

Consonances and dissonances in the Chinese translation of *Ariel* by José Enrique Rodó

MANUEL PAVÓN-BELIZÓN

DOI: 10.31577/WLS.2026.18.1.4

© Institute of World Literature
Slovak Academy of Sciences

© Manuel Pavón-Belizón 2026
Licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Consonances and dissonances in the Chinese translation of *Ariel* by José Enrique Rodó

Latin American thought. José Enrique Rodó. Chinese reception. Paratexts. Chinese-Spanish translation.

This article examines the 2021 Chinese translation of *Ariel* (1900) by Uruguayan thinker José Enrique Rodó, a seminal text in Latin American intellectual history. Through analysis of the paratexts produced by its translator, editors, and commentators, it explores how *Ariel* is connected with current Chinese intellectual interests. The study addresses the discursive strategies used in the paratexts to emphasize those aspects of Rodó's work that align with the sociopolitical outlook of its promoters in Chinese, while also neutralizing the text's conservative and Eurocentric elements.

Manuel Pavón-Belizón
Department of Translation and Language Sciences
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Barcelona
Spain
manuel.pavon@upf.edu
ORCID: 0000-0002-7846-9648

The essay *Ariel* (1900; Eng. trans. 1922), by the Uruguayan thinker José Enrique Rodó (1871–1917), is one of the most influential works in the intellectual history of Latin America. Published originally in Montevideo when the author was not yet 30 years old, *Ariel* articulated an anti-imperialist stance and a critique of Anglo-American utilitarianism that had infused Latin American thought for decades. At the same time, it also contains elements that could be deemed problematic, such as social elitism, a certain form of cultural Eurocentrism, and a negative vision of indigenous populations.

Ariel was translated into Chinese for the first time in 2021 as part of a collection that seeks to introduce the works of modern Latin American thinkers to China. This article analyzes the discursive practices surrounding *Ariel*'s translation to understand how it is *positioned* within the Chinese intellectual context. "Positioning" refers to "the process by which authors or speakers allocate specific features to themselves and to others, thereby locating themselves within the intellectual arena or within the broader sociopolitical or artistic context in which they operate" (Baert 2018, 228). The case of the Chinese translation of *Ariel* demonstrates how Rodó's ideas are positioned for a particular initiative and readership by establishing explicit consonances between the original social context and the contemporary Chinese context. At the same time, the translator employs paratexts to negotiate dissonances, that is, elements of *Ariel* that might be considered problematic by the agents implicated in the translation initiative.

In this analysis, I suggest the analytical categories of "consonances" and "dissonances". Consonances refer to those aspects of Rodó's work that align with the sociopolitical outlook of the Chinese promoters and their intended readership. Conversely, dissonances denote the elements of *Ariel* that might be considered problematic from the perspective of the translator and the collection's agenda. The Chinese translation process thus involves establishing explicit consonances while negotiating the dissonances, such as Rodó's social elitism, Eurocentrism, and disregard for indigenous populations.

To observe such negotiation, the analysis will rely on the close reading of paratextual materials, particularly those produced by its Chinese translator, Yu Shiyang, as well as the collection's editors. As Kathryn Batchelor (2018) argues, paratexts provide a critical framework for translation research, encompassing both terminology and case-based methodology. They raise questions of power and visibility (of the translator, publisher, or author) as well as issues of reception that go beyond purely linguistic equivalence. In this study, I focus on paratexts as they can illuminate how translations participate in the circulation and legitimation of ideas (Bourdieu 2002) in a context of international intellectual exchanges of unprecedented intensity.

RODÓ AND *ARIEL* IN THE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT

Born in Montevideo, Uruguay, in 1871, Rodó was raised in a well-established family of Uruguayan and Catalan descent. His father, active in intellectual circles, died when Rodó was 15, plunging the family into financial hardship. As a result,

the young Rodó was forced to abandon his studies and take work. Nevertheless, he proved to be a prodigious autodidact, immersing himself in literature (particularly French literature and the emerging modernist movement) as well as in European philosophical currents.

