An overview of contemporary literary prose translation from Basque into other languages[*]

Panorama general de la traducción de narrativa contemporánea del euskera a otras lenguas

ANE IRIZAR MELERO
Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Departamento de Lingüística, Estudios Árabes, Hebreos, Vascos y de Asia Oriental. Facultad de Filología. Calle Profesor Aranguren, s/n. 28040, Madrid. España.
Dirección de correo electrónico: airizar@ucm.es
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8293-8980

Abstract: This paper aims at presenting a panoramic overview of the main features and evolution of translated Basque literary prose through a quantitative analysis of the metadata featured in a translation catalog made up of 1192 translations published from 1970 to 2023. This study includes separate analyses of data regarding publication chronology, target reader, target language, gender distribution of authors and translators, and modes of translation, as well as identified relations between these sets of data.
Keywords: Literary translation; Basque; quantitative analysis; metadata; modes of translation.
Resumen: Este artículo se propone presentar una visión panorámica de las principales características y evolución de la narrativa vasca traducida, a través del análisis cuantitativo de los metadatos recogidos en un catálogo de traducciones compuesto por 1192 traducciones publicadas entre 1970 y 2023. Nuestro estudio incluye diferentes análisis relacionados con la cronología de las publicaciones, su público objetivo, su lengua meta, la distribución de género de autores y traductores y modalidades de traducción, e identifica relaciones entre dichos conjuntos de datos.
Palabras clave: Traducción literaria; euskera; análisis cuantitativo; metadatos; modalidades de traducción.
Summary: 1. Introduction; 2. Methodology; 3. Findings, 3.1. Chronological distribution, 3.2. Target reader, 3.3. Target language distribution, 3.4. Authors and translators and their gender

---

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation plays a central role in the normalization and dissemination of minority languages (Luna, 2006), and Basque is no exception to this (*cf.* Manterola, 2014). Since the 1970s, translated Basque literature has grown considerably, as has scholars' interest in researching it. Said decade marked the beginning of a more systematic and abundant literary production in Basque (López Gaseni, 2009). In the same vein, Ibarluzea (2021, p. 48) places the start of Basque translated literature's path to —partial— autonomy in the 1970s and relates it to linguistic normalization laws passed after the Spanish transition to democracy (*Ibid,* p. 46).

In recent years, several research projects have been conducted in the realm of literary translation from and into Basque, focusing on different aspects of it: historical and systemic approaches (Ibarluzea, 2021), translation of a certain genre (Zubillaga, 2013), translation of a certain linguistic phenomenon (Sanz, 2015; Etxeberria, 2022), a certain mode of translation (Manterola, 2015, 2017; Arrula, 2018), a certain author (Jaka, 2011; Manterola, 2012), etc. However, it should be noted that translation into Basque has been more researched than that done from Basque —it is also the more common directionality for translations, as the former outnumber the latter "by three to one" (Manterola, 2023, p. 47). This is one of the reasons why this article focuses on Basque literature translated into other languages.

In terms of its object of study, this paper analyzes paratextual information of literary prose translations done from Basque, with the objective of shedding light on its main features and patterns. In this regard, Manterola's (2012) work is of particular interest to this research and can be considered a direct predecessor of it. Her ELI catalog (Manterola, 2021a) —which, as I will detail later, is the starting point of my own one— stems from her PhD research and has been periodically updated by the author since. According to Manterola (2012, pp. 120-122), ELI features

literary translations done from Basque into any other language[1] starting from the 16th century until present day. The catalog is currently available online,[2] and can be downloaded in its entirety. In addition to creating the catalog, Manterola has also conducted quantitative studies on it. The first iteration of this, which studied data of works published until 2010, was published as part of her doctoral thesis (2012), and data encompassing translations published until 2020 was analyzed in some of her more recent publications (Manterola, 2021b, 2023). Thus, when comparing this study to those of Manterola's, I should note that, on the one hand, this study extends further in time, as it includes translations published until 2023, and, on the other hand, mainly differs from Manterola's studies in the parameters it's focused on: while her work focuses on such aspects as the main target languages (TL) of Basque literature (Manterola, 2021b, pp. 75-78; 2023, pp. 50-51) or the main genres translated from Basque (Manterola, 2021b, pp. 74-75), this study isolates one literary genre — prose— and a few TLs and analyzes their internal dynamics looking at some new parameters, such as authors' and translators' gender. This being so, both analyses are not completely parallel and, hence, comparable. This will be further detailed in the next section.

In summary, this article aims at offering an overview of the main features and trends in contemporary literary prose translations from Basque into the five most common target languages of Basque literature (Catalan, English, French, Galician, and Spanish) through the analysis of metadata compiled from several sources into a translation catalog. In other words, this article presents a quantitative analysis and discussion of a translation catalog designed *ad hoc* for my research project.[3]

The study presented in this paper serves several purposes. Firstly, as mentioned, it offers a continuation of previous quantitative analyses regarding the landscape of translated Basque literature (Manterola 2021b, 2023). It is important to update and expand on these datasets, as this will allow us to understand not only the current state of the field, but also its evolution over time. In addition, the results of this study provide a useful tool for conducting other research in the field of Basque Translation Studies. Insofar as catalog analyses serve to create specialized corpora

---

[1] The catalog only features interlinguistic translations.
[2] See https://www.ehu.eus/ehg/eli/
[3] The study presented in this paper has been carried out as part of a PhD research project concerning translation of genderless forms in literary translations done from Basque into other languages.

adequate to a given project's needs, the data presented in this paper may be a useful baseline to those interested in conducting research involving the building and analysis of new specialized corpora. Additionally, this research opens the door to comparative studies, be it through comparing the translation of other textual genres, or the translation of other literatures and their evolution. To say it shortly, the contribution of this study is twofold: it provides an up-to-date version of previous relatively analogous quantitative studies, and it offers a tool to those interested in conducting corpora-based or comparative work.

