
Translating concepts from Latin American philosophy: Ontologies and aesthetics in the work of Rodolfo Kusch

Traduire les concepts de la philosophie latino-américaine : Ontologies et esthétiques dans l'œuvre de Rodolfo Kusch

ترجمة المفاهيم من الفلسفة الأمريكية اللاتينية: علم الوجود وعلم الجمال في أعمال رودولفو كوش

Rulpazugueyüm Latinoamérica Filosofía nhemül. Ontología yegün estética txipalelu Rodolfo Kusch tañi küzaw mew

লাতিন আমেরিকান দর্শন অনুবাদ: তত্ত্ববিদ্যা, নন্দনতত্ত্ব এবং রোডলফো কুশ

Traducir conceptos de filosofía latinoamericana. Ontologías y estéticas en la obra de Rodolfo Kusch

ترجمه مفاهیمی از فلسفه آمریکای لاتین: هستی‌شناسی و زیبایی‌شناسی در آثار رودولفو کوش

Traduzindo conceitos da filosofia Latino-Americana: Ontologias e estéticas na obra de Rodolfo Kusch

Filosofia latinoamericamanta rimariykuna tikray: Rodolfo Kusch llank'ayninpi ontologiaswan esteticaswan

Latin Amerikan Felsefesindeki Kavramları Çevirmek: Rodolfo Kusch'un Eserlerinde Ontoloji ve Estetik

拉丁美洲哲学中的概念翻译：鲁道夫·库什 (Rodolfo Kusch) 作品中的本体论和美学

Joshua M. Price

 <https://publications-prairial.fr/encounters-in-translation/index.php?id=955>

DOI : 10.35562/encounters-in-translation.955

Référence électronique

Joshua M. Price, « Translating concepts from Latin American philosophy: Ontologies and aesthetics in the work of Rodolfo Kusch », *Encounters in translation* [En ligne], 2 | 2024, mis en ligne le 24 novembre 2024, consulté le 19 mai 2025.
URL : <https://publications-prairial.fr/encounters-in-translation/index.php?id=955>

Droits d'auteur

CC BY-SA 4.0



Translating concepts from Latin American philosophy: Ontologies and aesthetics in the work of Rodolfo Kusch

Traduire les concepts de la philosophie latino-américaine : Ontologies et esthétiques dans l'œuvre de Rodolfo Kusch

ترجمة المفاهيم من الفلسفة الأمريكية اللاتينية: علم الوجود وعلم الجمال في أعمال رودولفو كوش

Rulpazugugeyüm Latinoamérica Filosofía nhemül. Ontología yegün estética txipalelu Rodolfo Kusch tañi küzaw mew

লাতিন আমেরিকান দর্শন অনুবাদ: তত্ত্ববিদ্যা, নন্দনতত্ত্ব এবং রোডলফো কুশ

Traducir conceptos de filosofía latinoamericana. Ontologías y estéticas en la obra de Rodolfo Kusch

ترجمه مفاهیمی از فلسفه آمریکای لاتین: هستی‌شناسی و زیبایی‌شناسی در آثار رودولفو کوش

Traduzindo conceitos da filosofia Latino-Americana: Ontologias e estéticas na obra de Rodolfo Kusch

Filosofia latinoamericanamanta rimariykuna tikray: Rodolfo Kusch llank'ayninpi ontologiaswan esteticaswan

Latin Amerikan Felsefesindeki Kavramları Çevirmek: Rodolfo Kusch'un Eserlerinde Ontoloji ve Estetik

拉丁美洲哲学中的概念翻译：鲁道夫·库什 (Rodolfo Kusch) 作品中的本体论和美学

Joshua M. Price

PLAN

Situating Kusch and his philosophical method: Narratives of everyday life

Researching and translating Kusch

América

Pulcritud vs. hedor

Ser vs. estar

Conclusion

TEXTE

I would like to acknowledge the substantial comments provided by Mona Baker and John Ødemark, and by an anonymous external reviewer. María Constanza Guzmán discussed many of the key concepts with me. I owe an enormous debt to María Lugones (1944–2020) for the years of conversation, collaboration, and

collaborative translation that ground this text. Any remaining errors are mine alone.

- 1 In *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977), Argentinian philosopher Rodolfo Kusch aims to recuperate a form of thinking he believes lies at the root of the American continent, though he thinks it is covered or buried underneath a dominant way of thinking imported from Europe. “The search for an Indigenous way of thinking”, he explains, “is motivated not only by the desire to uncover it scientifically, but by the need to rescue a style of thinking which, as I see it, is found in the very depth of América and maintains a certain potency among people born and rooted here” (*La búsqueda de un pensamiento indígena no se debe sólo al deseo de exhumarlo científicamente, sino a la necesidad de rescatar un estilo de pensar que, según creo, se da en el fondo de América y que mantiene cierta vigencia en las poblaciones criollas*) (Kusch, 2010, p. lxxv/1977, p. 11). Thinking in and from the Americas has an ontological dimension for him: *being* in the Americas is different from *being* in Europe, to paraphrase Walter Mignolo (2010, p. xviii). Kusch ties this ontological distinction to a linguistic and grammatical distinction in Latin American Spanish that does not exist in English: *ser* vs. *estar*, which I explore in some detail below. This and other key concepts posed a challenge for my co-translator, the late María Lugones, and me, as we set out to produce an English translation of his book, which we eventually published as *Indigenous and Popular Thinking in América* (Kusch, 2010) as part of the Duke University Press series *Latin America Otherwise*.
- 2 The purpose of this essay, however, is not merely to fret over how to translate words from one language to another; rather, it is to consider how translating key concepts in a given body of work can bring worldviews and linguistic horizons into new relationships with one another and engender novel narratives and traditions. As Marilyn Gaddis-Rose (1998) has argued, translating concepts can further be a means of analyzing or interpreting those concepts. Translation, in this reading, is a way of giving textual and material life to the intellectual activity of conceptual analysis, a way of embodying or realizing that analysis in textual form. In the particular case of translating Kusch, deciding whether and if so how to translate key concepts such as *estar* (to be) or *América* can provoke a reflection on the prac-

tice of translation itself. Thus, translating can be a metapragmatic exercise, engendering thinking by both translator and reader on how languages and conceptual schemas might stand in relation not only to each other but also in relation to an evolving social context in a dynamic way, a dynamism enhanced by the very practice of translation.

- 3 To illustrate how translation practices can instigate this kind of reflection, I focus on several difficult-to-translate concepts that Kusch identifies in common words from Latin American Spanish as his entry points to excavate the bases for an autochthonous Latin American philosophical tradition—a tradition emerging from and corresponding to everyday life in América, as he might have put it. In particular, the focus in what follows is on geographic, aesthetic and ontological terminology. Some of the key terms Kusch isolates and that I engage with below are *América* (which could be misleadingly translated as “America”); *pulcritud* (“order” or “cleanliness”) in contrast to *hedor* (“stench”) as a binary at the heart of Latin American modernity; and, most of all, as I already mentioned, the distinction in Spanish between *estar* and *ser*, on which Kusch bases a complex ontological theory informed by Quechua and Aymara thinking. In subjecting these quotidian terms to exegesis and conferring upon them a philosophical heft, Kusch is not merely describing an existing state of affairs; instead, he points to a beyond, a hoped-for reality for Latin America that does not yet exist. The *América* of his title is aspirational.¹ Correspondingly, we could describe the afterlife of América granted through the linguistic borrowing in our translation as a narrative reframing of the continent. I draw on Mona Baker’s understanding of narrative here as including larger configurations rather than narrowly as only “discrete, fully articulated local ‘stories’” (Baker, 2006, p. 4). Through the translation, we can see an emergent alternative to hegemonic geographies. If a shimmering, incipient América offers an alternative narrative to conventional geography with its deference to the nation state, national borders, and possibly identity, *pulcritud* and *hedor* present an alternative narrative along the axis of aesthetics and urban design, and the distinction between *ser* and *estar* an alternative ontological narrative.

- 4 I begin by situating Rodolfo Kusch’s philosophical project within its wider context and explaining what I take to be his philosophical

method. It is necessary to explore in some detail Kusch's method of conducting research and drawing on narratives of everyday experiences because that method informed and inspired our own process of translating, as will shortly become clear. I will then turn to our corresponding method of translating his text, focusing on the process of narrative retelling we engaged in.

Situating Kusch and his philosophical method: Narratives of everyday life

- 5 Günter Rodolfo Kusch (1922-1979) is best known as an unorthodox philosopher who has been lately embraced as a decolonial thinker in Argentina, and to a lesser extent throughout Latin America. Since 2000, he has become better known to the English-reading public, due in part to the efforts of scholars and critics who have championed his work (Castro-Klarén, 2011; Mignolo, 2010; Peña, 2022; Rivara 2016), and in part to the English translation by María Lugones and me (Kusch 2010), which made it more widely available to that public.
- 6 Kusch was born in Buenos Aires to German immigrants and grew up in a middle-class urban milieu. At the Universidad de Buenos Aires, he studied philosophy, especially the work of Martin Heidegger. After graduating, he worked for a time in the Ministry of Education, and in the 1950s earned some recognition as a playwright. Over the course of his career, Kusch taught at various universities, including the Universidad de Buenos Aires and later at the Universidad Nacional de Salta in the Northeast and other provincial universities in the Argentinean Andes and Bolivia. After the military coup and the violent imposition of military law in 1976, Kusch opted to leave Buenos Aires for the village of Maimará in the Quebrada de Humahuaca, the Province of Jujuy, in the Northeast. He died a scant three years later, in 1979.
- 7 Kusch's philosophical outlook evolved in the 1950s through a series of field trips to the Andes in Northern Argentina and Southern Bolivia. He ventured out into the countryside, striking up conversations in

open-air markets, in villages, and on farms with *campesinos* and other rural people, especially people of Indigenous descent. Over time, he formalized this dialogic form of philosophical fieldwork into a methodology that he then practiced throughout his life—using chance encounters as entry points to write on language, epistemology, aesthetics, non-Western logics, and ontology.

