



Odorico Mendes and the poetic translation of Virgil

Odorico Mendes e a tradução poética de Virgílio

Paulo Sérgio de Vasconcellos*

Abstract:

The paper focuses on Manuel Odorico Mendes' translations of Greek and Latin poetry, with an emphasis on some key passages from his translations of Virgil. The paper highlights the Brazilian translator's efforts to preserve the semantic specificities of the original language and to recreate in Portuguese certain effects of sound and rhythm, thereby challenging the widely-held belief that poetry is untranslatable in poetic form.

Keywords: Virgil; Poetic translation; Odorico Mendes

Resumo:

O artigo enfoca as traduções de poesia grega e latina de Manuel Odorico Mendes, com ênfase em algumas passagens especialmente significativas de suas traduções de Virgílio. O artigo sublinha os esforços do tradutor brasileiro em preservar as especificidades semânticas da língua original e em recriar em português certos efeitos de som e ritmo, desafiando assim a crença amplamente difundida de que a poesia é intraduzível em forma poética.

Palavras-chave: Virgílio; Tradução poética; Odorico Mendes

This paper⁵⁶ aims to introduce Anglophone classicists to Manuel Odorico Mendes (1799-1864), a seminal Brazilian translator of Greco-Roman literature, who is relatively unknown outside of national borders. In the nineteenth century, Odorico Mendes translated all of Virgil and Homer,⁵⁷ challenging the often-alleged impossibility of translating a poetic text in poetic form.

Besides being a prominent literary figure, Manuel Odorico Mendes was also an important politician when Brazil was ruled by the Emperors Dom Pedro I (1822-1831) and

* Professor do Departamento de Linguística e do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística do Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem – IEL da Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil. E-mail: odoricano@gmail.com.

⁵⁶ I would like to thank Linda El-Dashy for translating my paper into English, Ben Young for his help with the final version, and, especially, Konstantinos Nikoloutsos and Anastasia Bakogianni for improving the text in several ways. Needless to say, all remaining mistakes are entirely my own. Finally, I also wish to thank Rodrigo Gonçalves who has been an enthusiastic and tireless supporter of the whole project of presenting papers on Brazilian reception of the Classics at the APA meeting and subsequently getting them published.

⁵⁷ M. O. Mendes, *Eneida brasileira*, Paris: Rignoux, 1854; *Vergilio brasileiro*, Paris: W. Remquet, 1874; *Iliada de Homero*, Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Guttemberg, 1928; *Odyssea de Homero*, Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Leite Ribeiro.

Dom Pedro II (1831-1889). However, in 1847 he abandoned politics and moved to France with the intention of dedicating his time and energy exclusively to translating classical literature into Portuguese. While in Europe, he published *Eneida Brasileira* [Brazilian Aeneid] (1854) and *Vergílio Brasileiro* [Brazilian Vergil] (1858). The latter publication contained Virgil's entire literary output. It featured the original Latin text along with a Portuguese poetic translation, as well as copious notes on some finer points of the translation and on philological aspects of the work. Odorico Mendes died in 1864 from a heart attack in London and his translations of the Homeric epics were published posthumously. His death occurred while he was paying a final visit to the British capital before his planned return to his native country.

Odorico Mendes' works had, until recently, given rise to controversy; his translations, especially his verse renditions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, had frequently been the target of harsh criticism. By contrast, the reception of his translations of Virgil has, on the whole, been more positive, although they, too, have been the subject of criticism. Silvio Romero (1851-1914), for instance, an influential scholar of Brazilian literature, wrote: 'As for the translations of Virgil and Homer attempted by the poet, the harshest criticism of them is insufficient. Everything is false, artificial, extravagant, impossible. They are true monstrosities' ('Quanto às traduções de Virgílio e Homero tentadas pelo poeta, a maior severidade seria pouca ainda para condená-las. Ali tudo é falso, contrafeito, extravagante, impossível. São verdadeiras monstruosidades', 1949, p. 35).⁵⁸ In the same vein, Antonio Candido, a major Brazilian literary critic who died recently (in May 2017), wrote in 1975 that Odorico Mendes' translations of the epics of Homer were 'a height of idiocy' ('um ápice de tolice', p. 74). Nowadays, however, the reception of his works has changed, and they are recognized as one of the most intriguing translations ever produced by a Brazilian author.⁵⁹

There is a longstanding *topos* regarding translations of poetic texts, which is often reproduced in academic discourse. This *topos* is chiefly demonstrated in translators' declarations, which serve to clarify that, in translating a poetic text into the language of the receiving culture, every effort is made to remain faithful to the *sense* of the original rather than to its poetic aspects. However, it is hardly plausible to maintain that, in translating poetry, no attempt should ever be made to reproduce certain sound effects and rhythms present in the original, since sound and rhythm are vital signifiers, inseparable parts of the meaning of a

⁵⁸ All translations from Portuguese into English are my own.

