited professorships, fellowships, and research assignments at Princeton, in Paris, Lima, Boston and La Paz. In 1978–79 he spent eight months working in the Archivo General de las Indias, Seville, during his sabbatical leave from Cornell University and he became an emeritus professor in 1982. In 1983–84 he was a Guggenheim Fellow, spending that year in Spain for archival work, where he returned in 1985–86 for seven months. In spring 1987 he was visiting professor at the London School of Economics. In 1980 Asna Bialik, their mother, died in New York and, prior and after that unfortunate event, Ata travelled several times to the States to visit her mother and her daughter, Măriuca, a student at NYU since 1977. Her eldest daughter immigrated to Israel together with her husband in 1984.

The reference text for the translation was the English edition of the thesis, published in 1980 in the Research in Economic Anthropology Series, edited by George Dalton (Murra, 1980a). The latter wrote to John Murra in October 1977 with the proposal to publish the 1956 thesis in the Series as a supplement volume. In his reply letter to Dalton, Murra was pleased with the invitation to contribute a revised version of the thesis to the series – a change in his reluctance to publish his thesis throughout all previous years. In his letter, Murra explained to Dalton that the imminent publication of the Spanish translation of the thesis and the planned Italian translation softened his reluctance to have his revised thesis published in English. Murra offered to write a new introduction and to revise the manuscript, especially the footnotes, and to update the bibliography.

However, as I mentioned earlier, Ata had learnt Spanish in order to be able to read Murra's publications in that language. She read *Formaciones* in the late 1970s, before approaching the publishing house for the translation, and she

[19] The letters are mostly handwritten, several are typed. Murra had a large, leased Xerox machine in his dining room at home since the early 1970s (Adorno, 2010), and he used it for photocopying documents, letters, and newspaper clips.

started the translation in December 1979 from English. Her working method was to confront the Spanish translation with the English original, while translating it into Romanian. She found a number of discrepancies between the English original and the Spanish translation and asked Murra for clarifications. She found out that the translation into Romanian worked better when she had both versions of the text, in Spanish and in English. She decided to translate two chapters of the thesis by using their improved versions published in Spanish in *Formaciones*, the one on herds and herders (chapter 3) and on cloth in the Inka Empire (chapter 4). Whenever she felt that the text was not easy to follow, she asked for clarifications and made suggestions accepted by Murra. One example is the question of land rights in the Inka Empire (chapter 2): in the thesis the distinctions between the land owned by the state ('crown') and the land owned by kings and their relatives as personal property were not clear enough. She proposed to Murra to include a diagram and some explanatory notes about the land tenure in the Inka Empire, using an article he had published in 1980 (Murra, 1980b). Murra's anthropological style is clear and jargon-free, so there weren't many difficulties in translation, with the exception of a few concepts (*mana*, cultural hero, and moieties) that had to be explained in the Romanian translation in footnotes. However, Murra employed numerous native Quechua terms in his dissertation, such as *ayllu*, *curaca*, *mita*, *pachaca*, *quipu* and others, which were defined in a glossary. Ata included a glossary too, and explained some of the terms in footnotes when they first occurred in the text.

Several times, Ata expressed the pleasure she derived from translating. On October 17, 1983 she mentioned in a letter to Murra some paragraphs from a letter she had written to Heather Lechman, in English, about her experience:

> I am always surrounded by a lot of dictionaries and I have fun looking up words. I discover that even in Romanian I had only an approximate knowledge of the exact meaning of many words, and so much the more [so] in English or Spanish. I like to compare them, to look for roots and [I] am wondering what a marvelous instrument words are. I think it comes from learning a foreign language as an adult. Before that, I took words for granted and ever wondered why people were bothering about 'linguistics' – a luxury occupation, I considered, and tedious as well […] I am slowly changing my mind. I cannot say I like learning grammar now, but I recognize [it], at least, as I look at it as a piece of natural, spontaneous rationality which looks beautiful as compared to the crazy, crazy world we are living in.[20]

[20] Letter of Ata Iosifescu to John Murra, October 17, 1983, NAA, JVM Papers.