2. METHODOLOGY

The translation catalog analyzed in this article has been created *ad hoc* for the author's doctoral research project, part of which is presented in this paper. The catalog stems from two main predecessors: the ELI catalog (Manterola, 2021a), which has been used as its main basis, and the NorDaNor catalog (EIZIE, n.d.),[4] which has been used for corroborating and expanding on data. As mentioned, the ELI catalog is the result of Manterola's PhD research (*cf.* Manterola, 2012) and has been periodically updated by its author since. The online version was last updated on March 1, 2021, and hence later data included in this study was provided directly by Manterola, whom I thank for her generosity.

Indeed, the ELI catalog was the starting point of my own: I downloaded all data from it and placed it in an Excel spreadsheet. These raw data were then modified, updated, and expanded on, according to the specific needs of the study: categories such as target reader, author's and translator's gender and decade of publication were added. To correct and expand on missing data, the NorDaNor catalog was used as the main source of information. Doubtful and missing data were further checked through consulting other catalogs: Index Translationum (UNESCO, n.d.), EIMA (Basque Government, n.d.-a), Euskariana (Basque Government, 2021), Public Reading Network of Euskadi (Basque Government, n.d.-b), the Catalog of the Spanish National Library (Spanish Government, n.d.), etc. Finally, some data have been obtained or verified through directly contacting authors and publishers.[5] This being so, a catalog has been

---

[4] See https://nordanor.eus/?n=l
[5] I would like to thank Itziar, from Ediciones Mensajero, Luzien Etxezaharreta, from Maiatz, Enrique Dávila, from the BBK Foundation, Luis Escribano, from UNO, and

elaborated which includes, *inter alia*, the following data sets: source text (ST) author, ST author's gender, ST title, ST publication date, literary genre (i.e., target reader), TL, translator, translator's gender, target text (TT) title, TT publication date, TT publication decade, mode of translation 1 (authorship), mode of translation 2 (indirect translation), pivot language (when applicable).

Inclusion and exclusion parameters have been determined by the necessities of my research.[6] In this regard, translations featured in the catalog all comply with the following requirements:

Chronology. Translations must be published between the years 1970 and 2023.

Genre. Translations must belong to literary prose, either for children and young people (CYL) or adults (AL).[7]

Target language. Translations must be done into Catalan, English, French, Galician, or Spanish.[8]

(Data concerning the criteria above must be available and certain, meaning translations lacking data or featuring doubtful data regarding publication date, literary genre, or target language are to be discarded).

As for the analysis, all calculations have been conducted on Microsoft Excel. Firstly, data in each category have been individually counted and divided into percentage points. Secondly, complex calculations have been made, combining two or more datasets: How many texts were translated into Spanish? > How many texts were translated into Spanish in the 90s? > How many CYL texts were translated into Spanish in the 90s? etc. These calculations have been reflected on this paper both in absolute numbers

---

Maitena Illarramendi, author of *Gatz, titiritorto basatia*, for their willingness to help with this research.

[6] As mentioned in Footnote 3, the elaboration and analysis of this translation catalog is encompassed within a doctoral thesis project regarding translation of genderless forms. Thus, a set of criteria was put in place to select works where this phenomenon could be best observed.

[7] Literary prose for adults and CYL are the genres most translated from Basque (Manterola, 2023, p. 49).

[8] Catalan, English, French, Galician, and Spanish are the languages most translated-into from Basque (Manterola, 2023, p. 50).

and percentage points. Particularly notable findings and anomalies have been explored further through additional analyses. Finally, findings have been contextualized by looking into such factors as language policies in effect, economic and sociolinguistic circumstances, etc.

3. FINDINGS

This section offers the main results of the quantitative analysis of the described translation catalog, which have been segmented into five main groups: chronology (3.1.), target reader (3.2.) target language (3.3.), authors and translators and their gender distribution (3.4.), and modes of translation (3.5.). These five categories offer different ways of approaching and envisioning the evolution of translated Basque literature. Finally, a deeper look has been taken into works translated into three or more languages (3.6.), with the goal of understanding the particularities of works translated the greatest number of times.

First and foremost, our catalog is comprised of 1192 entries, meaning 1192 translated texts: these include several translations of the same text and several editions of the same translation. This list of translations is limited to those published in book format, meaning translations published in magazines, websites or blogs have not been considered. The catalog, thus, is comprised of 654 different STs, which means each work is translated 1,82 times on average. The arithmetic mean, however, is not an accurate representation of the data: on the one hand, 426 (65,14%) out of the 654 STs present in the catalog appear only once, while the rest take up two entries or more; on the other hand, for instance, Bernardo Atxaga's *Obabakoak* takes up 36 entries and *Behi euskaldun baten memoriak*, by the same author, takes up 17. In other words, distribution is not even regarding the number of times each work has been translated.