- 8 Starting with his *La seducción de la barbarie: Análisis herético de un continente mestizo* (1953), Kusch began to grapple with the legacies of Indigenous thinking, and with worldviews that seemed to follow logics fundamentally different from the European philosophical canon in which he had been trained, but which nevertheless appeared to pervade all spheres of his society—and the continent at large. This was followed by *América profunda* (2000, originally published in 1962), *Indios, porteños y dioses* (1966b), *De la mala vida porteña* (1966a), and the book María Lugones and I translated, *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977, originally published in 1970), in addition to other publications. In this body of work, he tried to craft the basis for a way of doing philosophy that is ultimately rooted in Indigenous worldviews and metaphysics but that finds its way in fractured form in the lives of urban people in Latin America, even those who receive a Western education and who seem to be otherwise socialized into and willing to adopt Western values and ways of thinking and acting. Based on this work, Kusch has been characterized as a “philosopher of decolonization and liberation” (*filósofo de la liberación y de la descolonización*) (Rivara, 2016, p. 2, my translation), a “de-colonial” thinker (Mignolo, 2010, pp. xxiii, xxxv–xxxvi), “one of the key figures of *Pensamiento latinoamericano* [Latin American thought]” (Peña, 2022, p. 1), and “a pioneer in the effort to understand indigenous thought from within its own matrix” (Castro-Klarén, 2011, p. 426).
- 9 Kusch’s growing interest in and engagement with Indigenous thinking gradually made him quite critical of the middle-class milieu in which he grew up and the Eurocentric pieties he felt it upheld. His critique conforms neither to orthodoxies of the traditional left nor to those of the traditional right. In *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América*, which was first published in 1970, Kusch is iconoclastic to the point of cynicism, rejecting social science, Marxism, and other theoretical and methodological paradigms that would have been popular in the

restive days of the 1960s and 1970s among urban intellectuals, liberal-minded reformers, as well as progressives in Argentina, throughout Latin America and beyond. For instance, he argues in the introduction that:

Cuestionarios, materialismo dialéctico, educación pública, sufragio universal o valores espirituales son los slogans de una América activa, pero que en el fondo no pasa de ser sino el pensamiento de una clase media emprendedora, situada en las ciudades de la costa del continente. Frente a ellas se da un pueblo relativamente inerte y hostil o un indígena segregado, que pareciera resistir esa acción. Además, los ideales arriba mencionados son distintos aspectos del pensamiento de una burguesía en crisis, en la cual incluyo gustosamente el más extremista de los revolucionarios utópicos, así como el progresista más emprendedor. Uno y otro son segregados—y la historia lo demuestra—por algo que alienta dentro mismo, del continente. (Kusch, 1977, p. 12).

Questionnaires, dialectical Marxism, public education, universal suffrage, or spiritual values are the slogans of an active América, but at base they are nothing but the thinking of an enterprising middle class, situated in the coastal cities of the continent. Opposed to them stand a relatively inert and hostile pueblo, or segregated Indigenous people, who seem to resist that active posture. Besides, the ideals mentioned above are different aspects of the thinking of a bourgeoisie in crisis, in which I gladly include the most extreme of utopian revolutionaries as well as the most enterprising of progressives. The one and the other are segregated—and history shows this—from and by something that breathes within the continent itself. (Kusch, 2010, p. lxxvi)

- 10 Kusch is unsparing in his contempt for the Latin American middle class, including its most revolutionary elements, suggesting that they live an existence alienated from the larger community. The enterprising middle class ignores something that lives within the core of *all* inhabitants of the hemisphere. That ‘something’ is the chief subject of the book, and, arguably, his entire oeuvre. As the middle class strives for political and social solutions that come from Europe (universal suffrage, public education, even utopian revolution), they repress everything that represents Indigenous thinking or ways of being. For Kusch, this sets up an internal clash which he illustrates by

describing how philosophy is studied in Latin American universities versus how it is lived in everyday life:

En materia de filosofía tenemos en América, por una parte, una forma oficial de tratarla y, por la otra, una forma, por decir así, privada de hacerlo. Por un lado está la que aprendemos de la universidad y que consiste en una problemática europea traducida a nivel filosófico y, por el otro, un pensar implícito vivido cotidianamente en la calle o en el campo. (Kusch, 1977, p. 15)

In América we treat philosophy in one of two ways, an official way and a private way. From the university we learn of a European problematic translated philosophically. The other is an implicit way of thinking lived every day in the street or in the countryside. (Kusch, 2010, p. 1)

- 11 Studying a European problematic translated from across the Atlantic leads to sterile philosophy and inauthentic ways of being, Kusch argues, and so he chooses to focus on the philosophy of everyday life since, for him, every philosophical system corresponds or should correspond to a form of life:

Cuando Kant enuncia su teoría del conocimiento, lo hace porque en ese momento era imprescindible. Lo mismo ocurre con Hegel, quien expresa el sentir íntimo de la burguesía alemana de su tiempo. Descartes había pensado su *cogito, ergo sum*, porque así lo exigía el siglo de Richelieu con su razón de estado. El pensar europeo, como bien lo demostró Dilthey, siempre se vinculó a un estilo de vida. (Kusch, 1977, pp. 15–16)

When Kant enunciates his theory of knowledge, he does so because it was necessary at that moment. The same is true of Hegel, who expresses the intimate feeling of the German bourgeoisie of his time. Descartes had thought his *cogito ergo sum* because the century of Richelieu, with its reason of state, demanded it. European thinking, as Dilthey has so ably demonstrated, always linked itself to a way of life. (Kusch, 2010, p. 1)

- 12 Kusch thinks philosophy as it is taught, studied and practiced in América should be closer to the realities of América. “Clearly”, he

states, “the issue is not to negate Western philosophy, but to look for a formulation closer to our own lives” (Claro está que no se trata de negar la filosofía occidental, pero sí de buscar un planteo más próximo a nuestra vida) (Kusch, 2010, p. 1/Kusch, 1977, p. 15). He does not seek to offer an alternative philosophy purified of European elements or free of European influence. At this late stage in transnational and global exchanges, this is not possible nor desirable. Nevertheless, he offers a narrative that is critical of taking up European problems of philosophy through an unthinking universalism, writing that is *recherché*, or dedication to philosophical topics that are rarefied or irrelevant.

Si nuestro papel como clase media intelectual es el de regir el pensamiento de una nación, tenemos realmente la libertad de asumir cualquier filosofía? ¿Cuál es, en suma, nuestra misión? ¿Consistirá en representar y tamizar el sentir profundo de nuestro pueblo o consiste simplemente en incrustarnos en su periferia detentando especialidades que nuestro pueblo no requiere? Evidentemente ésta es la paradoja que plantea el quehacer filosófico cuando se lo toma en profundidad. (Kusch, 1977, p. 22)

If our role as middle class intellectuals is to lead the thinking of a nation, do we really have the freedom to adopt any philosophy? In sum, what is our mission? Will it consist in representing and sifting through the depth of the sensibility of our people, or does it consist simply in lodging ourselves in its periphery, retaining specializations our people do not require? Evidently, this is the paradox that the philosophical task poses when it is taken in its depth. (Kusch, 2010, p. 6)

- 13 Kusch then proceeds to describe his own method, modelling himself on a contemporary intellectual of note—the influential historian and critic Miguel León-Portilla.

Mucho más importante que el instrumental extranjero me pareció el trabajo del mejicano León-Portilla sobre la filosofía náhuatl. Considero que este autor brinda un método muy claro, aunque traté de ampliarlo con el trabajo de campo, no sólo por la ausencia de textos quechuas y aymaras, sino también para verificar las

observaciones hechas a raíz del análisis de los pocos himnos quechuas que se conservan. (Kusch, 1977, p. 13)

Much more important than the foreign instrument is the work of the Mexican León-Portilla on Náhuatl philosophy. I think this author offers us a very clear method—although I have tried to widen it with fieldwork. I have done so not only because of the absence of Quechua and Aymara texts, but also to verify the observations made as a result of the analysis of the few Quechua hymns that have been preserved. (Kusch, 2010, p. lxxvii)

- 14 Miguel León-Portilla (1922-2019) was a rigorous and gifted researcher who fashioned philological and exegetical tools that generations of researchers in several fields continue to use and build upon. He combined philological work with translation to study Nahua people's world view and thought (*pensamiento*), as he put it in one of his most cited works (León-Portilla, 1990, p. vii, also see 2015, 2007). León-Portilla offered a nuanced reading of Nahua culture as well as its linguistic legacies, and the body of scholarship he produced has led to a wider embrace of Nahua culture and the Nahuatl language in contemporary Mexico as well as among Mexican-Americans, or Chicanxs. Methodologically, and this must have inspired Kusch, León-Portilla combined techniques from various disciplines, drawing on archaeological methods as he deciphered the pictographs left on ruins of the Aztec empire, poring over the codices and other manuscripts left by Nahua intellectuals and scribes, and studying the manuscripts of noted colonial missionaries such as Bernardino de Sahagún (León-Portilla, 1999).
- 15 Trained as a philosopher rather than as a linguist or historian, Kusch nevertheless also draws on colonial-era texts (especially *vocabularios* or early missionary glossaries of Indigenous languages) and on first-hand examination of monuments such as the Bennett Monolith. He took the unusual step (for a philosopher) of conducting research in a way that resembles what ethnographers would call participant-observation: observing shamanic rituals, interviewing Ceferino Choque, a shaman or witch doctor, and Apaza Rimachi, whom he describes as a blind witch from Tiahuanaco, as well as other *yatiris* (shamans or witch doctors), *curanderos* (healers) and *brujos* (witches), noting interactions he found revealing. Some of these interactions

took place in Spanish, or at least the Spanish inflected by Quechua as it is spoken throughout the Andes, while others were primarily conducted in Quechua or Aymara; in the latter case, Kusch relied on an interpreter. This kind of material is usually considered more the domain of linguists, anthropologists and folklorists than philosophers. Kusch also visited archaeological sites and from these visits he elaborated novel interpretations of pre-Columbian ruins in Southern Bolivia and Northern Argentina. He noted how Indigenous cosmogonies are evident in the layout of stone shrines, the iconography rendered on ancient monoliths, and the renowned pictographs of the sixteenth-century itinerant Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala. He used these sources of qualitative evidence to explore the ontological, temporal, spatial and epistemic dimensions of Quechua and Aymara thinking and the presence of their cosmologies in everyday practices such as making agricultural decisions on water use, ritualistically reading coca leaves, and deciding whether to take a journey. Significantly, Kusch saw how these Indigenous elements of language and belief emerged in fragmentary form in contemporary popular speech in cities, among both the middle and working class, and this led him to argue that Indigenous roots lie at the core of popular culture, even when these Indigenous roots are suppressed or denied.

- 16 These methods are consistent with Kusch's goal of uncovering a philosophy as it is lived on the streets and in the countryside. As he develops his argument in *Indigenous and Popular Thinking* (Kusch, 2010), he narrates these relatively mundane encounters that he presents as evidence or as points of departure for his larger narrative about being and thinking in the Americas. Kusch's reliance on common turns of phrase and everyday conversations has been noted by several scholars. Walter Mignolo, for instance, characterizes Kusch's "philosophical method" as drawing "from anecdotes and verbal expressions, from Aymara (mainly) and other languages' vocabularies (*dichos y decires populares*)" and suggests that he "derives, infers, interprets the philosophically unsaid in the expression or the anecdote" (Mignolo, 2010, p. xxviii). Kusch sifts through these popular sayings, stories he hears, retelling of myths, and anecdotes he recounts to see what they can tell him about Indigenous realities.