⁵⁹ Among modern influential Odorico's defenders in Brazil we can cite the critic and translator Haroldo de Campos and the classicists Antonio Medina and Francisco Achear.



poem.⁶⁰ Frequently, in attempting to convey meaning within these self-imposed limitations, the translator fails to preserve the most singular semantic aspects of expression in the original, thus eliminating everything that might appear strange to the original readers. The opposition between ‘domesticating’ and ‘foreignizing’ translations mounts at least to Schleiermacher (1768-1834), whose ideas Venuti (2008, p. 15) synthetizes with his usual clarity: ‘Admitting (with qualifications like ‘as much as possible’) that translation can never be completely adequate to the foreign text, Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.’ My impression is that, in the field of Classics, the practice of *explaining* texts has resulted in the tendency of translating a text via a choice of words and expressions that serve to simplify and make it clear to the modern reader, even when the original includes words or concepts that are difficult to ascertain, terms or concepts that are enigmatic, imprecise, or even vague.

In this type of translation, the main goal is to smooth over rough edges in the original text, offering the reader something fluent and simple, something that can be understood immediately without an extensive cognitive process. In principle, I have nothing against such an approach – which could be called ‘didactic’ – as long as one does not claim it is more legitimate because it is loyal to the meaning of the source text. First of all, since the priority is not to reproduce literary aspects of the original, ‘fidelity’ is precisely what this type of translation lacks. By following such eclectic practices, one cannot reproduce the full meaning of the text for two main reasons. First, as we know, an essentialist, singular meaning does not exist. Every text (and this is obviously true, too, about the *Aeneid* and the Homeric epics) contains within itself the possibility of many meanings; hence it is impossible to come up with a translation that does justice to the source texts’ full spectrum of meanings (a complex question into which I cannot delve here). Second, in a poetic text, sound and rhythm also connote meaning; how to proclaim fidelity to the meaning when the translator subordinates them to the literal sense of the words? Finally, this kind of ‘fidelity’ may betray even the literal meaning, if the reader is presented with a banal rendition of what in the original was a more singular

⁶⁰ Cf. ‘First it [literary translation] must semiotize forms and sounds like the original, although in a different system...’ (Michael Riffaterre, ‘Transposing Presuppositions on the Semiotics of Literary Translation’, in: Rainer Schulte; John Biguenet, p. 204).



expression.

Odorico Mendes, in turn, tended to re-create the enigmatic and singular phrases of the original in his Portuguese renderings. Here is a succinct example from his translation of the *Georgics*:

Vmida solstitia atque hiemes orate serenas (I, 100)

In Odorico Mendes' version:

'Rogai solstício aguado e inverno claro'... (101)
[Pray for a wet solstice and clear winter.]

In his notes on the translation, Odorico Mendes explains that in this particular context 'solstice' means 'summer', thus sparing the reader from trying to reach this conclusion by him-/herself. At the same time, this note casts light on the way in which the translator approaches the original text. The Latin *solstitia* means solstices, both summer and winter, as is the case in Portuguese; but when employed on its own, it refers specifically to the summer solstice. The synecdoche becomes a synonym for summer (as can be seen in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*: 'the period of the summer solstice'). Odorico Mendes, thus, molds the Portuguese language to match Virgil's Latin. In Portuguese dictionaries we do not find 'solstício' as a synecdoche for summer, but even without Odorico Mendes' note, the reader can understand the meaning in this context since 'solstício' is juxtaposed with 'inverno' (winter). This a brief yet illuminating example of the work of a translator who did not try to explain the original and facilitate its reading by producing a banal and trivial translation. Rather, he preferred to tailor his mother tongue to create a synecdoche in Portuguese similar to that found in the Latin text. The influence of the language of the source text upon the language of the translated text is pervasive in Odorico Mendes' translations.