On March 2, 1984, she reported that she finished the first draft, minus the historical note she hadn't yet started to write. She also informed Murra that she had asked Petru Năvodaru to revise her translation, which he (and his sister) did, with a lot of useful observations.[21] It was a moving gesture, and another sign of Ata's ability to bring people together through her actions, that she involved Murra's political mentor in the translation project. Murra dedicated his first ever published book (*Formaciones*) to this friend and role model from his adolescence who had initiated him into the Communist movement, a friend he kept visiting whenever he came to Romania.

Ata Iosifescu submitted the translation to the publishing house in March 1984 and received a very positive report from the reviewer who confronted the original with the translation by the end of 1984. In 1985, the translation was also checked by a researcher from the Institute of anthropology (at the recommendation of Mihai Pop, but the researcher's name is not mentioned in the correspondence). Once it received positive reviews, linguistically and scientifically, the translation entered the next stage of preparing the visual illustrations (pictures and maps), of which I write in the following section. The book appeared in the printing plan of the publishing house for 1986, but it only came out in May 1987.

Paratexts: prefaces, dedication, visual illustrations

The French structuralist scholar Gerard Genette coined the term paratext to refer to 'what enables a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to its public' (Genette, 1997). These are devices and discourses that mediate between the main body of the book and the reader, such as the title, dedication, acknowledgments, prefaces, introductions, illustrations, footnotes, glossary, the author's biography, the presentation on the back cover. They are liminal categories, not really within the main text of the book, nor outside of it. Most paratextual elements of a book, besides their informational content, have a pragmatic quality: they aim to appeal to the readers and persuade them to read the book. Prefaces, in particular, are such texts, but also jacket blurbs. Most of the time, these paratexts are produced by other persons than the author, which makes of the book the product of a joint

[21] Petru Năvodaru (1913–1988), born Peter Fischer, an economist by training, was a Romanian-Jewish member of the Romanian Communist Party since the beginning of the 1930s. After 1947, he became part of the socialist bureaucracy in charge with economic planning. In the last decade of his life, he fell into political disgrace and was under Securitate surveillance, as his daughter was married to the dissident-writer Paul Goma. He also translated from English and German into Romanian works by Carl von Clausewitz, Thomas Mann, and Marshall McLuhan, among others.

effort. Translation itself – mentioned by Genette as a paratextual device, but not analyzed as such by him – is crucial in enlarging the readership of a book beyond its initial audience, by making it available to different linguistic communities. Paratexts are 'the most socialized side of the practice of literature (the way its relations with the public are organized)' (Genette, 1997: 14), being defined by the particular moment and place of its publications and its intended public.

The Romanian translation of Murra's thesis contains several paratexts, which are worth analyzing. After the title and the copyright pages, there are acknowledgements of the persons who helped with the visual illustrations of the book. After the acknowledgments, there is one page of endorsements of Murra's work by Heather Lechtman, Ruggiero Romano, and Sidney Mintz. Further on, there is a six-page historical outline, written by Ata Iosifescu. During the process of translation, she asked Murra to briefly sketch the history of the Inka Empire, especially of the members of the Inka dynasty, mostly unknown to the general public. Murra put off writing the outline so Ata wrote the note herself using publications she received from Murra and his former students, and encyclopedias from the American Library in Bucharest. Initially conceived as an appendix, the editor decided to put the outline up front to serve as an introduction written by a Romanian scholar, usually required for volumes published in this series.

The Romanian edition has, in fact, three introductions: the original introduction of the thesis, the 1980 introduction to the English edition (partially translated), and the introduction written for the Romanian edition.[22] The 1980 introduction was not completely translated: it is the longest introduction in the English edition and it contains important information on Murra's biography, his becoming an anthropologist, the context of the thesis' elaboration, and his subsequent research in the Andes. Ata left out a third of that text in the translation. She left out the passages containing biographical information on Murra's early involvement in the Communist movement in Romania, his participation in the Spanish Civil War, and his difficult years of fighting to obtain the US citizenship.[23] Murra's introduction to the Romanian

[22] In the English edition, the new introduction appears as 'Introduction to the 1979 edition' and the title is kept as such in the Romanian edition, even though the English edition was published in 1980 (Murra, 1980a). And the new introduction to the 1980 English edition is the same introduction (with minor changes) Murra wrote for the Spanish translation of the thesis (Murra, 1978).