17 Kusch developed this method in order to engage Indigenous ways of thinking. Through his fieldwork, he tries to enter into the “rhythmic” thinking, as he puts it, that beats in the heart of América. In other words, this work of philosophy does not take the form of Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, a systematic philosophical treatise, nor is it an ethnographic portrait. Instead, Kusch builds a bridge, or, better, a tunnel—burrowing or sensing his way in. Thus, Kusch sees his project not so much as a means of *representing* Indigenous or popular thinking, but rather as a laneway he provides, or an opening he is forging, with the aim of rescuing or retrieving that which had been left behind, the shattered and splintered residua after five centuries of colonial depredation.

18 At the centre of this project is the question of being (*estar*):

A su vez, no podía estar ausente en este trabajo el esbozo de un pensamiento americano que gire en torno al concepto del *estar*. Creo que dicho término logra concretar el verdadero estilo de vida de nuestra América, en la cual entrarían blancos y pardos, y ofrece, desde un punto de vista fenomenológico, una inusitada riqueza. Va implícito en dicho término esa peculiaridad americana a partir de la cual recién habremos de ganar, si cabe, nuestro verdadero lugar, y no esa penosa universalidad que todos pretendemos esgrimir inútilmente. (Kusch, 1977, pp. 13–14)

What could not be absent in this work is a sketch of an American thinking that turns on the concept of *estar*. I believe this term succeeds in concretizing the true way of life of our América, including white and brown people alike, and offers an unexpected richness from a phenomenological point of view. Implicit in this term is that American peculiarity which could ground our reaching our true place, rather than that burdensome universality to which we all pointlessly aspire. (Kusch, 2010, p. lxxvii)

19 Kusch sets up a particular understanding of *estar* (to be) at the core of a “way of life” that is particular or peculiar to América. He finds in this common verb what makes Indigenous philosophy qualitatively different from conventional philosophy as it is studied in Buenos Aires or Berlin. “I insist”, he says, “on the opposition between the urban and the Indigenous styles of thinking” (*hice especial hincapié*

en la oposición entre el estilo de pensar del ciudadano y del indígena) (Kusch, 2010, p. lxvii/Kusch, 1997, p. 13). Later, he concretizes this distinction thus:

La distancia real que media entre un pensar indígena y un pensar acorde con la filosofía tradicional, es la misma que media entre el término aymara *utcatha* y el término alemán *Da-sein*. Heidegger toma esta palabra del alemán popular, en primer término porque *Sein* significa *ser*, con lo cual podía retomar la temática de la ontología tradicional, y en segundo término, porque *Da*, que significa *ahí*, señalaba la *circunstancia* en que había caído el ser. (Kusch, 1977, p. 20)

The real distance between an Indigenous way of thinking and a way of thinking consistent with traditional philosophy is the same as that between the Aymara term *utcatha* and the German term *Da-sein*. Heidegger takes up this word from ordinary German speech, first because *Sein* signifies *being (ser)*—which allowed him to take up again the themes of traditional ontology—and second because *Da*—which means “there”—signaled the *circumstance* into which being had fallen. (Kusch, 2010, p. 4)

20 For Kusch, Heidegger’s philosophy belongs to a German middle class of his time and place:

Su mérito consiste en haber retomado en el siglo xx el tema de ser en una dimensión exacta, tal como en realidad la vivía la clase media alemana, la cual siempre sintió como propia esa caída del ser, con todas sus implicaciones angustiosas. Si a ella agregamos los conceptos de tiempo y de autenticidad, advertimos que una temática así hilvanada, no dista del pensamiento propio de una burguesía europea que siente la crisis del individuo y que trata de remediarla. (Kusch, 1977, p. 20)

[Heidegger’s] merit lies in having taken up in the twentieth century the theme of being with an exactitude that befitted the lives of the German middle class. This class had always felt the fall of being as its own, with all of the anguish that implies. If we add to it the concepts of time and authenticity, we notice that a thematic so threaded is not so far from the thinking of a European bourgeoisie which feels the crisis of the individual and tries to remedy it. (Kusch, 2010, p. 4)

- 21 Using the same logic, Kusch seeks to carve out a space for a philosophy that corresponds to the phenomenology of the everyday in Indigenous América, and in broader stroke throughout América, albeit in fragmentary form:

Pero mucho más propio del sentir indígena sería el término *utcatha*. Según el mismo autor [Bertonio] significa “estar”. [...] En suma, se trata de un término cuyas acepciones reflejan el concepto de un mero darse o, mejor aún, de un mero *estar*, pero vinculado con el concepto de amparo y de germinación. Ahora bien, es evidente que el sentir profundo de un indio, cuando está en la calle Buenos Aires de La Paz y decide tomar un camión para ir a su *ayllu*, ha de ser en términos de *utcatha* y no de *Da-sein*. (Kusch, 1977, pp. 20–21).

But the term *utcatha* is much closer to the Indigenous sensibility. Bertonio translates *utcatha* as “estar”. [...]. The meanings of *utcatha* reflect the concept of a mere givenness or, even better, of a mere *estar*, but linked to the concept of shelter and germination. The depth of feeling of an Indian when he is on Buenos Aires Street in La Paz and decides to take a bus to his *ayllu* must be understood in terms of *utcatha* and not *Da-sein*. (Kusch, 2010, p. 5)

- 22 As is clear in this citation from our English translation, we preserved *estar* (to be) in our translation and we preserved the accent *é* in *América* in the book title and throughout. We wanted to offer these concepts as an opening into Kusch’s thinking, influenced by his own method. As Kusch remarks in an early passage:

Pero no podía quedar el trabajo limitado únicamente a la exhumación del pensamiento indígena. Considero que este pensamiento nos abre la comprensión de los problemas americanos y, por consiguiente, la segunda parte del libro está dedicada a medir las posibilidades que dicho pensamiento ofrece. (Kusch, 1977, p. 13)

But I could not limit this work to exhuming Indigenous thinking. I think this thinking opens our understanding of the problems of América; thus, the second part of the book is devoted to weighing the possibilities this thinking offers. (Kusch, 2010, p. lxvii)

- 23 We wanted our translation to embody these possibilities, these contingent futures for an América that has the potential to break apart or dismantle a sense of reality as stable and uniform. Kusch characterized Indigenous thinking as seminal, in the sense of generative and dynamic, and he wanted to capture a reality that was always subject to a *vuelco*, or *kuty*—that is, to a cosmic shift or revolution. Influenced by his philosophical method as much as by the way he linked thinking with being, we wanted to translate his text, and the key concepts he chose to engage with, in a way that was consistent with the insights he provided rather than simply render Spanish words into English as a semantic task. The latter project would have in any case proved difficult, not only because Kusch moved between Quechua, Aymara and Spanish, but also because the conceptual interpretation of popular speech he engages in has no counterpart in the dominant modalities of Anglophone speech and perception. Instead, we thought, the translation should act as an opening in a metaphorical fence between Spanish, Quechua and Aymara on the one hand, and English on the other, an opening that can allow words and concepts to move back and forth among these different worlds. What this entailed in practice was preserving words or concepts from the original in select cases. As we recontextualized these key concepts in our English-language text, they inevitably took on new nuance and meaning. *América* in an English text means something different from *América* in a Spanish text, as I explain in more detail below.
- 24 There is a long tradition of translators refusing to offer smooth, seamless texts for easy consumption by the target audience, even though the contemporary aesthetic for English readers at least seems to demand just that kind of easy-to-assimilate text. This refusal by translators to meet the expectations of their audience can have different motivations, including the desire to bring the reader closer to the writer's worldview, to paraphrase Schleiermacher (Schleiermacher, 1992, p. 6). Lawrence Venuti famously termed this technique "foreignization" (Venuti, 2008). A foreignized text draws attention to itself and in the best of cases can momentarily arrest the attention of a reader, even defamiliarize them with the conventions and norms of their language and make them reflect on the experience of reading. At worst, as Antoine Berman has pointed out, the resulting text will

lean toward the unintelligible (1992, p. 4). Our own strategy to navigate this dilemma was to try and bring the reader along to new horizons, to signal to the reader that they were reading a text originally written in Spanish, and one that they would have to work to understand, while we tried to ease that passage by glossing key terms and explaining their constellation.

- 25 I characterized translating Kusch's text as breaching a fence between languages to bring a reader to new horizons. In this approach to translation, the languages are not regarded as distinct and discontinuous with one another, but rather as part of a larger ecology on which a border has been imposed. The border can be torn asunder or opened, thus linking the languages separated by it. This understanding of language and translation is akin to translanguaging,² an approach where languages are not treated as discreet and separate, but rather are brought together to form a repertoire of words and phrases, where the distinction between them is understood as an ideological construct (García & Wei, 2014; Canagarajah, 2011). Translanguaging is thus a way of articulating new realities, new ways of being and acting in evolving social, cultural and political contexts, as Creese et al. put it (2018, p. 26). It refers to

new language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchanges among people with different histories, and releases histories and understandings that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states. (García & Wei, 2014, p. 21)

- 26 Translanguaging is the enactment of language practices which "use different features that had previously been independently constrained by different histories, but which now are experienced in speakers' interactions as one new whole" (Creese et al., 2018, p. 27).
- 27 As translators, we came to this project with a recognition of how English and Spanish are already connected in myriad ways—by geography, by history, and most of all, by agile users of language whose continued creativity forms the basis for García's (2009) notion of translanguaging. In a curious way, this approach to the translation also paid homage to the original, since Kusch's original text similarly combines different languages (Aymara, Quechua, Spanish) and

registers—from the colloquial Spanish spoken in Latin America, including popular sayings and expressions, to the rarefied language of philosophy and linguistics, including the specialized vocabulary used to discuss Heidegger, Kant, and Whorf in Spanish.

- 28 We developed a more nuanced sense of which of Kusch's key concepts needed to stay in Spanish and which we could translate, and how, from our own version of translation fieldwork. We retraced Kusch's steps in the Andes and got to know people in Maimará, in the North of Argentina, where Kusch lived the final years of his life, and where his widow still resided. Through extended stays, we took better measure of the worlds he encountered while living there. The next section describes our background research in more detail.

Researching and translating Kusch

- 29 In 2003, María Lugones invited me to co-translate Rodolfo Kusch's *El pensamiento indígena y popular*. I accepted the invitation, and in order to understand the context of Kusch's work, including his observation of interactions with people in the Argentinean and Bolivian Andes and his remarks on rituals and the use of common speech, we decided to do some preliminary background research. We conducted field research for several months in Jujuy, in the Puna of Argentina, in the altiplano or high Andean plateau, near the border with Bolivia. Through several research stays in Jujuy, we were able to ask philosophers as well as everyday rural people how they understand concepts that were key for Kusch: concepts such as *Pachamama* (Mother Earth), *kuty* (the turning over of the universe), and *utcatha* (which Kusch connects with being, dwelling and germination).³ Spending several months in Jujuy allowed us to visit some of the sites Kusch visited, observe the type of rituals he observed, speak to philosopher Mario Vilca, a Kusch expert from the Puna, Lucila Bugallo, an anthropologist, as well as various *curanderos* and *curanderas* (healers), and participate in daily Andean life—from the kitchen to the marketplace. Our experiences deepened our understanding of Kusch's project and answered many of the riddles we had to solve as translators of his text.