Let us analyze briefly another example from the *Georgics*. Virgilian didactic poem begins with the words *Quid faciat laetas segetes*: 'what renders happy the plantations'. *Laetas* is a poetic and metaphorical use of the adjective *laetus* ('happy', i.e. 'flourishing'). Odorico Mendes translates literally ('O que alegre as searas'), thereby maintaining the singularity of the expression that personifies nature, one of the fundamental aspects of the language of the *Georgics*. These are examples of semantic singularities that are preserved in Odorico Mendes' translations. I could also mention syntactic constructions that are Latinisms: for instance, reproductions of the ablative absolute and the accusative of respect in the Portuguese text. Here is an example of reproduction of the peculiarities of the Latin syntax. In *Eclogue 2*, Virgil



writes:

*Pallas quas condidit arces
Ipsa colat (61-62)*

Literally: ‘Pallas herself, which citadels she founded, may she inhabit’. It is a singular construction; more commonly we would have *Pallas ipsa arces colat, quas condidit*: ‘May Pallas herself inhabit the citadels she founded’. Odorico reproduces the singular construction, giving as an equivalent a very unusual word order in Portuguese:

No que alçou castelos
Minerva habite.

This literally means: ‘In those castles she founded, Minerva inhabits.’ The Brazilian reader is presented with a difficult sentence, whose structure is based on the Latin syntax that influences the Portuguese rendition.

In defense of this kind of translation Ortega y Gasset point out:

The decisive point continues to be that, when translating, one attempts to move from one’s own language to encounter that of the others, rather than the contrary, as is generally done.⁶¹

Translations that purport to remain true to the original meaning often prune away all the singular and unusual features of the source text, thus offering a clarifying interpretation instead of re-creating, for instance, a similarly imprecise, obscure, and challenging equivalent. Obviously, there are risks involved in opting for the latter: the new text becomes more difficult and therefore risks being called opaque, or even criticized as unreadable, as did indeed happen with Odorico Mendes’ translations.⁶²

In scholarship produced within the field of classical studies, it is not rare to find a condemnation of any failure to reproduce the literal meaning found in the source text, especially when the translator re-contextualizes and situates the text within another culture and/or in

⁶¹ ‘The Misery and Splendor of Translation’, in: Rainer Schulte; John Biguenet (eds.), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992, p. 112. On the influence of the source language on the target language, see Walter Benjamin’s seminal essay *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers*.

⁶² See, for instance, Frederico José Correa (1878, p. 49), who states that, reading the *Virgílio Brasileiro*, he was compelled to check out the Latin text many times in order to understand the Portuguese version. Carlos de Laet (1847-1927) said it was easier to read the originals than the translations of Odorico Mendes (*apud* Moreno, org., 2006, p. 176).

another era.⁶³ Personally, I prefer translations that retain the references to the source text's material culture and the signs of a certain ideology, and preserve the marks of 'alterity' of another epoch. But translators should not pretend that this approach brings them closer to the essence of the ancient text, to its one and only unchanging Meaning, to a fossil that 'archaeologists' of meaning will somehow bring to light in all its glory once the dust of history that has accumulated on the text has been cleared away. Some translations make it clear that there is no transparency in the process of translating, just as there is none in the process of interpreting; others have pretensions of re-creating the original in the mode of Pierre Ménard,⁶⁴ as if history could be eluded. What I do object to is that the academy rejects translations that poetically re-create the original on the grounds that some passages are not faithful to the literal meaning taken as *the* Meaning of the source text – a position that betrays its roots in positivism.

Poetic translations that sometimes stray from the literal meaning so as not to weaken the poetic aspect of the original text are the most effective means of enabling literary works from antiquity to resonate with modern readers. In my opinion, they can have an impact upon contemporary cultural life that is far greater than that which is possible via an erudite academic translation, full of footnotes but bereft of the aesthetic play on language typical of poetry. This is not to suggest two mutually exclusive approaches, but rather about different approaches to ancient texts that keep them alive, relevant, and influential, each in its own way, and each drawing on its own concepts and methods.

Another commonplace popular with translators is that 'poetry is untranslatable'.⁶⁵ Odorico Mendes seems to challenge this belief. The subtitle of his translation of the *Aeneid* illustrates that it is a 'poetic translation', a phrase which encapsulates his whole approach to the practice of translation. The Brazilian poet and translator Haroldo de Campos (1929-2003), one

⁶³ Classicists can easily, I think, remember examples of this attitude; I prefer to mention the 'sin', and not the 'sinners', imitating Gian Biagio Conte in his recent *Dell'imitazione* (2014, p. 95), when he criticizes what he thinks are mistakes in the use of the intertextual methods he advocated.