[23] It is not clear why Ata chose not to translate fully the second introduction. One contentious issue, possibly raising problems with the censorship, was the fact he mentioned in the introduction he lost his Romanian citizenship in 1938. It was a consequence of the Anti-Semitic Laws adopted by the Goga-Cuza government. His attempt at enlisting as a candidate for recruitment during WWII by the Office of Strategic Agency (later the Central Intelligence Agency) to return to Spain for undercover missions against Franco's regime could have also

edition is a clear, well-written statement about the Andean civilization: its technological achievements, the ecological complementarity and its social and political organization.

The Romanian edition is richly illustrated in contrast to the English and Spanish editions, which contain no illustrations at all. There are twelve pages of black and white illustrations (including 25 reproductions of drawings by Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala[24]) and eight pages of color illustrations. Ata repeatedly asked Murra to send black and white photos and color slides in order to create a rich visual illustration for the book, with the argument that the Romanian public didn't know much about the Inka civilization and Andean cultures. She managed to gather photographs from several Andean specialists and friends of Murra's, such as John Hyslop, Craig Morris, Heather Lechtman, Marcia Ascher, and Robert Ascher. Moreover, in one of her trips to New York, she bought three photographs from the American Museum of Natural History, [25] which hosts an important collection of artefacts belonging to the pre-Hispanic cultures. She requested permission to use them for the Romanian edition without paying royalties. Permission was granted by the museum and the photographs became part of the book illustrations: a photo of a silver *llama* figure, one of a *poncho* and another one of a *quipu*.[26] By arguing for the importance of visual illustrations, Ata showed both her enthusiasm for the Andean cultures and her determination to reach out to the Romanian public who, she argued, would better receive the text if accompanied by visual materials showing the progress of the Inka civilization.

---

been controversial for Romanian officials. Another section left out contains Murra's self-criticism about the thesis: the fact that he had missed important primary sources like the inspections made by Spanish administrators during the early decades of colonization and the inability to fully understand and conceptualize the ecological complementarity operating in the Andes. He could only grasp the latter aspect after his return to the Andes in the 1960s.

[24] Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala (1535–1616) was a Quechua nobleman who authored the illustrated chronicle *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*, a 1,188-page-long manuscript with 398 pen-and-ink illustrations. It was addressed to King Philip III of Spain and was a denunciation of the Spanish colonial rule. The manuscript was discovered in 1908 in the Royal Danish Library and published in 1936. John Murra and Rolena Adorno published a new edition of the chronicle in 1980 (Guamán Poma de Ayala, 1980[1615]).

[25] Besides visiting museums in New York, Ata cultivated her interest in Inka history by watching various documentaries on Romanian TV and by reading articles in *National Geographic*, which she received in Bucharest. Murra paid for the subscriptions to US magazines such as *National Geographic*, *New York Review of Books*, or the *American Scientist* as a gift for her family. In the 1970s and 1980s receiving such magazines in Romania was exceptional, and they were read and circulated among networks of friends. In fact, foreign magazines were often stolen from mailboxes, at times even by employees of the Romanian post office.

[26] *Quipu* (or *khipu*) were recording devices made of knotted cotton or camelid fiber strings used in pre-Hispanic Andean cultures.