- 30 I was not uncritical of the text we were translating. Given Kusch's propensity to use 400-year-old colonial-era glossaries and bilingual dictionaries (*vocabularios*), I suspected his knowledge of Quechua and Aymara might have been spotty. Elizabeth Lanata, Kusch's widow, confirmed as much. As a linguistic anthropologist, I found Kusch's practice of relying on these dictionaries flawed. For example, he does not seem to take into account the fact that Quechua and Aymara as languages have evolved since the colonial era, or that the Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries, as assiduous as they may have been, might have been unreliable lexicographers (Price, 2023, pp. 23–52). A philosopher who does linguistic analysis, comparative philology and fieldwork, Kusch engages in other practices that would also raise eyebrows among anthropologists. He draws connections across time (five centuries) and space (from the North of Argentina to various points in Bolivia and even to the Hopi in what is now the United States) in the use of ritual and symbol in a way that many contemporary ethnographers might find hasty or haphazard. At other points we had trouble working out his logic, including his exploration of numerology, and how he associates different ruins in ways we found esoteric.
- 31 Vigilance was thus warranted. Yet one can lose the forest for the trees. Kusch's methodological innovation of doing fieldwork as a philosopher, for example, is inspiring. Similarly, his discussion of the instability of the cosmos in the Quechua worldview and the corresponding necessity for ritual action to try and stave off the *kuty*, or an overturn in the cosmos, is compelling. One must propitiate the *Pachamama* or she may swallow you. I found this striking, given the idealized portrait of Indigenous life that is sometimes painted as a harmonious coexistence between Indigenous people and nature. Even if one quibbles with the small things, in other words, Kusch's most basic motivation is to reach for an Américan thinking that is not contained by European thought, and this we believed was a worthwhile endeavour that needed to be captured in the translation.
- 32 Deciding whether to translate key concepts meant we had to be clear about the context of translation: were we going to treat Latin America as a land apart and translate the Spanish, Aymara and Quechua across the linguistic border? Or were we going to try and build a bridge, treating an Anglophone audience as part of the larger

project that Kusch may have had in mind? This was a metapragmatic consideration in the sense that it was about deciding on the context for the translation. In the end, we decided to keep the key words in the original language since translating them could, we felt, stunt Kusch's ambition and his careful exegesis of the core concepts intended to channel the reader into the unstable reality he thought characterized the everyday in América.

- 33 Marilyn Gaddis-Rose has suggested that translations of literary texts can, in effect, be a form of literary criticism (1998, p. 7), a critical interpretation of a work of literature. In applying her understanding of the translation of poetry and fiction to the translation of philosophy and the human sciences more generally, I am extending her argument: translating concepts elaborated in academic texts, I would argue, involves actively interpreting these concepts, building on them, lending them an afterlife, in Walter Benjamin's famous phrase (Price, 2008). Translating concepts from Latin American philosophy, moreover, is a form of analysis from which new narratives of modernity can emerge. In other words, translating is, or can be, a means of constructing new narratives, or of revealing existing ones to a new audience. In the case of Latin American philosophy, a translation can also provide the necessary scaffolding for these alternative narratives of modernity to circulate and prosper in new environments.
- 34 The translator's task of midwifing narratives, including new narratives, can be aided by paratextual activities such as the convention of prefacing a translated book with a translator's introduction, glossing, footnoting, writing reviews and stand-alone academic articles (including the present one) and providing interviews. Paratextual material of this type allows translators to act as cultural brokers, contextualizing Latin American philosophy for a new audience, participating in the cultural and linguistic refraction of a text (Lefevere, 2000) from one language ecology to another—even, at the margins, participating in entwining those ecologies together through various processes of knowledge transfer (Guzmán, 2020).
- 35 Adapting Gaddis-Rose's (1998) method of reading a translation alongside its original, I will now focus on a number of core concepts in Kusch's philosophy. My analysis of these concepts is reflected in the

translation, and it is intended to promote new narratives that highlight the interdependence as well as the conflict and tensions between Eurocentric knowledge and the type of thinking emerging from Latin America, with Kusch as a leading example of the latter. These alternative narratives are manifest in the translation and further elaborated on in our “Translators’ Introduction”(Lugones & Price, 2010).

América

- 36 *América* is a common word in Latin America, but we were unable to find a fair equivalent in English. One obvious translation, *America*, we rejected out of hand, given that *America* denotes the United States in most contexts. Indeed, through a strange kind of linguistic imperialism, the United States seems to have arrogated the word *America* to itself. It has done the same with the *United States*: Mexico is also officially named the “United Mexican States” but is hardly ever referred to as such—only as “Mexico”. As my co-translator once pointed out to me, the United States of America arguably has no name that does not in itself enact or represent a kind of imperialism.
- 37 Kusch also occasionally uses the terms *sudamericano* and *latinoamericano*, among others, but he most often uses *América* and at times its adjectival form, *americano*, which is consistent with his emphasis on the Indigenous presence throughout the hemisphere. *The Americas* might have worked as a translation for *América*, but we were concerned that this would still have framed the continent within a kind of European or Eurocentric view of the world. *Latin America* would have emphasized Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking perspectives whereas Kusch clearly wished to centre Indigenous peoples throughout the continent, including the Hopi, Navajo, and others in the Northern part of the continent. Had he been writing today, Kusch might have used the increasingly popular *Abya Yala*, but that term was not as common with non-Indigenous writers in the early 1970s.
- 38 *América* with an accent had several advantages. Keeping the Spanish term signalled to the reader that the text was a translation, and secondly, it defamiliarized the term, the language, and the continent for the English-language reader in a salubrious way. Retaining the

accent in an English language context is a provocation, as it draws attention to the contrast between a conventional geography of the continent and what *América* could portend. Where Kusch was simply using the conventional Spanish word to refer to the continent, the accent in English conferred a new and unexpected nuance, we hoped. *América* does not refer to a given geographic entity, much less a nation or a geo-political formation. It recuperates the past and present even as it leans towards the future. Kusch's vision of *América* unearths half-buried forms of life from within urban and rural habitats that draw on the rhythmic thinking and thousand cosmologies of Indigenous nations that snake their way through contemporary life. These ways of living and thinking are nonetheless marked by the erosion brought on by waves of settler colonialism over the last five centuries. *América* is impure and unstable—it is a contingent possibility, it is incipient, not a fully realized place.

- 39 Retaining the accent makes the exercise reflexive, since *América*, as I believe Kusch intended it, challenges the boundaries that mark where one language, identity, or nation ends and another begins. It troubles the linguistic, cultural, and national boundaries among Anglophone, Lusophone, Francophone, Indigenous, and Spanish speakers, as well as speakers of various patois, creoles, and Papiamentu throughout the hemisphere. Maintaining *América* in Spanish—or, framed differently, bringing it into English with an accent—loops us into a hermeneutical circle.

Pulcritud vs. hedor

- 40 If *América*, as a concept, signals an alternative narrative of geography, the distinction between *pulcritud* and *hedor* provides an alternative narrative along the axis of aesthetics and urban design, and the distinction between *ser* and *estar* an alternative ontological narrative.
- 41 In *América Profúnda* (2000), another work by Rodolfo Kusch that has not yet been translated, Kusch observes that a line runs down the centre of the continent between *pulcritud* and *hedor*. Despite the terms' originating in a book other than the one we translated, I include them here because I believe they complement the other concepts and distinctions we grappled with, and because they provide further insight into the narrative Kusch elaborated and the

trajectory of his thought over the course of his many books. I have also begun to translate this book into English. The distinction between *pulcritud* and *hedor* could be rendered loosely in English as contrasting order, cleanliness and neatness with stench, stink or pestilential odour. For Kusch, this contrast marks the distinction between modernity and the connotations of Indigeneity, where Indigenous people are often described by a (racist) dominant culture as smelly or stinking. It should go without saying that the distinction is imagined rather than real. Yet it informs people's individual perceptions—it is a visceral, phenomenological reaction to the supposed stench of the subaltern. But also, clearly, modernity and the search for order (*pulcritud*) and discipline in Latin America encompass nation-building projects, economic programmes and development schemes.⁴

- 42 Rodolfo Kusch draws the distinction between *pulcritud* and *hedor* in order to cover a wide range of phenomena of I/Other relations that mark the conventional relationship between the urban middle-class and its others (such as the urban underclass, the rural, people of the African diaspora, and Indigenous): “the streets stink, they stink of the beggar, and so does the old Indian [sic: “la vieja india”] who speaks to us but we understand nothing she says, just as it’s true that we are clean and orderly” (las calles hieden, que hiede el mendigo y la india vieja [sic], que nos habla sin que entendamos nada, como es cierta, también, nuestra extrema pulcritud)⁵ (Kusch, 2000, p. 16). This is a psycho-social phenomenon for Kusch: “the truth is we’re afraid, a fear of not knowing how to call all of this that is irritating us, that is outside and that makes us feel vulnerable and trapped” (La verdad es que temenos miedo, el miedo de no saber cómo llamar todo eso que nos acosa y que está afuera y que nos hace sentir indefensos y atrapados) (Kusch, 2000, p. 11). By invoking a “we”, Kusch is criticizing a social class—city-dwellers from the middle-class—in which he includes himself. From that insider perspective, he uncovers and denounces the psychological impulse to push away or quell that which cannot be contained by oneself. Calling oneself clean and orderly is a way of calming that psychic dissonance: “there’s a certain satisfaction in thinking that effectively, we’re clean and that the streets are not, nor is the beggar nor the old Quechua woman” (“Hay cierta satisfacción de pensar que efectivamente estamos limpios y

que las calles no lo están, ni el mendigo aquel, ni tampoco la vieja quechua”) (Kusch, 2000, p. 11).

- 43 Kusch writes disparagingly of how this fearful urban middle-class imagines a solution to the problem of the disorder and the miasma of bad smell that emanates from the streets of América:

[...] El borracho de chicha, el indio rezador o el mendigo hediento, será cosa de internarlos, limpiar la calle e instalar baños públicos. La primera solución para los problemas de América apunta siempre a remediar la suciedad e implantar la pulcritud. (Kusch, 2000, p. 13)

If it's the guy drunk on chicha, the Indian beseeching us or the foul-smelling beggar then it's nothing other than a question of putting them in prison, cleaning up the street, and installing public bathrooms. The first solution that América always tries is to clean out the squalor and install order.

- 44 The fix to the problems of dirt and disorder is to build more prisons, pick up the garbage, and engage in better urban planning.