⁶⁴ Studies on translation, as those about intertextuality, frequently mention Borges' fascinating tale. Scholars interested in intertextuality use the Ménard paradigm to illustrate that even a literal verbal echo of another text will assume different meaning in the new one; rewriting the *Quijote* line-by-line will not result in a reproduction of the book, because the same lines would have different meanings in a new social and literary context. For theorists of translation, the tale can illustrate the chimera of the exact reproduction of meaning.

⁶⁵ If one looks more deeply, all language can seem in fact untranslatable, as indeed is frequently admitted; for instance: 'it is utopique to believe that two words belonging to different languages, and which the dictionary gives us as translations of each other, refer to exactly the same objects. Since languages are formed in different landscapes, through different experiences, their incongruity is natural' (Ortega y Gasset, p. 96); 'The answer to the question, 'Can one translate a poem?' is of course no. The translator meets too many contradictions that he cannot eliminate; he must make too many sacrifices' (Yves Bonnefoy, 'Translating Poetry', in: Rainer Schulte; John Biguenet, 1992, p. 186).



of the greatest theorist of translation in Brazil, has labelled this kind of creative translation a ‘trans-creation’ of the original.⁶⁶ He considered Odorico Mendes a pioneer, the first to present such a poetic ‘trans-creation’ in Brazil and the first to propose a more systematic discussion about the translation of literary texts in his country.⁶⁷ Odorico Mendes frequently explains his methods in the notes to the translations, pointing out his effort to be precise and to recreate poetic effects that he found in the source texts, as if he felt compelled to defend his translations in advance. Here are some examples:

‘O *praeruptus aquae mons* acaba em monossílabo, como para mostrar o cimo da montanha d’água. O nosso *monte* é dissílabo, e terminando nele o verso português não tinha a mesma graça: terminei-o no pronome *se*, e obtive assim a vantagem do latino. Os que sentem a beleza da versificação, devem gostar do exdrúxulo, que, tendo mais uma sílaba, parece aumentar a altura da vaga’ (*Eneida Brasileira*, p. 51).

‘The *praeruptus aquae mons* ends with a monosyllable, so as to point out the summit of the mountain of water. Our *monte* [mountain] is a disyllable, and if the Portuguese line, if it ends with it, would not have the same grace: I ended it with the pronoun *se*, and I attained by this way the quality of the Latin line. Those who feel the beauty of the versification should like the polysyllable, which, having one more syllable, seems to augment the height of the wave’.

‘Conservei a audácia do original... Não me exprimo com mais atrevimento que Ferreira’... (*ibidem*, p. 55)

‘I conserved the audacity of the original... I am not more audacious than Ferreira [a Portuguese poet]’.

What could be more untranslatable in a language like Portuguese than the quantitative rhythm of Latin or Greek? Yet when Odorico Mendes identified an expressive effect engendered by rhythm in classical languages, he set out to create something analogous. Ancient

⁶⁶ See Campos’s concept of ‘transcriação’ (trans-creation): ‘Once we admit, in principle, the thesis of the impossibility of translating ‘creative’ texts, it seems that we may also admit, in principle, the corollary of this thesis, the possibility of re-creating the texts. The texts may exist... in two languages and as two bodies of autonomous aesthetic information, which, we should like to add, will be linked to each other through an isomorphic relation: they will be different in language, but like isomorphic bodies, they will crystallize within the same system’ (H. de Campos, ‘Translation as Creation and Criticism’, in: *Novas. Selected Writings*, ed. A. S. Bessa and O. Cisneros, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007, p. 315). The same text in another translation is found in Mona Baker (ed.). *Translation Studies*. Vol. I. London and New York, Routledge, 2008, p. 130-145. Cf. ‘Literary translation, in the final analysis, participates in both creation and imitation. [...] a translator is definitely an originator, for the only way he could come up with a translation at all is by going beyond and above the source text, by breaking free from its wording, and by giving full scope to his own imagination. The translator’s need to break free from the constraints imposed by the original work accounts for what can be seen as the creative dimension of translation’ (Xu Chonsxin, ‘Literary Translation. Some Theoretical Issues Investigated’, in: BAKER, *ibidem*, p. 116).