The question of reception

Although it is difficult to assess in retrospect how the translation was received by the general and academic public, one can still have an idea of the scale of the book's success: the publishing house printed the same year an extra 7,000 copies besides the initial run of 20,000 copies. For a specialized, anthropological book this was considerable, knowing as we do that the initial plan of the publishing house was to print only 1,000.[27] Murra was impressed by the number of copies printed – even though he knew that this was not extraordinary in a socialist country, where culture was heavily subsidized. But even by the standards of the publishing world of 1980s Romania, the number of printed copies of a specialized text (originally a doctoral thesis) was almost twice the average of printing copies per title.[28] Part of the popular success could be attributed to the collection to which it belonged, a collection dedicated to foreign cultures and civilizations, with works of solid scholarship and published in hardcover with quality visual material, and thus quite more attractive in its visual aspect than the majority of paperback books printed in Romania. Another factor contributing to the popular success of the book was the strong appeal of the subject: the Incas, with their amazing mountainous cities and their struggle against the Spaniards led by Fernando Pizzaro.[29]

In order to grasp the 'horizon of expectations' (Jauss, 1982) of the book within the intellectual sphere and the academic world, it is necessary to provide some context concerning the public discussions at the time in Romania.[30] The last years of the socialist regime in Romania were characterized by an autarchic economic orientation and a virulent nationalism. Ceaușescu's personality cult was a defining feature of public life (Verdery, 1991; Cioroianu, 2004). The printed press, cultural magazines, and even academic journals had to allot many pages to

[27] In a couple of letters sent in June and September 1987, Ata wrote to Murra about her difficulty to buy additional copies of the book for him and for those who helped her with the translation. The book was already hard to find in September, a few months after its publication.

[28] The average printing of copies per titles published in Romania was 14,400 in 1988 for literature (Macrea-Toma, 2009: 146).

[29] In 1970, Romulus Vulcănescu, ethnologist, published a popularizing book on the Inkas, using second literature, some of it outdated at the time. The book was published in a mass, popularizing series about various civilizations. There is no reference to John Murra's work in the book, even though by the end of the 1960s he had achieved a reputation among Andean specialists. This omission is likely to be the result of the hazardous access to foreign publications by Romanian scholars at the time.

[30] The concept of 'horizon of expectations', coined by the German literary scholar Hans Robert Jauss, refers to the set of cultural norms, presuppositions, and conventions of readers of a certain literary, and implicitly, non-literary text.

paying homage to the presidential couple. Celebrating and commemorating national historical figures and events also occupied a consistent proportion of the printing space of the cultural magazines. Besides these, there were the ideological campaigns initiated by the Party that had to be present in the pages of the cultural press and academic journals. In 1987, for example, the year of Murra's book printing, a Party-orchestrated campaign produced numerous articles against the three-volume *History of Transylvania* published the previous year under the auspices of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences that was seen as a revisionist historical endeavor by the Romanian Communist Party. This campaign led to a 'near-hysterical atmosphere' (Verdery, 1991: 220), which left little printing space for other subjects than national history, such as more specialized topics like the economic structure of the Inka state. The other dominant genre of articles in cultural magazines was literary criticism, with little taste for and/or knowledge of social sciences, including anthropology. This explains the near-absence of reviews or comments on Murra's book in the cultural magazines in Romania in the years 1987–1989.[31] Nonetheless, the translation was mentioned in the two periodicals with some of the largest circulation at the time: *Magazin istoric* and *Viața Studențească*.[32]

The reception of the book in the academic journals was not much better than in the cultural magazines. As mentioned before, when he visited Romania in 1976 Murra delivered a talk on his vertical archipelago model in the Andes at the Institute for Ethnography and Folklore. The director of the institute, Mihai Pop, wrote the report for the publishing house recommending the translation of the book. Researchers at the institute knew about him and his work. However, Murra's book was not reviewed in the journal edited by the institute (*Revista de Etnografie și Folclor*), or in the only anthropological journal edited in Romania at the time (*Annuaire roumain d'anthropologie*). In fact, hardly any anthropological book not dealing directly with Romania was reviewed in those journals at the time. Ata Iosifescu's choice not to have an introduction written by a Romanian scholar could have played against the

[31] I consulted the collections for 1987–1989 of the following periodicals: *Amfiteatru*, *Astra*, *Contemporanul*, *Tribuna*, *Cronica*, *Viața Studențească*, *Magazin istoric*, *România Literară* and academic journals: *Annuaire Roumain d'Anthropologie*, *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie si Arheologie A.D. Xenopol*, *Revista de Etnografie si Folclor*, *Viitorul Social*, *Revue roumaine d'histoire*.