- 45 The division between *pulcritud* and *hedor* also operates on the level of language. *Hedor* brings us to a rougher aesthetic. In the context of translation, an aesthetics of *hedor* has an affinity with the notion of textual resistance Lawrence Venuti articulated several decades ago and his parallel ethical injunction to “do wrong at home [...] by deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience” (Venuti, 2008, p. 16). The defamiliarization brought about by the linguistic smuggling of *hedor* into English arrests the eye of the reader, drawing attention to the process of translation, alerting the English-language reader to the textual manipulation exercised by the translation. An *hedor* aesthetics also has some affinity with what Glissant called the right to opacity: “We claim our right to opacity” (Nous réclamons le droit à l’opacité) (Glissant, 1990, p. 209, my translation). The text need not reveal all the secrets of the writer, it need not yield to an aesthetic of transparency. Transparency can be an oppressive aesthetic. Transparency or the desire for transparency can also be an epistemicidal force, whereas that which is constructed as *hedor* resists the verbal hygiene imposed by *pulcritud*. The *hedor* creeps out from under the imposed order, seeps out through its cracks and

forces new cracks, and in this way constantly threatens the *pulcritud*, the colonial linguistic order and hygiene. This is the linguistic conflict that runs through *América* in speech and oral traditions, as well as in writing. It provides the basis for this alternative narrative of modernity, and of an official, superior language.

- 46 Kusch's highlighting of the distinction between *hedor* and *pulcritud* is an attempt at recasting the narrative of modernity in the West and Latin America (and perhaps elsewhere too). If the dominant developmentalist narrative in Latin America is one of the spread of Western reason, literacy, republicanism, representative democracy, progress, linear time, capitalism, Western education, and the imposition of Western binary understandings of gender and sexuality, then the threat of *hedor*, of Indigenous resurgence, challenges and complicates that narrative, since it eschews many of the nostrums typically woven into narratives of progress. It also complicates the conventional framing of politics as a left-right continuum. Kusch constructs an alternative framing of modernity. He examines the contours of European thought and explains how, from that Eurocentric point of view, *América* is wretched and hapless. But from within the *hedor*, from within the view of the streets or that which is Black or Indigenous or working-class, the urge to cleanliness and order rests on a psycho-social preoccupation with resolving inner conflict into an obsession with developmental projects and goals that are, at root, just a form of suppressing the existential instability that is also a cosmic instability. Rather than dwelling on that moment of psychological uncertainty and discomfort and confronting the inherent social volatility, societies and individuals motivated by an urge for *pulcritud* try to find technological fixes or political solutions—whether Marxist, technocratic, Chicago School economics, or any number of alternatives.

Ser vs. estar

- 47 The last example concerns a philosophical distinction that rests on a linguistic category. In Spanish, *ser* and *estar* are usually translated as forms of the verb “to be”. As elementary students of Spanish conventionally learn, *ser* refers to permanent or existential statements (“I am tall”), and *estar* to accidental, circumstantial or temporary conditions

(“I am sad”). They are both as common in Spanish as the verb “to be” in English—in other words, they are basic building blocks of speaking and writing and provide the girding for language, action, existential statements, identity claims, descriptions, referring and predicating, and so on.

- 48 Kusch attaches considerable weight to the distinction between these two verbs and gives it a peculiarly Latin American twist, tied to Indigenous ontologies.

Es curioso que el castellano marginal que se habla en Sudamérica, especialmente cuando se quiere hablar bien, resulta excesiva y sospechosamente decantado, hasta el punto de que este último termina por ser sumamente incómodo. Por ejemplo, una expresión como *yo soy*, siempre va acompañada de cierto esfuerzo, por el cual lo, que se es, está pegado al sujeto y afirmado enfáticamente. Además, nunca se es totalmente médico. (Kusch, 1977, p. 251)

It is odd that the marginal Spanish spoken in South América, particularly when one wants to speak properly, becomes excessively and suspiciously qualified, to the point that it becomes very cumbersome. For example, though an expression such as *I am* is always accompanied by a certain effort, so that what one is is glued to the subject and emphatically affirmed, one never is totally what the predicate expresses. (Kusch, 2010, p. 158)

- 49 For Kusch, whose goal, after all, is to reveal Indigenous and popular thinking in América, the distinction marks an ontological contrast between, on the one hand, a Western conceptualization of subject-object relations, corresponding to *ser*, in which the world is fixed, definable, knowable, and subject to the laws of cause and effect, and, on the other hand, an “unstable relation among the elements of the cosmos”, signified by *estar* (Lugones & Price, 2010, p. lviii). It is important to underscore that Kusch’s central claim is that the grammatical distinction in Spanish between *ser* and *estar* has taken on a special significance in Latin American popular usage. As I showed above, Kusch ties *estar*, as used in América, to the Aymara term *utcatha*, and thus to an Aymara ontology. He implies that this grammatical distinction performs a particular function in Latin America

that it does not necessarily perform in the Spanish spoken in Spain or elsewhere. Kusch uses as an example the popular expression *estar/estoy trabajando* (“to be working/I am working”) instead of *yo trabajo* (“I work”). He suggests that this routine usage in América captures a tentative, protean subject in a shifting, unstable universe, “as if whatever one is doing were the momentary product of a great instability which hovers in an unseen background” (*como si aquello en que se anda fuera el producto momentáneo de una gran inestabilidad que se cierne en un trasfondo que no se ve*) (Kusch, 2010, p. 159/Kusch, 1997, p. 251). He also ties this reliance on *estar* to the Quechua notion of the *kuty*, or what he calls, following Guamán Poma de Ayala and others, *Pachakuti*, the *vuelco*, the turning over of the universe. For the Quechua, the history of the planet and the universe is marked by five great ages, each of which ended with a *kuty* of cataclysmic remaking of the cosmos. The universe, and the planet, the *Pachamama*, or Mother Earth, remains subject to this cosmic instability, where everything and anything can be lost, swallowed, annihilated or overturned. The second half of Kusch’s book, and especially its crescendo, is concerned with elaborating this distinction and this quality of instability as it emerges in popular speech in Argentina and, by extension, throughout the rest of the Spanish-speaking and Indigenous parts of the continent.

Esto coincide con la característica argentina, por no decir americana, que pareciera consistir en sumergir todo lo que es estable dentro de la circunstancia, como si aquello en que se anda fuera el producto momentáneo de una gran inestabilidad que se cierne en un trasfondo que no se ve. Un gobierno recién instalado es siempre inestable, lo que se tiene también es inestable, y aun la opinión propia va acompañada por la disculpa del *me parece a mí*. En general se sumerge lo estable en lo inestable, o sea que se puebla el mundo de circunstancias, y se reduce lo que es a lo que *está*. (Kusch, 1977, p. 251)

This [use of the verb *estar*] coincides with the Argentinean and, even more widely, American characteristic, which seems to consist in submerging everything stable within circumstance, as if whatever one is doing were the momentary product of a great instability which hovers in an unseen background. A recently established government is always unstable, what one owns is also unstable, and one even excuses one’s opinion by accompanying it with *it seems*

to me. Generally, the stable is submerged in the unstable, that is, the world is populated by circumstances, and what is reduced to what *está*. (Kusch, 2010, pp. 158–159)

- 50 Being dwells within circumstance; this Indigenous worldview is not one of harmony with nature. Quite the contrary, people must constantly engage in ritual propitiation of the *Pachamama* as insurance against an overturn or *vuelco*. For Kusch, in other words, this cosmic instability has bubbled up through the colonially imposed Spanish language, inflecting it with an Indigenous sensibility, albeit as broken shards. Glissant would refer to a similar phenomenon as forced poetics. Poetics is forced when a subordinate people tries to push their expression through the colonizer's language (Glissant, 1999, p. 120–121).
- 51 My co-translator María Lugones and I tried to introduce this philosophical distinction in our English translation by preserving *estar* and *ser*, not only because the distinction was key for Kusch, but also because we thought it could be a useful contribution to English-language philosophy. The distinction between *estar* and *ser* provides an alternative narrative of modernity along the axis of cosmology and ontology.

Conclusion

- 52 Kusch longs for an *América* that is potential, not yet real, and that is currently manifest only in fragments. He tries to recuperate an Indigenous thinking that could help realize that vision of *América*. Correspondingly, we sought in our translation to shore up that vision where current identities and categories may be inadequate or out of sync with what Kusch wants to bring into being (Griffiths, 2012, p. 22).
- 53 The theory of translation that informs this article assumes that translating texts in the human sciences is a form of doing original social analysis, in this case as critique or critical elaboration of an original text. Translation thus goes beyond merely transposing meaning from one set of signs to another. Translators consciously attempt to reveal the epistemic foundations on which the source relies. Translation in this sense is a creative act to the extent that all critical work, such as

literary criticism, art history, or philosophical critique are creative acts.

- 54 The focus on Latin American thinking, social theory and philosophy allows new narratives to come into being. What emerges from the translation of Kusch's *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* is an alternative narrative to those taken for granted in European and Eurocentric thinking. This alternative narrative begins by describing the emergence of Eurocentric modernity *as seen from Latin America*. *Visión de los vencidos: Relaciones indígenas de la Conquista* is the title of a celebrated historiographic text that is simultaneously a translation of Nahua thought by Miguel León-Portilla (2007). Although the published translation has the title *Broken spears: Aztec accounts of the Conquest of Mexico* (2006), a literal translation might be "The viewpoint of the vanquished: Indigenous accounts of the Conquest". Eurocentric modernity, viewed from the margins (as in León-Portilla's text), posits a split or binary divide between technological innovation, progress, economic advancement, and the lulling comforts of consumerism, on the one hand, and the perceived irrationality, ethnic diversity, and Babel of multilingualism on the other. The complementary narrative, also from within the margins, projects an imaginary of América predicated on a cosmic instability and logics of everyday life that break with positivism, linear reason, Newtonian causality, American pragmatism, the Cartesian divide of mind/body, as well as other dualist ontologies. We viewed the frontier of language as a threshold at which one could cut a hole in the fence—create an opening between languages—rather than a barrier one could only pass through conventional linguistic translation. Selecting a text and translating it is not just a question of aesthetics and semantics, but also of ethics and politics, and even potential futures. Thus translation—what is selected for translation and how it is translated—can also be a question of epistemic justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. Routledge.

Bennett, K. (2024). Translating knowledge in the multilingual paradigm: Beyond epistemicide. *Social Science Information*, 62(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/05390184231>

22807

Berman, A. (1992). *The Experience of the foreign: Culture and translation in Romantic Germany* (S. Heyvaert, Trans.). SUNY Press. (Original work published 1984)

Castro-Klarén, S. (2011). Domination without dominance: Inca-Spanish encounters in early colonial Peru and Indigenous and popular thinking in America. [review]. *MLN*, 126(2), 425–429. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mln.2011.0015>

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>

Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Hu, R. (2018). Translanguaging and translation: The construction of social difference across city spaces. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(7), 841–852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1323445>

Derbyshire, P. (2010). Andeanizing philosophy: Rodolfo Kusch and Indigenous thought. *Radical Philosophy*, 163, 34–42.