3.1. Chronological distribution

The catalog comprises translations published from 1970 to June 2023, as previous translations are few and sparse: the ELI catalog contains 47 translations published from 1657 to 1969 (Manterola, 2021a). That is the main reason why these texts have been left out of this analysis. As for translations published after 1970, they can be distributed in decades as follows:

	#	%
1970-1980	14	1,17
1981-1990	64	5,37
1991-2000	338	28,36
2001-2010	464	38,93
2011-2020	239	20,05
2021-2023	73	6,12
	1192	**100**

Table 1. Distribution of translated works across publication decades.

Table 1 offers a succinct view of the evolution on the number of translations published since the 1970s. As one can observe in the data, translations trend upwards in quantity until the 2010s, where growth is interrupted, and publications decrease by approximately 50%. This change is worthy of attention, as it reverses a tendency that had been somewhat steady for four decades. This phenomenon may be explained by the economic crisis of 2008, which slowed down economic activity all over the globe and especially in Spain. It should also be noted that this decade includes translations published in the year 2020, which may have also been negatively affected by the covid-19 pandemic.

Since the catalog was last updated on June 28, 2023, it only includes data corresponding to the first two and a half years of this decade. If the current publication rate is sustained —73 translations in two and a half years—, we may project that 292 translations (73*4=292) will be published this decade. This would mean works published in the previous decade would be surpassed and the upward tendency recorded until 2010 would be reestablished. Also, publications in the first years of the 2020s have likely also been affected by the covid-19 pandemic, meaning it wouldn't come as a surprise if the projection of 292 works published was exceeded. Of course, this is but an arithmetic projection, and should be taken with a grain of salt.

3.2. Target reader

Works featured in the catalog are fairly evenly divided into those targeting children and young people (CYL) and those targeting adults (AL): 634 (53,19%) works are classified as CYL, and 558 (46,81%) works

are classified as AL. Across decades of publication, distribution of AL and CYL varies quite arbitrarily, and no patterns in terms of its evolution have been identified. Correlations between target reader and gender of author will be explored in later sections.

3.3. Target language distribution

The catalog includes works translated from Basque into Catalan, English, French, Galician, and Spanish, in the proportion that may be seen in Table 2 below:

	#	%
CA	215	18,04
ES	695	58,31
FR	38	3,19
GL	79	6,63
EN	54	4,53
Several	111	9,31
	1192	**100**

Table 2. Distribution of translated works across target languages.

The prominence of Spanish as TL may be noted at first glance, with 58,31% of all texts being translated into this language. The second most common TL is Catalan, at 18,04%, with the third place being held by multilingual publications (9,31%), which of course include works translated into Spanish and Catalan as well.

A key factor in determining the prevalence of some TLs over others is the target reader of the text, although Spanish takes center stage across the board:

	AL		CYL	
	#	%	#	%
CA	53	9,50	162	25,55
ES	375	67,20	320	50,47
FR	23	4,12	15	2,37
GL	22	3,94	57	8,99
EN	49	8,78	5	0,79

Several	36	6,45	75	11,83
	558	**100**	**634**	**100**

Table 3. Distribution of translated works as function of TL and target reader.

Co-official languages of Spain, namely Catalan and Galician, become more relevant in CYL. Works translated into Spanish exceed 50% of the totality and, with Catalan and Galician, they make up more than 4/5 of all CYL translations. English almost disappears at 0,79% of all CYL translations, as opposed to multilingual editions, which also grow with respect to AL. French decreases by approximately 50% when comparing AL to CYL, which is considerable, but not as pronounced as the decline suffered by English.

As for the chronological distributions of target languages, these may be divided as follows:

#	1970-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2020	2021-2023	
CA	0	23	93	74	17	8	**215**
ES	7	29	179	264	175	41	**695**
FR	2	0	12	12	10	2	**38**
GL	0	8	22	38	6	5	**79**
EN	0	3	9	15	16	11	**54**
Several	5	1	23	61	15	6	**111**
	14	**64**	**338**	**464**	**239**	**73**	**1192**

Table 4. Distribution of TLs across decades (absolute numbers).

%	1970-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2020	2021-2023
CA	0,00	35,94	27,51	15,95	7,11	10,96
ES	50,00	45,31	52,96	56,90	73,22	56,16
FR	14,29	0,00	3,55	2,59	4,18	2,74
GL	0,00	12,50	6,51	8,19	2,51	6,85
EN	0,00	4,69	2,66	3,23	6,69	15,07
Several	35,71	1,56	6,80	13,15	6,28	8,22
	100	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 5. Distribution of TLs across decades (percentage of
translated works published in each decade as function of the TL).

%	1970-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2020	2021-2023	
CA	0,00	10,70	43,26	34,42	7,91	3,72	**100**
ES	1,01	4,17	25,76	37,99	25,18	5,90	**100**
FR	5,26	0,00	31,58	31,58	26,32	5,26	**100**
GL	0,00	10,13	27,85	48,10	7,59	6,33	**100**
EN	0,00	5,56	16,67	27,78	29,63	20,37	**100**
Several	4,50	0,90	20,72	54,95	13,51	5,41	**100**

Table 6. Distribution of TLs across decades (percentage of translated works published in each TL as function of publication decades).

Across all decades, Spanish remains the most translated-into language, even though its degree of prevalence varies. It is noteworthy that no works were translated into Catalan or Galician during the 1970s. The five translations classified as "Several" include four bilingual editions in Spanish and Basque and one bilingual edition in French and Basque. In other words, out of all five TLs, only Spanish and French were present in the 70s.