[32] *Magazin istoric. Revistă de cultură istorică* (founded in 1967) was a monthly history magazine mostly dedicated to Romanian history, but also with sections dealing with international history. It didn't have a section of book reviews, but had a section of 'received books' where they signalled recent publications. Murra's book is mentioned in the May 1988 issue. *Viața Studențească* was the weekly information magazine of the Communist Students' Association. Published between 1956 and 1989 it included sections on books, arts, politics, and sports. Murra's book is mentioned in the August 26, 1987 issue with a short notice in the books section.

visibility of the book among Romanian intellectuals, as it did not benefit from the symbolic capital of a local scholar.[33]

I found one book review of the translation, published in *Viitorul Social* (*The Social Future*), the only sociology journal in Romania published by the Romanian Academy during these years.[34] It is an extensive and laudatory presentation of the book in over two pages by sociologist Carmen Furtună (1987). The reviewer highlights the concept of redistributive state as the central concept of the theoretical argument and ends the review by endorsing the book as important for the future of the Andean population.

If published earlier, Murra's book might have contributed to discussions among Romanian scholars about the Asiatic mode of production (hereafter referred to as 'AMP') and its place in a Marxist interpretation of history.[35] In particular, this work could have interested Henri H. Stahl, who tried to develop a Marxist interpretation of the emergence of feudal states in Romania, by resorting to Marxist discussions from the 1960s around the concept of the AMP. In a series of articles published in *Viitorul Social* between 1975 and 1978, Stahl proposed the concept of 'tributary formation', a form of AMP distinct from a feudal social order.[36] Even though he never employed the concept of the AMP in his work, Murra's thesis was used by anthropologist Maurice Godelier in his contribution to the debates on the AMP in the French journal *La Pensée*.[37] Murra

[33] Mihai Pop was the scientific reviewer of the book, once the proposal for translation was submitted to the publishing house. Ata wrote to Murra that Pop acted as if he would have expected to be asked to write a preface or an introduction for the translation. She didn't, as she felt that Murra's three introductions were sufficient.

[34] The journal was being published under the patronage of the Academy of the Social and Political Sciences and of the Ștefan Gheorghiu Academy – the university for the Party's cadres.

[35] Three figures are important in Romania concerning this reconsideration of the Asian mode of production in the 1960s and 1970s: sociologists Miron Constantinescu and Henri H. Stahl, and the philosopher Ion Banu (1913–2000). The latter published in the French journal *La Pensée* an article contributing to the debates around the AMP in France at the time. He was in contact with John Murra, and, although the circumstances of their meeting are not yet clear, the letters between them kept in Murra's archive suggest a good rapport between the two. Murra informed Banu in a letter in 1970 that a translation of the latter's article on the AMP published in *La Pensée* appeared in Mexico in a collection on the AMP edited by Roger Bartra (1969), alongside a translation of a paper by Murra on the Inka political system. Both were printed without the permission of their authors. For an extensive discussion of the Romanian contribution to the international debates on the AMP see Guga (2015: 229–313).

[36] These articles were collected into a book (Stahl, 1980).

[37] Godelier (1971) coined the concept of 'economic and social formation' (*formation économique et sociale*) to refer to the articulation of various modes of production characterizing a particular society. He gives the examples of the Inka Empire using Murra's PhD thesis, which he read in a microfilm form. In turn, Murra titled his first published book *Formaciones Económicas y Políticas del Mundo Andino* (1975), in acknowledgement of Godelier's discussion, without

also had a profound intellectual exchange with his friend anthropologist Ángel Palerm, one of the most active proponents of the concept of AMP in trying to understand the emergence of pre-Columbian native states in America.[38] Murra's own involvement with Marxism changed over time from his early political activism to more detached and critical views of the Marxist debates in the 1960s (Anăstăsoaie, 2015: 34–37). He remained attached to historical materialism in his scholarly interest in land rights, macroeconomic mechanisms, and the relation between state and ethnic groups (Murra, 1984), but he never subscribed to a Marxist (linear) interpretation of history. He was more interested in cultural variability than in universalist, abstract social theories. His attachment to careful historical reconstruction through detailed description and holistic understanding of Andean cultures integrating historical, linguistic, and ecological aspects could have appealed to Henri H. Stahl's conception of historical sociology. An encounter of the two, which probably never took place, could have potentially been a fruitful intellectual exchange.[39]