⁶⁷ In his notes Odorico Mendes often discusses (sometimes in detail) aspects of his translations, so that we have a kind of *ars tradutoria* scattered throughout them. And he also judges other translations of the lines he is translating, occasions in which we can perceive his ideas about the theme.



authors have handed down texts that demonstrate that their contemporary readers could feel a sense of solemnity or get the impression of slowness from a strong spondaic rhythm, as well as a sense of speed and agility in a rhythm full of short syllables.⁶⁸ Recreating such rhythmic effects in a language like Portuguese is a challenge that might be regarded as irrelevant, or even impossible. However, Odorico Mendes always tried to render analogous effects in Portuguese, drawing on equivalences and similarities rather than seeking an exact (utopian!) reproduction of this aspect of the original.

In Book IV of the *Aeneid* we find an interesting example. The text describes a moment during the hunting trip taken by Aeneas and Dido (the parentheses mark the elisions):

*Pōstqu(am) āltōs uēnt(um) īn mōntēs ātqu(e) īnuia lustra,
Ēccē fērae, saxi deiectae uertice, caprae
Decurrere iugis...* (151-153)

In Sarah Ruden's translation (2006, p. 74):

They came into the hills and trackless woods.
Wild goats they started from a stony summit
Ran down the slope.

The first line is well stocked with long syllables. The second begins with a jumpy dactylic hexameter. The translation provided by Odorico creates the impression of speed in true imitative harmony:

*Chega-se a alpestres montes e ínvias furnas,
Eis, de íngreme rochedo, despenhando-se,
Bravias cabras pelos picos pulam.* (162-63)

One arrives at mountainous summits and impervious caves,
where, from the steep rocks, hurling themselves,
savage goats from the peaks leap.⁶⁹

The long 'despenhando-se' at the end of the second line in Odorico Mendes' translation stands out against the succession of disyllabic words in the next line (with the exception of 'bravias', each word is a disyllabic), in which only paroxitones are used, thereby creating an agile, leaping rhythm that relies on sonorous alliteration to produce an effect of vivid, imitative harmony:

braVIas CABras PElos PICos PULam. (stressed syllables marked)

⁶⁸ For instance: Cicero, *Orator* LXIV, 216; LVII, 191; LXXIII, 212; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* IX, 4, 83, 91.

⁶⁹ My literal translation.



Odorico thus not only found a means to reproduce the original text's rhythmic effect but actually heightened it in his re-working, creating a very agile passage in the style of other Virgilian ones, which manage to suggest, in terms of sound and rhythm, elements of nature.

Another passage I wish to highlight is found in Book II of the same epic. This one refers to the last night in Troy, at the moment immediately prior to the Greek invasion. Vergil describes that particular nightfall as follows:

*Vertitur interea caelum et ruit Oceano nox
Īnuōluēns ūmbrā māgnā tērrāmq̄ polumque* (v. 250-251)

The heavens swung round, night leaped from the ocean
To wrap the earth and sky [...] ⁷⁰

Odorico's version:

Vira o céu, no Oceano a noite cai,
E embuça em basta sombra a terra e o polo...

The sky swings, into the ocean the night falls
and veils in vast shadow the land and the pole... ⁷¹

Apart from maintaining the monosyllable at the end of the first line, very rare in Virgilian verses, ⁷² we observe a completely iambic second line, that is to say an exact progression of atonic (or unstressed) and tonic (or stressed) syllables. Even though it is not possible to reproduce a quantitative rhythm in a language that does not possess such a system, the translator does at least create an analogous poetic effect with an entirely regular rhythmic succession, which gives the line a special style, an effect heightened by the marked labial alliteration:

(e) emBUç(a) em BASTa SOMbr(a) a TERr(a e) o Polo () = elision

Odorico Mendes thus defied the claim that poetry is untranslatable; and his work, written in difficult (sometimes even challenging) Portuguese, was met with incomprehension. Today, however, we find ourselves at a point in history at which it is propitious to reevaluate his creative output and his achievement.

How did in the reception of Odorico Mendes' translations change from being mostly

⁷⁰ Sarah Ruden, p. 31.

⁷¹ My literal translation.

⁷² Cf. Nougaret (1948, p. 44): 'Vigile n'emploie le monosyllabe final que rarement et à bon scient'.