The landscape changes quite drastically in the 80s, as Catalan and Galician quickly become the 2nd and 3rd most translated-into languages. This increase in translations into Catalan and Galician coincides with their becoming co-official languages of Spain, as is also the case with Basque. This recognition was also the starting point of a process aimed at promoting and normalizing the Basque language, literature, and its translation (*cf.* Ibarluzea, 2021). Another reason for this turn may lie on the predominance of CYL during the 80s. Firstly, out of all 64 translations published during the 80s, 44 (68,75%) belonged to CYL, and all 44 were translated into either Spanish, Catalan, or Galician. Secondly, out of all 31 works translated into Catalan and Galician during the 80s, 25 (80,65%) belonged to CYL.

These pieces of data restate the importance of the co-official languages of Spain in translated Basque CYL. In this regard, Etxaniz and López Gaseni (2005, p. 116) speak of simultaneous publications derived from agreements between publishing houses in different autonomous regions or publishers with several regional branches, which brings them to consider CYL a circuit in and of itself. Indeed, across all decades, the catalog includes 44 STs belonging to CYL that were all translated into

Catalan, Galician, and Spanish. In the case of 28 (63,64%) of those, all three translations were published within the same year the original text was published, and we can find 9 (20,45%) other instances where translations were published with a maximum difference of two years with respect to their ST.

Another outstanding fact is the overwhelming prevalence of Spanish as TL during the 2010s, with almost ¾ of all works being translated into this language. This may be related to the rescinding of the agreements between publishers mentioned in the previous paragraph, which promoted translations into Catalan and Galician: "[M]ost recent data show that the collaboration between publishers has lost importance and very few books have been translated from Basque lately via such agreements" (Manterola, 2023, p. 52).

Indeed, data award Spanish an undeniably important role in the export[9] of Basque literature. Besides almost 60% of all works featured in the catalog being translated into Spanish, this language also plays a part in translation into other languages: it is often the first language works are translated into, with other TLs following suite; it serves as pivot language in indirect translations; it is the language almost all self-translating authors translate into, etc.[10]

These circumstances seem to support the characterization of the Basque literary system as not fully autonomous but rather dependent on Spanish literature, as some authors have previously put forward (Arrula, 2018, p. 96; Manterola, 2014, p. 184). In this regard, consistent translation into a specific language can be a double-edged sword:

> Si no se realizan traducciones, no se tendrá relación alguna con otras culturas, y habrá un completo desconocimiento de dicha literatura en otras culturas. Por el contrario, si el número de traducciones que se realizan desde una literatura es demasiado amplio, quizás se llegue a una dependencia excesiva o incluso a un cierto grado de colonización. […] En el caso de la literatura vasca, las traducciones al castellano abren el camino para llegar a más lectores, pero también se corre el riesgo de que la obra original se quede a un lado (Manterola, 2014, p. 181).

---

[9] The word *export* is used figuratively here, as "translating is not necessarily synonymous with exporting abroad" (Manterola, 2023, p. 46).
[10] These matters will be delved into further in the following sections.

3.4. Authors and translators and their gender distribution

The 1192 translations included in the catalog have been written by 183 different authors —excluding editors, compilers, and illustrators— and translated by 312 different translators, who may be classified by gender as follows:[11]

	Authors		Translators	
	#	%	#	%
M	114	62,30	164	52,56
F	69	37,70	148	47,44
	183	**100**	**312**	**100**

Table 7. Authors and translators as function of their gender.

Several facts from the data above are worthy of being delved into in a more in-depth way. On the one hand, translators are more numerous than authors by a substantial margin, even as 108 (9,06% out of all 1192) translations fail to include information regarding their translators. This means translators vary considerably more than authors. This, of course, shouldn't come as a surprise, as the catalog includes several translations of the same work. In addition, not all authors are equally represented in the catalog, and 10 of them suffice to encompass half of all translations included in it, as seen in Table 8. It is also noteworthy that only three out of these 10 authors are women, and their works mainly belong to CYL.

		#	%
1	Atxaga, Bernardo	201	16,86
2	Landa Etxebeste, Mariasun	95	7,97
3	Igerabide Sarasola, Juan Kruz	82	6,88
4	Ateka, Piedad	63	5,29
5	Zubizarreta Dorronsoro, Patxi	60	5,03
6	Lertxundi Esnal, Anjel	27	2,27

---

[11] Because of the practical impossibility of contacting each and every author and translator present in the catalog to ask about their gender identity, classifications have been done based on authors' and translators' first names, assigning each name the gender traditionally related to it. I acknowledge that this classification method is subject to errors on my part and may lead to inexact results.

7	Meabe Plaza, Miren Agur	26	2,18
8	Arretxe Pérez, Jon	25	2,10
9	Saizarbitoria, Ramon	21	1,76
10	Cano Jauregi, Harkaitz	18	1,51
		618	**51,85**

Table 8. Most translated authors in the catalog.

On the other hand, both in the case of authors and translators, men are more numerous than women, even if translators are more equally distributed than authors.

In addition, each translation included in the catalog has been classified according to the gender of its author(s). Each catalog entry has been assigned one of four labels: M (author(s) is/are male), F (author(s) is/are female), Both (authors include both men and women) or No Data (author's identity unknown). The same procedure has been followed for translators. So, looking at the amount of works in the catalog written and translated by men and women —meaning not the number of men and women present in the catalog, but the amount of separate translated works that were written and translated by men and women—, we may observe the following:

	Authors		**Translators**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**
M	788	66,11	564	47,32
F	355	29,78	456	38,26
Both	25	2,10	64	5,37
No Data	24	2,01	108	9,06
	1192	**100**	**1192**	**100**

Table 9. Distribution of translated works as function of the gender of their authors and translators.