Conclusions

In the political economy of intellectual work, translation is arguably among the lowest tasks in term of prestige and financial compensation. However, we could hardly conceive how intellectual life and the international exchange of ideas could function without it. In my essay I have attempted to make visible the translator's work by analyzing the case of an anthropological translation in the 1980s Romania. Ata Iosifescu's translation of her brother's PhD thesis stands out as one of the few anthropological translations in socialist Romania. This is no small achievement in a period when anthropology was a very marginal discipline, and when public culture was dominated by nationalism. Moreover, this case study makes a contribution to a larger theoretical discussion in translation studies about the relationship between the original and the translation. Contrary to the widely shared view that translation is

employing the Marxist theoretical apparatus of the latter. See also Godelier (2012) on the exchange of ideas between the two.

[38] Ángel Palerm (1917–1980), born in Ibiza, Spain, fought in the Spanish Civil War and went into exile to Mexico in 1939. He trained as an anthropologist at the National School of Anthropology and History in Mexico City and became an influential professor and researcher. His Marxist orientation was heterodox – he was a proponent of the AMP as a heuristic model for the understanding of the emergence of the Aztec empire.

[39] In a letter to Murra, Maurice Godelier writes that he recently read *Les anciennes communautés villageoises roumaines* by Stahl and finds it 'remarkable' (Letter of Maurice Godelier to JVM, September 17, 1977, NAA, JVM Papers). He asks Murra if he knows Stahl. Unfortunately there isn't any copy of a letter of Murra containing the answer to this question.

derivative or secondary to the original, Jacques Derrida argues, following Walter Benjamin, that translation is essential to the original, in the sense that it is the original that demands the translation and is indebted to the coming translation for its survival (Derrida, 1985b: 152). In the case of Murra's PhD thesis, unpublished for many years, it was the Spanish translation which preceded the publication of the English version 24 years after its defense. Moreover, the circulation of the Spanish translation of his work and its seminal importance for the Andean studies generated the demand for further translations into French, Italian, and Romanian. The latter translation, analyzed in this paper, created an original document thanks to the dedication and work of Ata Iosifescu. The translation was not a simple rendition into Romanian of the PhD dissertation, but an original result of the translator's effort to give the best version of Murra's path-breaking work into Romanian. This was acknowledged by Murra himself when he wrote to his sister that 'this book is yours' and 'your edition will be better than the original'.[40] The Romanian translation could have benefited from a better reception in a different period – less nationalistic in orientation and more open to heterodox thinking in Marxism and in multilinear models of social evolution. Even after the fall of Communism, anthropology in Romania has still remained exclusively oriented towards studying Romanian topics, with little interest in other cultures or civilizations. Nonetheless, a new edition of *Civilizație Inca* could bring new readers to the work of John V. Murra in Romania.

REFERENCES

Adorno, Rolena. (2010). Remembering John Murra: letters from a collaboration. *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena*, 42(1): 73–76.

Anăstăsoaie, Marian Viorel. (2015). Tracing the footsteps of a world anthropologist: clues and hypotheses for a biography of John V. Murra (Isaak Lipschitz). *New Europe College Yearbook, 2013–2014*, 21–49. Bucharest: New Europe College.

Benjamin, Walter. (2000[1923]). The task of the translator: an introduction to the translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, Ed. Lawrence Venuti, 15–23. London and New York: Routledge.

Cioroianu, Adrian. (2004). *Ce Ceausescu qui hante les Roumains : le mythe, les représentations et le culte du Dirigeant dans la Roumanie communiste*. Bucarest : Curtea Veche, L'Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie.

[40] Letter of JVM to AI, March 17, 1984, NAA, JVM Papers.