Gaddis-Rose, M. (1998). *Translation and literary criticism*. Routledge.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Wiley Blackwell.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging. Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave.

Glissant, É. (1999). *Caribbean discourse: Selected essays* (2nd ed.) (J. M. Dash, Trans.). Caraf Books/University of Virginia Press. (original work published 1981)

Glissant, É. (1990). *Poétique de la relation*. Gallimard.

Griffiths, P. J. (2012, March 9). “Called to a Halt.” Review of J. Lear’s *A Case for Irony*. *Commonweal Magazine*, pp. 22–23.

Guzmán, M. C. (2020). *Mapping spaces of translation in twentieth-century Latin American print culture*. Routledge.

Holston, J. (1989). *The modernist city: An anthropological critique of Brasilia*. University of Chicago Press.

Kusch, R. (1953). *La seducción de la barbarie: Análisis herético de un continente mestizo*. Editorial Raigal.

Kusch, R. (1966a). *De la mala vida porteña*. Peña Lillo.

Kusch, R. (1966b). *Indios, porteños y dioses*. Stilcograf

Kusch, R. (1977). *El pensamiento popular y indígena en América* (third edition). Librería Hachette.

Kusch, R. (2000). América profunda. In R. Kusch (author), *Obras completas*, tomo 2 (pp. 1–254). Fundación Ross.

Kusch, R. (2010). *Indigenous and popular thinking in América* (M. C. Lugones & J. M. Price, Trans). Duke University Press. (original work published 1970 and revised in 1977)

Laviosa, S. (2019). Translanguaging and translation pedagogies. In H. Dam, M. Brøgger, & K. Zethen, (Eds.), *Moving boundaries in translation studies* (pp. 181–199). Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (2000). Mother Courage's cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 33–50). Routledge.

León-Portilla, M. (1990). *Aztec Thought and Culture* (J. E. Davis, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (original work published 1963)

León-Portilla, M. (1999). *Bernardino de Sahagún: Pionero de la antropología*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas/El Colegio Nacional.
https://historicas.unam.mx/publicaciones/publicadigital/libros/sahagun_pionero/363.html

León-Portilla, M. (2006). *The broken spears: The Aztec account of the conquest of Mexico* (L. Kemp, Trans). Beacon Press. (original work published 1959)

León-Portilla, M. (2007). *Visión de los vencidos. Relaciones indígenas de la Conquista*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

León-Portilla, M. (2015). *Los antiguos Mexicanos a través de sus crónicas y cantares*. Fondo de cultura económica.

Lugones, M. C., & Price, J. M. (2010). Translators' introduction. In R. Kusch, *Indigenous and popular thinking in América* (pp. lv–lxx). Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2010). Introduction: Immigrant consciousness. In R. Kusch, *Indigenous and Popular Thinking in América* (pp. xiii–liv). Duke University Press.

Ostashevsky, E. (2023). Translingualism: A poetics of language mixing and estrangement. *Boundary 2*, 50(4), 171–194. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01903659-10694267>

Peña, H. A. (2022). In what person to say the disaster? From R. Kusch towards Another Cogitamus. *Philosophies*, 7(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies7010013>

Price, J. M. (2023). *Translation and epistemicide: Racialization of language in the Americas*. University of Arizona Press.

Price, J. M. (2008). Translating social science: Good versus bad utopianism. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 20(2), 348–364. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.20.2.09pri>

Rivara, L. (2016). Rodolfo Kusch y la constitución de lo popular en la Argentina. *Cuestiones De Sociología*, 14, e008.
<https://www.cuestionessociologia.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/article/view/CSn14a08/7367>

Schleiermacher, F. (1992). On the different methods of translating. (W. Bartscht, Trans.) In R. Schulte & J. Biguenet (Eds.), *Theories of translation. An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 36-54). The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1813).

Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>

NOTES

1 In a lengthy review of our translation and Kusch's body of work more generally, Derbyshire argues that Kusch sees Indigeneity itself as a "site of potential" (2010, p. 36).

2 The term translanguaging was originally coined by Ofélia García to describe the "language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (García & Wei, 2014, p. 2). This approach to language practice for bilingual speakers was based on sociolinguistic analysis, especially of the bilingual classroom (Wei, 2018; García, 2009). The notion of translanguaging is also increasingly being used to theorize multilingualism in written discourse, including translations (Laviosa, 2018; Bennett, 2024; Ostashevsky, 2023).

3 I offer these brief glosses as an admittedly problematic shorthand since the complexities of inter-epistemic and inter-ontologic translation are precisely what is at stake in this article.

4 Kusch's insight could be fruitfully applied to all kinds of social phenomena. For example, this quest for a modern sense of order serves as the background desire for the planned capital of Brasília: Oscar Niemeyer was inspired by le Corbusier's scheme for modernist architecture (Holston, 1989). *Pulcritud* is also at the heart of the Salvadoran President Nayib Bukele's decision to build some of the largest prisons in the world. Bukele's stated goal is to break the back of Salvadoran gangs such as la Mara Salvatrucha and the Eighteenth Street Gang, which he hopes to contain within his gleaming dystopian penitentiary structures.

5 This and other quotations from Kusch (2000) are my translations.

RÉSUMÉS

English

In *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977), philosopher Rodolfo Kusch aims to recuperate a form of thinking he believes lies at the root of the American continent. Thinking in and from the Americas has an ontological dimension for him: *being* in the Americas is different from *being* in Europe, and Kusch ties this ontological distinction to a linguistic and grammatical distinction in Latin American Spanish that does not exist in English (*ser* vs. *estar*). These and other key concepts posed a challenge for my co-translator, the late Maria Lugones, and me as we set out to produce an English translation of Kusch's book. The purpose of this article is to consider how translating challenging concepts of this type can bring world-views and linguistic horizons into new relationships with one another and engender new intellectual narratives and traditions. Moreover, translating concepts can be a means of analyzing or interpreting those concepts (Gaddis Rose, 1998), and is hence a productive exercise in its own right. The article focuses on several concepts that are difficult to translate and that Kusch identifies in Latin American Spanish as his entry points to uncover the bases for an autochthonous *Américan* philosophical tradition. These concepts include *América* (which could be misleadingly translated as "America"); *pulcritud* (order or cleanliness) in contrast to *hedor* (stench) as a binary at the heart of Latin American modernity; and, most of all, the distinction in Spanish between *estar* and *ser*, on which Kusch bases a complex ontological theory informed by Quechua and Aymara thinking.

A synopsis of this article can be found [here](https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounter-s-in-translation.548) (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounter-s-in-translation.548>).

Français

Dans *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977), le philosophe Rodolfo Kusch vise à récupérer une forme de pensée qu'il croit être à la racine du continent américain. Penser dans et depuis les Amériques a une dimension ontologique pour lui : être dans les Amériques est différent d'être en Europe, et Kusch lie cette distinction ontologique à une distinction linguistique et grammaticale dans l'espagnol latino-américain qui n'existe pas en anglais (*ser vstar*). Cette distinction et d'autres concepts fondamentaux ont constitué un défi pour ma cotraductrice, la regrettée Maria Lugones, et moi-même, lorsque nous avons entrepris de produire une traduction anglaise du livre de Kusch. L'objectif de cet article est d'examiner comment la traduction de concepts difficiles de ce type peut amener les visions du monde et les horizons linguistiques à établir de nouvelles relations entre eux et à engendrer de nouveaux récits et de nouvelles traditions intellectuelles. En outre, la traduction de concepts peut être un moyen de les analyser ou de les interpréter (Gaddis Rose, 1998) et constitue ainsi un exercice productif en soi. L'article se concentre sur plusieurs concepts difficiles à traduire que Kusch identifie dans l'espagnol latino-américain comme ses points d'entrée pour découvrir les bases d'une tradition philosophique *Américan* autochtone. Ces concepts incluent *América* (que l'on pourrait traduire à tort par « Amérique »), *pulcritud* (ordre ou propreté) par opposition à *hedor* (puanteur) en tant que binôme au cœur de la modernité latino-américaine et, surtout, la distinction en espagnol entre *estar* et *ser*, sur laquelle Kusch fonde une théorie ontologique complexe basée sur la pensée quechua et aymara.

Un synopsis de cet article est disponible [ici](https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.574) (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.574>).

العربية

يسعى الفيلسوف الأرجنتيني رودولفو كوش في كتابه الصادر عام (١٩٧٧) بعنوان: " *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* " إلى إحياء نمط فكري محلي يكمن في القارة الأمريكية، وذلك لاعتقاده بأن التفكير الذي ينشأ داخل القارة الأمريكية أو ينطلق منها له بعد وجودي بحكم اختلاف معنى "الوجود" في القارة الأمريكية عن معناه في أوروبا. ويستدل كوش لتوضيح ذلك الاختلاف بسمات لغوية ونحوية في اللغة الإسبانية تميزها عن اللغة الإنجليزية، ومنها الفرق بين كلمتي "ser" و "estar"، إذ شكّلت هذه المفاهيم الأساسية -وغيرها- تحدياً كبيراً في إنتاج ترجمة إنجليزية لكتابهِ. وتهدف هذه المقالة إلى دراسة أثر ترجمة هذا النوع من المفاهيم المعقدة على ظهور روابط جديدة بين وجهات النظر العالمية أو الآفاق اللغوية المختلفة، وعلى نشوء أفكار وتقاليد فكرية جديدة. علاوة على ذلك، قد تُعطي ترجمة تلك المفاهيم فرصة للمزيد من التحليل أو التفسير (Gaddis Rose, 1998)، ولذلك تعدّ الترجمة ممارسة مثمرة بذاتها. وتركز المقالة على عدة مفاهيم يصعب ترجمتها من اللغة الإسبانية اللاتينية وصفها كوش بنقاط البداية لاكتشاف الأسس التي تشكل تقليداً فلسفياً في القارة الأمريكية، وتشمل "América" التي قد تترجم خطأً إلى "أمريكا" أو "الأمريكتين"، و "pulcritud" وتعني "نظام" أو "نظافة" في مقابل "hedor" وتعني "النتانة". إن وجود هذه المفاهيم يُظهر التباين الرئيس في قلب الحداثة الأمريكية اللاتينية، وأهمّها تمييز اللغة الإسبانية بين "estar" في مقابل "ser" الذي يبنى عليهما كوش نظرية وجودية معقدة مستوحاة من تفكير شعوب الكيتشوا والأيمارا.