Table 9 shows a landscape not so different from Table 7, where men outnumber women among both authors and translators, and the imbalance is more pronounced in the case of authors. However, as previously said, it is noteworthy that almost 10% of all translated works lack data relating to the identity of their translators and hence cannot be classified in terms of gender.

We may also ask ourselves whether there exists a correlation between a text's author's gender and that of its translator, i.e., what percentage of works written by men have been translated by other men? Can we find a similar pattern in works written by women? The following table (Table 10) presents the crossing of authors' and translators' genders.

		Translators			
		M	F	Both	No Data
Authors	M	470	210	48	60
	F	78	227	11	39
	Both	11	5	3	6
	No Data	5	14	2	3

Table 10. Crossing of works as function of their authors'
and translators' genders.

The data featured in Table 10 reveals a high degree of correlation between authors' and translators' gender. Out of 788 works written by men, 470 (59,64%) were also translated by men. This elevated correlation can be verified by comparing these data to those featured in Table 9, which show 47,32% of all translations to be done by men. The same phenomenon can be observed in women's works, even more pronouncedly so: out of 355 works written by women, 227 (63,94%) were translated by women, while data in Table 9 show 38,26% of all works to be translated by women.

This may lead one to conclude that, in general, works are more likely to be translated by someone of the same gender as their author. A possible partial explanation for this lies in the mode of translation, which will be explored in greater detail in the next section. As shall be seen, self-translation has a strong presence in Basque translated literature, which will obviously increase the number of cases where authors' and translators' genders coincide.

The opposite test, however, renders different results: out of 564 works translated by men, only 78 (13,83%) had been written by women, while out of 456 works translated by women, 210 (46,05%) had been written by men. In other words, women translate men way more than men translate women.

The following tables present the evolution of authors' and translators' gender across decades:

	% (#)	1970-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2020	2021-2023
Authors	M	85,7 (12)	42,19 (27)	66,57 (225)	75,22 (349)	61,92 (148)	36,99 (27)
	F	0 (0)	48,44 (31)	29,88 (101)	20,26 (94)	34,73 (83)	63,01 (46)
	Both	0 (0)	0 (0)	0,59 (2)	4,09 (19)	1,67 (4)	0 (0)
	No Data	9,38 (2)	9,38 (6)	2,96 (10)	0,43 (2)	1,67 (4)	0 (0)
	100 (14)	**100 (64)**	**100 (338)**	**100 (482)**	**100 (239)**	**100 (73)**	

Table 11. Authors' gender as function of the publication decade, shown in percentages and absolute numbers.

	% (#)	1970-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2020	2021-2023
Translators	M	50,00 (7)	57,81 (37)	40,53 (137)	52,37 (243)	48,95 (117)	31,51 (23)
	F	7,14 (1)	34,38 (22)	44,67 (151)	33,62 (156)	38,49 (92)	46,58 (34)
	Both	0 (0)	1,56 (1)	5,33 (18)	4,53 (21)	7,11 (17)	9,59 (7)
	No Data	42,86 (6)	6,25 (4)	9,47 (32)	9,48 (44)	5,44 (13)	12,33 (9)
	100 (14)	**100 (64)**	**100 (338)**	**100 (482)**	**100 (239)**	**100 (73)**	

Table 12. Translators' gender as function of the publication decade, shown in percentages and absolute numbers.

Several conclusions may be drawn from these data. First, one can discern a preference for translating works written by men. In three out of the five decades analyzed, over 60% of all translated works had been written by men, and no works written by women were translated in the

70s,[12] as seen in Table 11. The 80s, on the other hand, stand out as an exception to this, with works written by women outnumbering those written by men. I shall come back to the data from the 80s in the following paragraphs. As for the 90s, 2000s, and 2010s, preference for translating works written by men is also notable: the 2000s show the most flagrant iteration of this, with a bit over ¾ of all translations being of works written by men. Finally, the data from the 2020s shows a sharp turn in this pattern, with 63,01% of all translations being of works written by women; it would be imprudent, however, to draw any big conclusions from this, as only a fourth of the decade has gone by.

The data from the 80s called for a deeper investigation into the possible explanations for this seeming anomaly. The strong presence of CYL in this decade, already mentioned in this article, comes to mind. Indeed, 68,75% of translations published in the 80s belong to CYL, which allows for formulating this hypothesis: CYL is a genre more dominated by women, while AL is more dominated by men. The data from the 80s show this to be true:

	AL		CYL	
	#	%	#	%
M	16	80,00	11	25,00
F	3	15,00	28	63,64
Both	0	0,00	0	0,00
No Data	1	5,00	5	11,36
	20	**100**	**44**	**100**

Table 13. Authors' gender in translations published in the 80s
as function of their target reader.

A more comprehensive analysis of the correlation between target readership and author gender, however, shows that data from the 1980s cannot be extrapolated to the entirety of the catalog, as shown in Table 14.

---

[12] The translations classified under "No data" in the 70s correspond with two editions of the same work where data regarding the gender of its author is missing due to it being a collection of popular legends and tales.