Corobca, Liliana. (2014). *Controlul cărții: cenzura literaturii în regimul comunist din România*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Derrida, Jacques. (1985a). Des Tours de Babel (trans. Joseph Graham). In *Difference in Translation*, Ed. Joseph Graham, 165–205. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. (1985b). *The ear of the other : otobiography, transference, translation : texts and discussions with Jacques Derrida*. Ed. Christie V. McDonald; tr. Peggy Kamuf, New York: Schocken Books.

Furtună, Carmen. (1987). Review of 'Civilizație Inca: Organizarea economică a statului incaș'. *Viitorul Social*, 16(5): 488–490.

Genette, Gérard. (1997). *Paratexts. Thresholds of interpretation* (Translated by Jane E. Lewin). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu. (1991). Specificul naţional în sociologia românească. In *Cultură și Societate*, Ed. Alexandru Zub, 443–456. București: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Godelier, Maurice. (1971). Qu'est-ce que Definir une 'Formation Économique et Sociale'? L'example des Incas. *La Pensée*, 159: 99–106.

Godelier, Maurice. (2012). Murra, Marx et la notion de 'formation économique et politique'. In Murra, J.V. Godelier, M., Lorandi, A.M. *et al*. *Formations économiques et politiques du monde andin*, 51–61. Paris: Éditions de l'Institut français d'études andines et Éditions de la MSH.

Guamán Poma de Ayala, Felipe. (1980[1615]). *El primer Nueva corónica y buen gobierno [1615]*. Edited by John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, Quechua translations by Jorge L. Urioste. 3 vols. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno.

Guga, Ștefan. (2015). *Sociologia istorică a lui Henri H. Stahl*. Cluj-Napoca: Tact.

Hanks, William F. and Carlo Severi. (2014). Translating worlds: the epistemological space of translation. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(2): 1–16.

Ionescu, Gelu. (1981). *Orizontul traducerii*. Bucharest: Univers.

Jauss, Hans Robert. (1982). *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. (Transl. from German by Timothy Bahti). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Leavitt, John. (2014) Words and worlds: ethnography and theories of translation. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(2): 193–220.

Macrea-Toma, Ioana. (2009). *Privilighenția: Instituții literare în comunismul românesc*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Murra, John V. (1951). *The Soviet linguistic controversy*. (Trans. from the Soviet press by John V. Murra, Robert M. Hankin, and Fred Holling). New York: King's Crown Press.

Murra, John V. (1972). El 'control vertical' de un máximo de pisos ecológicos en la economía de las sociedades andinas. In *Visita de la provincia de León de Huánuco (1562)*. vol. 2, 429–76. Huánuco: Universidad Nacional Hermilio Valdizan.

Murra, John V. (1975). *Formaciones Económicas y Políticas del Mundo Andino*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Murra, John V. (1978). *La organización económica del Estado Inca*. (Trans. by Daniel R. Wagner), Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Murra, John V. (1980a). *The Economic organization of the Inka state*. (Research in economic anthropology: Supplement 1), Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
Murra, John V. (1980b). Derechos a las tierras en el Tahuantinsuyu, *Revista de la Universidad Complutense*, XXVIII (117).
Murra, John V. (1984). An interview with John V. Murra. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 64: 1–21.
Murra, John V. (1987). *Civilizaţie inca. Organizarea economică a statului incaş*. (Trans. by Ata Iosifescu), Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Murra John V. and Mercedes López-Baralt. Eds. (1996). *Las cartas de Arguedas*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad.
Rubel, Paula G. and Abraham Rosman. Eds. (2003). *Translating cultures: perspectives on translation and anthropology*, Oxford, U.K, New York: Berg.
Scott, James C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Stahl, Henri H. (1980). *Teorii şi ipoteze privind sociologia orînduirii tributale*. Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi enciclopedică.
Venuti, Lawrence. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Second Edition. London: Routledge.
Verdery, Katherine. (1991). *National ideology under socialism: identity and cultural politics in Ceauşescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Vianu, Lidia. (1998). *Censorship in Romania*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
Vulcănescu, Romulus. (1970). *Incaşii*. Bucureşti: Albatros.