يمكن العثور على ملخص لهذه المقالة هنا <https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.69>

Taño wirrintukun yenielu ti gvy, rakizuam mapu kvpalu ti pu che ka popular en América (1977) ti rakizuamtukelu Rodolfo Kusch, ñi tuwvn argentina, fey kintuykiñe wvtrapvrramal kiñe rakizuam rvkvlvwal ti continente americano mu. tvfachi kusch, taño rakizuam tvfachi américa pikelu pu che yeniey kiñe rakizuamn zungu nielu ti che ka rakizuam niey pu che mvlelu Europa. Feymew ti filosofo feypi mvley kiñe leling tvfachi epu leling kmvvn tvfachi mongenmu ka trvr mvlelunulo ti wirrintukunmu español mvlenulu ti ingles mu. Akulu ti antv ñi epuñpvle genial ti kewvn tvfachi chillka kusch ta ingles mu, feita ka leling, ka kiñe rulpazungu mvley. Tvfachi wirrintukun yeniey rulpazungu ñi kvzaw Kusch kintukey feipial chumgechi rulpazungual ti zungu kiñeke kimfalay ka mvley kake leling linguisticos ka itrofill leling mongen, ka kimvn mvlelu pu intelectuales mu. Pütrükeñma ga rakizuamkey che rulpazuguyem (Gaddis Rose, 1998) femgechi güeniegerpukey kimün, kiñe rakizuam. Feytachi artikulu mew tukulpagey kike ngemül küzawgelu ñi rulpazugueal, Kusch pünhey feytachi nhemül mülelu latinoamericano español mew, zewmayam kiñe filosofía autóctona rulpazugun tripalu Latinoamérica mapu mew. Tukulpaiñ kiñwke nhemül, müley América ("América" (país) reke rulpazugueafuy inglés zugu mew; ka müley pulcritud (Pepi femün nhemül "order" well "cleanliness") Nümün ("stench") mew nüwküley ka püchi kaley feychi nhemül mee pi Kusch, feytachi dicotomía taño ñizo tati latinoamericana modernidad mew, la müley "femgen" ka "mvlen", feytachi zugu rume faliy, günezuamfalüy pi Kuch, feytachi zugu mew nüwküley ñi ontológico teoría, nüwküleu kechua rakizuam mew ka aymara rakizuam mew. Pütrükeñma ga rakizuamkey che rulpazuguyem (Gaddis Rose, 1998) femgechi güeniegerpukey kimün, kiñe rakizuam. Feytachi artikulu mew tukulpagey kike ngemül küzawgelu ñi rulpazugueal, Kusch pünhey feytachi nhemül mülelu latinoamericano español mew, zewmayam kiñe filosofía autóctona rulpazugun tripalu Latinoamérica mapu mew. Tukulpaiñ kiñwke nhemül, müley América ("América" (país) reke rulpazugueafuy inglés zugu mew; ka müley pulcritud (Pepi femün nhemül "order" well "cleanliness") Nümün ("stench") mew nüwküley ka püchi kaley feychi nhemül mee pi Kusch, feytachi dicotomía taño ñizo tati latinoamericana modernidad mew, la müley "femgen" ka "mvlen", feytachi zugu rume faliy, günezuamfalüy pi Kuch, feytachi zugu mew nüwküley ñi ontológico teoría, nüwküleu kechua rakizuam mew ka aymara rakizuam mew.

We would like to thank Luz Marina Huenchucoy Millao (Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile) for this translation of the article's abstract in Mapudungun.

বাংলা

আর্জেন্টিনীয় দার্শনিক রোডলফো কুশ তাঁর *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977) বইটিতে আমেরিকা মহাদেশের দার্শনিক চিন্তাধারার যে স্রোতটি পুনরুদ্ধারের চেষ্টা করেছেন, সেটি ইউরোপীয় চিন্তাধারার মূলস্রোত থেকে প্রসূত। মার্কিন যুক্তরাষ্ট্রে থাকা এবং মার্কিন যুক্তরাষ্ট্রের মধ্যে থেকে চিন্তা করা কুশের মতে মার্কিনী অস্তিত্ব যে ইউরোপীয় অস্তিত্বের থেকে ভিন্ন এই বিশেষ তাত্ত্বিক মাত্রা বহন করে। এই তাত্ত্বিক পার্থক্যটি তিনি স্প্যানিশ ভাষার একটি ভাষিক এবং ব্যাকরণগত বৈশিষ্ট্যের সাথে যুক্ত করেছেন যা ইংরেজিতে নেই (*ser* বনাম *estar*)। এটি বৈশিষ্ট্যটি এবং তত্ত্ববিদ্যার অন্যান্য মূল ধারণাগুলি আমার সহ-অনুবাদক, প্রয়াত মারিয়া লুগোনেস, এবং আমার জন্য কিছু সংগ্রহ তৈরি করেছিল যখন আমরা কুশের বইয়ের অনুবাদ ইংরেজিতে করতে শুরু করেছিলাম। এই প্রবন্ধটির উদ্দেশ্য একটি নির্দিষ্ট চিন্তাশৈলীর মূল ধারণাগুলির অনুবাদ নতুন বিশ্বদর্শন এবং ভাষাগত দিগন্তকে কী ভাবে একে অপরের সাথে নতুন সম্পর্কে আবদ্ধ করে অভিনব আখ্যায়িকা এবং ঐতিহ্যের জন্ম দেয় তা নিয়ে আলোচনা করা। তা ছাড়াও গ্যাডিস রোজের (১৯৯৮) যুক্তিতে তত্ত্বের (*concepts*) অনুবাদ সেই ধারণাগুলিকে বিশ্লেষণ বা ব্যাখ্যার করার আরও একটি পদ্ধতি হতে পারে এবং নিজ অধিকারেই অনুবাদ এক্ষেত্রে একটি ফলপ্রসূ প্রচেষ্টা। এই প্রবন্ধে অনুবাদের জন্য কঠিন (*difficult-to-translate*) কিছু ধারণার ওপর জোর দেওয়া হয়েছে, মূলতঃ যে ধারণাগুলিকে কুশ ল্যাটিন আমেরিকান স্প্যানিশ ভাষা দিয়ে দেশজ আমেরিকান দার্শনিক ঐতিহ্যের প্রকৃতি বিশ্লেষণের জন্য ব্যাখ্যা করেছেন। যে ধারণাগুলি এই আলোচনার জন্য বেছে নেওয়া হয়েছে তা হোল আমেরিকা (অনুবাদের ক্ষেত্রে যা আমেরিকা মহাদেশ বা মার্কিন যুক্তরাষ্ট্র হিসাবে বিভাজিত সৃষ্টি করতে পারে); ল্যাটিন আমেরিকান আধুনিকতার দুই বিপরীত *mergulhitud* (শৃঙ্খলা বা পরিচ্ছন্নতা) এবং *hedor* (দূর্গন্ধ); এবং, সর্বোপরি, স্প্যানিশ ভাষায় *estar* এবং *ser* মধ্যে পার্থক্য। এই পার্থক্য এবং কেচুয়া ও আইমারা চিন্তাভাবনার ওপর ভিত্তি করে কুশ তাঁর জটিল সত্ত্বাতাত্ত্বিক মতবাদ প্রতিষ্ঠা করেন।

প্রবন্ধটির সারসংক্ষেপ এখানে (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.720>) পাওয়া যাবে।

Español

En su libro *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977), el filósofo argentino Rodolfo Kusch se propuso recuperar una forma de pensamiento que consideraba arraigada en el continente americano. Para Kusch, pensar en y desde América tiene una dimensión ontológica: el ser en América es diferente del ser en Europa; a partir de allí, el filósofo establece un vínculo entre esta distinción ontológica y una diferencia lingüística y gramatical del español que no existe en inglés: *ser* vs. *estar*. A la hora de traducir el libro de Kusch al inglés, esta diferencia, entre otros elementos y conceptos, representa un obstáculo o desafío de traducción. Este artículo aborda la traducción de la obra de Kusch buscando poner de relieve el hecho de que la traducción de conceptos, más allá de su dificultad, genera también nuevas relaciones entre distintos horizontes lingüísticos y cosmovisiones diversas, nuevas narrativas, e incluso tradiciones intelectuales. De hecho, la traducción de conceptos puede ser una manera de analizar e interpretar dichos conceptos (Gaddis Rose, 1998), por lo que supone un ejercicio productivo en sí mismo. En el artículo se comenta la traducción de varios conceptos específicos difíciles de traducir y que, siendo propios del español latinoamericano, Kusch utiliza como punto de partida para elaborar su trabajo sobre una tradición filosófica autóctona latinoamericana. Entre estos conceptos se encuentran *América* (que puede ser traducida al inglés de manera errónea como “America”; también *pulcritud* (equivalente posible de “order” o “cleanliness”) y que Kusch contrasta con *hedor* (“stench”) para formar una dicotomía que según él constituiría la matriz de la modernidad latinoamericana; y finalmente, *ser* y *estar*, relación muy importante para Kusch y en la cual el filósofo basa su compleja teoría ontológica a partir del pensamiento quechua y aimara.

Una sinopsis de este artículo se puede encontrar [aquí](https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.572) (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.572>).

فارسی

پروفسور رُدولفو کُوش در کتاب (1977) خود، *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América*، قصد دارد شکلی از تفکر را احیا کند که به عقیده او در ریشه‌های قاره آمریکا نهفته است. به نظر او، اندیشیدن در بستر قاره آمریکا و از منظر آن، جنبه‌ای هستی‌شناختی دارد: بودن در قاره آمریکا با بودن در اروپا متفاوت است، و کوش این تفاوت هستی‌شناختی را به تمایزی زبان‌شناختی و دستوری در زبان اسپانیایی آمریکای لاتین پیوند می‌زند؛ تمایزی که در زبان انگلیسی وجود ندارد (*ser* vs. *estar*). این مفاهیم اصلی و موارد دیگری از این‌دست موجب شده است که ترجمه کتاب او به زبان انگلیسی کار دشواری باشد. هدف آن است که ببینیم چطور ترجمه مفاهیم جدل‌برانگیزی از این نوع، می‌تواند روابط جدیدی میان جهان‌بینی‌ها و افق‌های زبانی ایجاد کند و موجب ظهور روایت‌ها و سنت‌های فکری جدید شود. علاوه بر این، ترجمه کردن این مفاهیم می‌تواند روشی برای تحلیل یا تفسیر آنها باشد (Gaddis Rose, 1998) و به همین دلیل، فی‌نفسه سازنده است. این مقاله بر چند مفهوم تمرکز دارد که ترجمه‌شان دشوار است و کوش از این مفاهیم در زبان اسپانیایی آمریکای لاتین، به‌منزله نقاط ورود خود برای کشف مبانی سنت فلسفی بومزاد آمریکایی بهره می‌گیرد. این مفاهیم شامل دوگانه‌های زیر است: *امریکا* (*América*) که ممکن است به اشتباه به آمریکا (*America*) ترجمه شود؛ *pulcritud* (آراستگی، تمیزی) در مقابل *hedor* (متعفن، بوی گند) - دوگانه‌ای مفهومی در دل مدرنیته آمریکای لاتین؛ و مهم‌تر از همه، تمایز بین *ser* و *estar* در زبان اسپانیایی که کوش، با الهام از تفکر کیچوا و ایمارا، نظریه هستی‌شناختی پیچیده‌ای را بر پایه آن مطرح می‌کند. خلاصه این مقاله را می‌توانید در اینجا (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.699>) پیدا کنید.