	AL		CYL	
	#	%	#	%
M	425	76,16	363	57,26
F	117	20,97	238	37,54
Both	7	1,25	18	2,84
No Data	9	1,61	15	2,37
	558	**100**	**634**	**100**

Table 14. Authors' gender in translations of the entire catalog as function of their target reader.

Indeed, translations of works written by men prevail both in AL and CYL. It is notable, however, that proportions are much more asymmetrical in the case of AL.

This gives ground to not completely disregard the initial hypothesis and amend it instead: AL is more disproportionately male-dominated than CYL, even though both genres are male-dominated to a certain extent. In addition, Table 14 shows another interesting fact: works written by men are the only category where AL outnumbers CYL. Conversely, CYL outnumbers AL in the case of works written by women, works written by several authors and those with missing data, i.e. the more marginal categories.

As for translators, Table 12 shows a more balanced distribution of male and female translators, even though male translators are still more numerous in most decades. It bears being noted, however, that missing data regarding translators' gender is quite ubiquitous, which negatively weighs on the accuracy of this analysis.

3.5. Mode of translation

Another important factor that shapes the translation catalog is the mode of translation, both in terms of translation authorship (self-translation) and usage of pivot languages (indirect translation).

In the first case, these data are highly missing in the ELI catalog, and downright not included in the NorDaNor catalog. This being so, I have

classified translations myself, by assigning them one of the following five labels:[13]

   a) **Allograph translation.** Author's and translator's names do not coincide at all.
   b) **Collaboration with author**. Author's name appears alongside another translator's name.
   c) **Self-translation**. Author's and translator's names coincide fully.
   d) **Several modes of translation**. Several translation modes were identified, e.g., in the case of multilingual editions that required several separate translation processes.
   e) **No data**. Data regarding the identity of authors and/or translators is missing.

	#	%
Allograph translation	650	54,53
Collaboration	47	3,94
Self-translation	371	31,12
Several modes	9	0,76
No Data	115	9,65
	1192	**100**

Table 15. Modes of translation present in the translation catalog
in terms of translation authorship.

Data in Table 15 presents a preference for allograph translation, even though individual self-translation and, more generally, the involvement of the author in the translation process is commonplace; indeed, 35,06% of translated works show author involvement.

As one can see in Table 16, individually self-translated works are almost universally translated into Spanish:

---

[13] For the sake of this paper, classification regarding author involvement in translation has been limited to five categorical labels, and potential overlaps have been disregarded. However, reality is more accurately represented by a spectrum with individual allograph translation on one end, and individual self-translation on the other (Manterola, 2014, p. 93). In between those two ends, several degrees and modes of collaboration can be found (*cf.* Dasilva, 2016).

	#	%
ES	367	98,92
FR	4	1,08
	371	**100**

Table 16. Self-translated works as function of their TL.

This is consistent with the sociolinguistic landscape of the Basque Country: there are no monolingual Basque speakers, and over 90% of all Basque speakers are located on the Spanish side of the border.[14]

As for allograph translations, they are distributed by language more or less in accordance with the general TL distribution of translations presented in Table 2, with one exception: Spanish-language translations plummet from 58,31% in the general TL distribution to 36,15% of allograph translations. This, of course, is consistent with the ubiquity of Spanish among self-translated works, as shown in Table 16. In fact, self-translations outnumber allograph translations by more than a hundred in the case of Spanish as TL.

On the other hand, translated works have also been classified in terms of pivot language usage. To that effect, the data available in the ELI catalog has been complemented with that included in the NorDaNor catalog. Finally, the works whose data were still missing have been looked up on Index Translationum (UNESCO, n.d.). This notwithstanding, most catalog entries have remained unclassified, as shown in Table 17. Therefore, all translated works have been assigned to one of the following labels:[15]

a) **Direct translation**. Translation is done directly from Basque into the TL in question.
b) **Indirect translation**. Translation is not done directly from Basque but rather using another language as a pivot language.
c) **Several translation modes**. Several modes of translation were identified.
d) **No data**. No data were found regarding the use of pivot languages.

---

[14] This has been calculated using data from the Basque Statistics Office (Eustat, 2023). For this calculation, passive Basque speakers have been excluded, meaning only "full" speakers have been considered.
[15] Considerations expressed in Footnote 13 also apply to classifications regarding indirect translation.

	#	%
Direct translation	75	6,29
Indirect translation	104	8,72
Several modes	2	0,17
No data	1011	84,82
	1192	**100,00**

Table 17. Modes of translation present in the catalog
in terms of pivot language usage.

Indeed, Table 17 reveals a severe lack of information regarding use of pivot languages, as 84,82% of all translated works remain unclassified. To remedy this, I have assumed that works translated into Spanish belong in the "Direct translation" category. This assumption is justified by the fact that Spanish *is* the pivot language in almost every case of indirect translation, as shown in Table 18:

	#	%
ES	96	97,96
EN	2	2,04
	98	**100**

Table 18. Pivot languages used in indirect translations
that are present in the translation catalog.

Indeed, Spanish is almost universally the language used to bring Basque literature into other languages —it is also the language Basque literature is almost exclusively self-translated into—. I believe this to be reason enough to deduce that Basque literature is virtually always translated directly into Spanish and works translated into this TL can be safely placed under the "Direct translation" label. This change leaves us with quite a different landscape:

	#	%
Direct translation	797	66,86
Indirect translation	104	8,72
Several modes	2	0,17

No data	289	24,24
	1192	**100**

Table 19. Indirectness in translations
present in the catalog, assuming translations
into Spanish are always direct.