negative in the past to mostly positive today? Scholars like the aforementioned Haroldo de Campos and Antonio Medina, professor of Greek Literature, who discussed Odorico Mendes' translations (the first, in essays; the later in his Master and PHD, in 1977 and 1980, respectively) played a crucial part in this change. They pointed out the qualities of Odorico Mendes' translations, without denying its controversial aspects, such as the occasional tortuous syntax. The so-called 'movement of the concrete poetry' (of which Haroldo was a leader, and Medina a sympathizer) discussed and practiced the poetic recreation of poems, and the example of Odorico was not rarely mentioned. In 1992 Medina published an annotated edition of Odorico Mendes' *Odyssey*; Luiz Alberto Machado Cabral an edition of the *Aeneid* (from the version of 1854) in 2005; I myself coordinate a group of professors and graduates that work on annotated editions of Mendes' translations of Virgil. The group published the *Aeneid* (from the version of 1858), and the *Eclogues* (2008); the edition of the *Georgics* is in print. Another significant sign of the present interest in Odorico Mendes' translation: a group of Brazilian actors presents public recitations of all the books of the *Iliad* in his translation (information about can be found on: <https://iliadahomero.wordpress.com/sobre-nos>); the oral performance highlights the musical and rhythmic qualities of the translation. A sign of the new times in Odorico's reception: two recent editions of his *Eneida Brasileira* (2005 and 2008) were sold out.

Philologists today, in their vast majority, are aware that, without sacrificing the rigor with which they go about their work, they can and should be open to other ways of appropriating ancient texts, ways that can live alongside the more common (and entirely legitimate) approach to translation in some classical philology. In the field of classical reception many scholars are open to creative translations that combine philological precision and poetic elaboration.⁷³

Odorico Mendes combined philological rigor and poetic creativity in his craft. His translations can stand on their own merits as literary texts and they continue to seduce and provoke us, as is shown by the new editions of his Virgil and Homer translations, now accompanied by explanatory notes and commentaries on a difficult but always fascinating text. It is a good sign that the merits of perhaps the greatest Brazilian Classicist have finally been recognized; this recognition coincides with the impressive vitality of Brazilian Classical Studies nowadays, and maybe it is by itself an indication of this vitality.

⁷³ See, for instance, PARKER, J. and MATTHEWS, T. (eds.). *Tradition, Translation, Trauma: The Classic and the Modern*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.



References

- BAKER, M. (ed.). *Translation studies*. Vol. I. London and New York, Routledge, 2008.
- BASNETT, S.; LEFEVERE, A. *Constructing cultures. Essays on literary translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998.
- BENJAMIN, W. Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers. In: Heidermann, W. (ed.) *Clássicos da teoria da tradução*. Vol. I, Florianópolis, UFSC, p. 202-231, 2010.
- BOSI, A. *História concisa da literatura brasileira*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1983.
- DE CAMPOS, H. Translation as Creation and Criticism. In: _____. *Novas. Selected writings*. Edited by A. S. Bessa and O. Cisneros. Illinois, Northwestern University Press, p. 312-26, 2007.
- LANDERS, C. E. *Literary translation. A practical guide*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- CANDIDO, A. *Formação da literatura brasileira*. Vol. 2. São Paulo, Itatiaia-Edusp, 1975.
- CONTE, G. B. *Dell'imitazione. Furto e originalità*. Pisa, Edizioni della Normale, 2014.
- CORREA, F. J. *Um livro de crítica*. Maranhão, Typ. do Frias, 1878.
- MENDES, M. O. *Eneida brasileira*. Paris, Rignoux, 1854.
- _____. *Vergílio brasileiro*. Paris, W. Remquet, 1858.
- _____. *Iliada de Homero*. Rio de Janeiro, Typographia Guttemberg, 1874.
- _____. *Odyssea de Homero*. Rio de Janeiro, Livraria Leite Ribeiro, 1928.
- MORENO, M. Q. (org.). *Humanismo e ciência para Francisco de Assis Magalhães Gomes*. Belo Horizonte, UFMG, 2006.
- NOUGARET, L. *Traité de métrique latine*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1948.
- ROMERO, S. *História da literatura brasileira*. Vol. 3, 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro, José Olympio, 1949.
- PARKER, J.; MATTHEWS, T. (ed.). *Tradition, Translation, Trauma: The Classic and the Modern*. Oxford, UP, 2011.
- SCHULTE, R.; BIGUENET, J. (ed.). *Theories of translation. An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- STEINER, G. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 3. ed., Oxford, UP, 1998.
- VANUTI, L. *The Translator's Invisibility: a history of translation*. 2. ed. Oxon, Routledge, 2008.
- VERGIL. *The Aeneid*. Translated by Sarah Ruden. New Have & London, Yale University Press, 2008.
- VIEIRA, B. V. G. Recepção de Odorico Mendes: (a)casos de crítica de tradução no séc. XIX. *PhaoS*, vol. 10: p. 139-54, 2010.

[RECEBIDO 24/03/2018]

[ACEITO 27/09/2018]