Português

Na obra *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América* (1977), o filósofo Rodolfo Kusch busca resgatar uma forma de pensamento que, segundo ele, está na origem do continente americano. Pensar nas Américas, e a partir delas, tem para ele uma dimensão ontológica: ser/estar nas Américas é diferente de ser/estar na Europa, e Kusch faz uma conexão entre essa distinção ontológica e uma distinção linguístico-gramatical no espanhol latino-americano que não tem correspondência em inglês (*ser* vs. *estar*). Estes e outros conceitos-chave constituíram um desafio para a produção de uma tradução do seu livro para a língua inglesa. O objetivo deste artigo é considerar como a tradução de conceitos desafiadores dessa natureza pode fazer com que visões de mundo e horizontes linguísticos se conectem entre si em novas relações, engendrando narrativas e tradições intelectuais inovadoras. Além disso, a tradução de conceitos pode ser um meio de análise e interpretação desses mesmos conceitos (Gaddis Rose, 1998), sendo, assim, um exercício produtivo em si mesmo. O artigo volta-se, primordialmente, para vários conceitos difíceis de traduzir que Kusch identifica no espanhol latino-americano como os seus pontos de entrada que conduzem a um desvelar dos fundamentos de uma tradição filosófica autóctone *américana*. Esses conceitos incluem *América* (que poderia ser, de forma equivocada, traduzido como “America”); *pulcritud* (ordem ou limpeza) em contraste com *hedor* (fedor) como uma forma binária no coração da modernidade latino-americana; e, acima de tudo, a distinção, em espanhol, entre ser e estar, com base na qual Kusch desenvolve uma complexa teoria ontológica informada pelo pensamento quéchua e aimará.

A sinopse deste artigo pode ser acessada [aqui](https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.587) (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.587>).

Kichwa

El pensamiento indígena y popular en América (1977) sutichasqa p'anqanpi, amawt'a argentino Rodolfo Kusch continente americanopi runa t'ukurisqanmanjina umancharikuna tiyan, nispá nirqa. Tata Kuschpaq Americapipis Americamantapachapis runaq t'ukuriyninqa uk dimensión ontológica nisqayuq: Americapi kay rimariyqa Europamanta kay rimariyqa wakjina; chaymanta, payqa chay distinción ontológica nisqata khuskachan, chantapis español simiq lingüísticanpi gramaticanpi kasqanta mana inglés simipi kasqanwan qhawarin: inglespiqa kay (ser) /kasay (estar) uklla. Kay rimariykunapis wak rimariykunapis Kushpata p'anqanta españolmanta inglesman tikrasaspaqa, ancha sasa karqa. Kunanqa, kay llank'ayniy Kuschpaq p'anqaynin inglesman amawt'a wañusqa mama María Lugoneswan tikrasqaykumanta qhawarichin. Kay llank'ayniypiqa askha sasa rimariykunay tikrayninmanta qhawarichini. Chayta ruwaspaqa musuq relaciones nisqa cosmovisiones lingüísticaspura khuskachayta atikun. Musuq narrativas yurichiytapis ruwayta atikullantaq, intelectualespata llank'ayninkutapis tikrayta. Mama Gaddis Rosepaq (1998) rimariykunata tikrayqa kanman: rimariykuna kasqankuta qhawariy jinallataq niyta munasqankuta. Jinaspataq, rimariykunata tikrayqa amañayman apawanchis, chayta ruwayqa sumaqa, ininapapapis sumaqpunimin. Kay llank'ayniypiqa askha sasa rimaykunay tiqrayninmanta qhawarichini. Kay rimariykuna español latinoamericano simimantapuni kasqankuraykutaq, chaykunawanpuni uk tradición filosófica autóctona latinoamericana nisqamanta llank'ayninta ruwananpaq p'anqayninpi tata Kusch apaykachan. Kay laya rimariykunamantaqa kaykuna kasanku: América inglesman tikrayqa "America" pantasqacha kanman, jinallataq *llimphu* inglés simipi "k'uchunchasqa" manaqa "pichasqa". Kaytataq tata Kusch asna rimariywan kikinchan, dicotomía nisqata wakichinapaq. Kaytaq paypaq modernidad latinoamericaqpata matriznin kanman. Kuschpaq kay / kasay rimariykunata khuskachayqa anchayupapuni. Chaykuna patapitaq sasa teoría ontologicanta llank'arin. Chaytaq qhiswa runaq aymara runaq t'ukuriyninkumantapacha qhawarisqa kasan.

We would like to thank Denise Laredo Antezana (Universidad Mayor de San Andrés (Bolivia) and Qjinti Barrios van der Valk (York University, Canada) for this translation of the article's short abstract in Quechua.

Türkçe

El pensamiento indígena y popular en América adlı eserinde filozof Rodolfo Kusch, Amerika kıtasının kökeninde yattığına inandığı bir düşünce biçimini hayata döndürmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ona göre Amerika'da ya da Amerika'ya özgü düşünmenin ontolojik bir boyutu vardır: Amerika kıtasında olmak Avrupa kıtasında olmaktan farklıdır. Kusch, bu ontolojik ayrımı İngilizcede olmayıp Latin Amerika İspanyolcasında bulunan dilbilimsel ve dilbilgisel bir ayrım ile ilişkilendirmektedir (*ser* ve *estar*). Bu ve benzeri anahtar kavramlar kitabın İngilizce çevirisinde zorluklar oluşturmaktadır. Bu makale, bu tür zorlu kavramların çevirisinin dünya görüşü ve dilbilgisel ufukları yeni ilişkilerle nasıl buluşturabileceğini ve alışılmışın dışında anlatılar ve gelenekler meydana getirebileceğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bununla birlikte, söz konusu kavramları çevirmek aynı zamanda bu kavramları analiz etme ve yorumlamanın da bir yolu olabilir (Gaddis Rose, 1998). Bu sebeple çeviri kendi başına bir üretim eylemidir. Bu makale çevrilmesi zor olan birkaç kavrama odaklanmaktadır. Kusch, Latin Amerika İspanyolcasındaki bu kavramları, kadim *América* felsefe geleneğinin temelini ortaya çıkarmak için başlangıç noktası olarak görmektedir. Bu kavramlar *América* (yanlışlıkla Amerika olarak çevrilmeye yatkındır), Latin Amerika modernliğinin merkezindeki bir ikilik olarak *hedor*'a (kötü koku) zıt *pulcritud* (düzen ya da temizlik) ve en önemlisi de Kusch'un Quechua ve Aymara felsefesine dayandırdığı karmaşık ontolojik bir kavram olan İspanyolcadaki *estar* ve *ser* arasındaki ayrımı içermektedir.

Bu makalenin genişletilmiş özetine [buradan](https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounter-s-in-translation.616) (https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounter-s-in-translation.616) ulaşabilirsiniz.

中文

在《*El pensamiento indígena y popular en América*》(1977)中，阿根廷哲学家鲁道夫·库什(Rodolfo Kusch)致力于恢复一种思考形式，他相信这种思考形式根植于美洲大陆。对他来说，在美洲，从美洲的角度思考，意味着一种本体论的维度：生存于美洲不同于生存于欧洲(*being in the Americas is different from being in Europe*)，库什将这种本体论差异与拉丁美洲西班牙语中语言和语法区别联系起来，而这种区别在英语中并不存在(*ser* vs. *estar*)。当我们着手翻译库什的书时，这些和其他关键概念对我的合作译者，已故的玛丽亚·卢戈内斯(Maria Lugones)和我自己提出了挑战。本文旨在思考翻译这种具有挑战性的概念是如何将世界观和语言视野带入彼此之间的新的关系中，并产生新的知识叙事和传统。此外，翻译概念可以成为分析或解释这些概念的一种方式(Gaddis Rose, 1998)，因此翻译本身就是一项富有成效的实践。本文重点讨论几个难以翻译的概念，这些概念被库什在拉美西班牙语中确定为他的切入点，用以揭示本土*América*哲学传统的基础。这些概念包括 *América* (可能被误导性地翻译为“America”)；*pulcritud* (order or cleanliness) 与 *hedor* (stench) 的对比作为拉丁美洲现代性核心的二元对立关系；最重要的是，西班牙语中 *estar* 和 *ser* 的区别，在此基础上，库什建立起了一套基于克丘亚语和艾马拉语思维的复杂的本体论理论

本文的概要可以在这里查阅 (<https://dx.doi.org/10.35562/encounters-in-translation.576>)

INDEX

Keywords

Rodolfo Kusch, Latin American philosophy, translation, epistemic injustice, ontology, colonialism

Mots-clés

Rodolfo Kusch, philosophie latino-américaine, traduction, injustice épistémique, ontologie, colonialisme

الكلمات المفتاحية

رودولفو كوش, الفلسفة الأمريكية اللاتينية, الظلم المعرفي, الترجمة, علم الوجود, الاستعمار

কীওয়ার্ড

রোডলফো কুশ, লাতিন আমেরিকান দর্শন, অনুবাদ, জ্ঞানতাত্ত্বিক অবিচার, তত্ত্ববিদ্যা, উপনিবেশবাদ

Palabras claves

Rodolfo Kusch, filosofía latinoamericana, traducción, injusticia epistémica, ontología, colonialismo

کلمات کلیدی

رودولفو کوش, فلسفہ آمریکای لاتین, بی عدالتی معرفتی, ترجمہ, هستی شناسی, استعمار

Palavras chaves

Rodolfo Kusch, Filosofia Latino-Americana, tradução, injustiça epistêmica, ontologia, colonialismo

Inininapaq rimariykuna

Rodolfo Kusch, filosofía latinoamericana, tikray, mana kasqanmanjina yachaykuna, ontología, colonialismo

Anahtar kelimeler

Rodolfo Kusch, Latin Amerikan felsefesi, çeviri, bilgisel adaletsizlik, ontoloji, sömürgecilik

关键词

鲁道夫·库什 (Rodolfo Kusch), 拉丁美洲哲学, 翻译, 认知正义, 本体论, 殖民主义

AUTEUR

Joshua M. Price

Toronto Metropolitan University, Canada

IDREF : <https://www.idref.fr/161216552>

Translating concepts from Latin American philosophy: Ontologies and aesthetics in the work of
Rodolfo Kusch

ORCID : <http://orcid.org/0009-0006-2584-7605>

ISNI : <http://www.isni.org/0000000071164003>