Even though unclassified works still make up approximately a quarter of all entries, Table 19 shows direct translation to be the privileged mode of translation in the catalog. Of course, the boundaries between direct and indirect translation bear questioning: Are direct and indirect translations two black-and-white categories or is there any overlap? Is a translation still direct if other translations were consulted during the translation process? That is, if a translation into Catalan was done from the Basque text but having the already-published Spanish translation always at hand, is this still a strictly direct translation? Does trusting the decisions made by previous translators constitute some sort of semi-indirect translation? Would we benefit from creating a new category such as *direct translation with consultation of other translations*? These questions will remain unanswered for now but shall be explored in future phases of research.

3.6. Works translated into three or more languages

The study presented in this paper is part of a research project whose core consists of a comparative analysis of several translations of the same work, hence the interest in texts translated into multiple TLs. In addition to this, as mentioned in the beginning of this paper, most works featured in the catalog were translated to only one of the TLs studied, and so I deem it interesting to isolate works translated into several languages and look at data specific to them. This exercise also allows for separately studying the Basque prose works that were most successful in terms of export or internationalization.

80 of the 654 STs present in the catalog have been translated into three or more of the five TLs. Most works are concentrated between the years 1981 and 2010, with the 2000s being the most prolific decade:

	#	%
1970-1980	1	1,25
1981-1990	17	21,25

1991-2000	24	30
2001-2010	28	35
2011-2020	7	8,75
2021-2023	2	2,5
No Data	1	1,25
	80	**100**

Table 20. Distribution of STs across publication decades.

As for translations, distribution across decades varies slightly when factoring TL in. Translations into English were published a bit later in comparison to other TLs. Across the board, the 2000s are the most prolific decade, but the second most prolific decade in the case of English is the 2010s, whereas, in the case of all other TLs, it's the 90s. Viewed in another way, 77,78% of translations into English (21 out of 27) were published in 2001 or after, which is the highest rate among all TLs.

In addition, CYL is overrepresented in this list. While it makes up 53,19% of entries in the catalog, it comprises 70% of STs in this list: 56 works belong to CYL, and 24 to AL. Target readership also affects the most represented TLs: 41 of the 56 CYL works (73,21%) were translated into Catalan, Galician, and Spanish, while only 3 (5,36%) added English to that list of TLs. On the other hand, all 24 AL works were translated into at least English and Spanish.

With respect to the authors present on this list, three authors stand out, as they collectively make up 50% of all 80 STs: Mariasun Landa (19 works), Bernardo Atxaga (15 works), and Patxi Zubizarreta (6 works). Out of the 80 works in the list, 47 (58,75%) were written by men, 32 (40%) were written by women, and 1 (1,25%) includes authors of both genders. This distribution is slightly more balanced than that found in the general catalog, where 66,11% of works were written by men and 29,78% were written by women. As for translators, 62 of 80 STs (77,5%) include translations done by both men and women, and there are only 11 STs where all translations were conducted exclusively either by men or by women. However, it is worth noting that in all those 11 cases, the gender of authors and translators coincides.

Finally, regarding mode of translation, it is remarkable that, in 52 of the 80 original works (65%), the author was involved to a certain degree in the Spanish translation: 45 (56,25%) were individual self-translations

and 7 (8,75%) were done in collaboration. In addition, 32 out of the 80 STs (40%) include at least one indirect translation.

CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study has been to offer a succinct overview of the main features and evolution of Basque literary prose translated into other languages. Through the quantitative analysis of a translation catalog containing 1192 translated works, I have strived to characterize the translation of Basque literary prose in terms of its chronological distribution, its target readership, its target language distribution, the authors and translators present in the catalog and their gender distribution, and the modes of translation —in terms of translation authorship as well as use of pivot languages. I consider the main takeouts from this study to be the following:

Translation of Basque literary texts are increasing overall, with projections showing the decrease of publications in the 2010s to be an anomaly.

Spanish has a strong numerical superiority over all other TLs analyzed in this study, with almost 60% of all works having been translated into it. Co-official languages of Spain, i.e., Catalan and Galician, show a stronger presence in CYL, as opposed to AL. On the contrary, English is more present in AL. French is also less present in CYL, but this reduction is less pronounced than that of English.

Data show a high tendency to translate several works by the same author and even translating and retranslating the same works several times, with only 10 authors making up over 50% of all translated works featured in the catalog. In addition, despite men being the majority in the case of both authors and translators, overrepresentation of men among authors has been proven to be more pronounced than that found among translators. As for the crossing of agents' genders, data have shown a high correlation between the genders of authors and translators, meaning works written by men are more likely to be translated by men, and vice-versa. On the contrary, when focusing on the gender of the translator, I have observed that women translate works written by men more than men translate works written by women. In terms of target readership, male authors have also proven to be the majority in both CYL and AL, but, once more, one group

has shown a bigger imbalance than the other: AL is more male dominated than CYL.

Allograph translation is the preferred method for translating literary prose from Basque, but authors are involved in a high number of analyzed translations: 31,12% of works featured in the catalog are individual self-translations, and 3,94% of translations have been conducted in collaboration with the author. This, however, is not true for Spanish, as self-translations outnumber allograph ones and, overall, Spanish is the TL of self-translations almost universally.

Most works are translated directly from Basque, even though the presence of indirect translation is far from negligible: 8,72% of translations featured in the catalog were done indirectly. Again, Spanish becomes crucial, with almost every indirect translation using it as pivot language. The lack of data regarding indirectness also stands out.

As for future developments, some classifications necessitate further looking-into, as they have proven to not be as clear-cut as previously thought. To this effect, I believe this study will benefit from a more qualitative assessment of matters such as undeclared author involvement, influence of other translations in a particular translation, etc.

REFERENCES

Arrula, Garazi (2018). *Autoitzulpenaren teoria eta praktika Euskal Herrian* [Monograph:]. Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. http://addi.ehu.es/handle/10810/27983

Basque Government (n.d.-a). *EIMA katalogoa*. Retrieved September 6, 2023, from https://eimakatalogoa.eus/vufind/

Basque Government (n.d.-b). *Public Reading Network of Euskadi*. Euskadi.eus. Retrieved December 17, 2023, from https://www.katalogoak.euskadi.eus/cgibin_q81a/abnetclop/O9265/ID3652e977/NT1?ACC=111&LANG=en-US

Basque Government (2021). *Euskariana* (Euskadi). DIGIBÍS. Producciones Digitales. https://euskariana.euskadi.eus/euskadibib/

Dasilva, Xosé Manuel (2016). En torno al concepto de semiautotraducción. *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció*, 23, 15-35.

EIZIE (n.d.). *NorDaNor | EIZIE*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://nordanor.eus/norda?n=l

Etxaniz, Xabier and López Gaseni, Manu (2005). *90eko hamarkadako haur eta gazte literatura*. Pamiela.

Etxeberria, Isabel (2022). Kolokazioak literatur testu itzulietan eta ez itzulietan: Emozioak eta sentimentuak. In Aitor Lizardi Ituarte, Sergio Monforte Del Valle, Laura Vela Plo and Alazne Arriortua Zorrilla (Eds.), *Hizkuntzalari Euskaldunen V. Topaketa: Kimu berriak Euskal Hizkuntzalaritzan 2021*. Udako Euskal Unibertsitatearen argitaletxea. https://www.inguma.eus/produkzioa/ikusi/kolokazioak-literatur-testu-itzulietan-eta-ez-itzulietan-emozioak-eta-sentimentuak

Eustat (2023). *Euskal Herriko 16 urte edo gehiagoko biztanleria, hizkuntza-gaitasunaren arabera lurraldeari eta adinari jarraiki*. https://www.eustat.eus/elementos/tbl0009564_e.html

Ibarluzea, Miren (2021). *Euskal literatura itzuliaren egitura eta islak 1975-2015*. Euskaltzaindia.

Jaka, Aiora (2011). *Itzulpenari buruzko gogoeta eta itzulpen-praktika Joseba Sarrionandiaren lanetan* [Monograph:]. Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/tesis?codigo=174002

López Gaseni, Manu (2009). Euskal itzulpenen inbentarioa eta azterketa (1976-2008). *Senez: itzulpen aldizkaria*, 37, 299-311.

Manterola, Elizabete (2012). *Euskal literatura beste hizkuntza batzuetara itzulia. Bernardo Atxagaren lanen itzulpen moten arteko aldaera* [Monograph:]. Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. https://www.inguma.eus/produkzioa/ikusi/euskal-literatura-beste-hizkuntza-batzuetara-itzulia-bernardo-atxagaren-lanen-itzulpen-moten-arteko-aldaera

Manterola, Elizabete (2014). Una mirada hacia la traducción literaria del euskera al castellano. *Hermēneus*, 16, 177-208.

Manterola, Elizabete (2015). La autotraducción en el contexto vasco: Entre distancia interlingüística y la constitución de un campo literario nacional transfronterizo. *Glottopol*, 25, 71-87.

Manterola, Elizabete (2017). Collaborative self-translation in a minority language: Power implications in the process, the actors and the literary systems involved. In Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page (Eds.), *Self-Translation and Power: Negotiating Identities in European Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 191-215). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-50781-5_9

Manterola, Elizabete (2021a). *Euskal Literatura Itzuliaren katalogoa (ELI)*. UPV/EHU. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://www.ehu.eus/ehg/eli/

Manterola, Elizabete (2021b). Euskal literatura itzuliari buruzko gogoeta. In Mikel Ayerbe Sudupe (Ed.), *Euskal ediziogintzaren hastapen ikerketak* (pp. 65-95). UPV/EHU. https://web-argitalpena.adm.ehu.es/pdf/UHPDF213496.pdf

Manterola, Elizabete (2023). Literary translation from Basque: A study of contemporary translation glows. *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 16 (2), 44-63. https://doi.org/10.33542/JTI2023-2-4

Sanz, Zuriñe (2015). *Unitate fraseologikoen itzulpena: Alemana-euskara. Literatur testuen corpusean oinarritutako analisia* [Monograph:]. Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. https://addi.ehu.es/handle/10810/15128

Spanish Government (n.d.). *Catálogos | Biblioteca Nacional de España*. Retrieved September 6, 2023, from https://www.bne.es/es/catalogos

UNESCO (n.d.). *Index Translationum*. Retrieved September 6, 2023, from https://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsform.aspx

Zubillaga, Naroa (2013). Alemanetik euskaratutako haur- eta gazte-literatura: Zuzeneko nahiz zeharkako itzulpenen azterketa corpus baten bidez [Monograph:]. Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. https://addi.ehu.es/handle/10810/12431