His early intellectual contributions emerged in the field of literary and political journalism and criticism, via the several journals he founded in Uruguay and his collaborations abroad. His growing intellectual prestige brought him to the presidency of the National Library of Uruguay, though only for two months. He also played an important role as a politician, serving intermittently as a member of the Uruguayan Parliament for the Colorado Party, where he advocated for liberal ideas of modernization through civic reforms that would ideally move Uruguay away from traditionalism and “caudillismo”.

He gained increasing intellectual and academic recognition throughout Latin America and Europe, particularly in Spain, where he was appointed a member of the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language, and in France, where his work was promptly translated. In 1916, amid World War I, he undertook a long-awaited journey to Portugal, Spain, France, and Italy, during which his health began to deteriorate. While staying in Palermo, his condition worsened, and he passed away on May 1, 1917, at the age of 45. Rodó’s death was met with widespread mourning across Uruguay and much of Latin America. Intellectual circles paid tribute to him, celebrating his life and work as a leading literary, philosophical, and moral figure. His body was repatriated to Montevideo, where he received a state funeral at the national mausoleum.

Rodó’s thought was eclectic, representing an ambitious attempt to reconcile the conflicting forces of tradition and modernization that marked the turn of the 20th century, particularly in Latin America. He is often regarded as a leading figure of the so-called “Generation of the 1900s” in Latin American intellectual history. This generation reacted strongly against the positivist philosophy that had dominated the previous generation’s approach to modernization and nation-building. In contrast, the Generation of the 1900s embraced idealism and modernism as tools to redefine Latin American identity and culture, opposing the utilitarian and materialistic tendencies – especially those emanating from North America – that were increasingly influential among elites in the region. As Belén Castro notes, “while other contemporaries close themselves off to the modernizing phenomenon, Rodó takes on the risk of thinking within the whirlwind, in the dizzying rush of acceleration: he is a modern thinker who, without renouncing to some traditional values, acts simultaneously as a conducting agent of the new processes and as a critic of them”¹ (2023, 11). Rodó’s stance on positivism combined an appreciation for scientific progress with a sharp critique of its extreme derivation, i.e. utilitarianism (Mellado 2006). He argued that the excesses of the utilitarian spirit, particularly in its Anglo-American form, had corrupted modern civilization. Seeking a balance between classical humanist heritage and the demands of a rapidly modernizing society, he championed the cultivation of virtue, beauty, and intellect as essential to both individual and collective advancement.

These ideas are most clearly expressed in his most famous and enduring work, *Ariel*, which “condenses the philosophical, ideological, and cultural foundations that marked the end of one era and the beginning of another in Latin American thought” (Dussel 2009, 895). Rodó explicitly conceived *Ariel* as a programmatic point of departure for an intellectual movement intended to offer a shared vision for the whole of Hispanic America. Written in poetic prose often characterized by its elusive style, the text takes the form of an exhortation for Latin American youth to seek progress guided by the pursuit of moral, aesthetic, and intellectual cultivation in opposition to mere materialistic concerns. Rodó structures the work around characters taken from Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*: the old teacher Prospero, who delivers the central exhortation; Ariel, the winged spirit that symbolizes the humanistic ideals of beauty and virtue; and Caliban, who embodies the forces of materialism, vulgarity, and utilitarian thought that Rodó opposes (König 2008). Influenced by Krausism, a central element of Rodó’s philosophical project was the conviction that education could serve as a catalyst for social progress and reform, championing the pursuit of beauty and non-utilitarian values and guiding society toward an ideal that harmonized intellectual cultivation with social progress.

The form of utilitarianism that Rodó targeted was embodied by the United States. *Ariel* was written amid the growing influence of North America, which had intensified after the Spanish-American War of 1898. In the essay, Rodó denounces the utilitarian ethos of US culture (an outlook increasingly adopted by Latin American elites) as the embodiment of destructive, materialistic, and anti-humanist forces. One of the most enduring and frequently discussed aspects of *Ariel* is its prescient warning against US imperialism, a concern that would exert a profound and lasting influence on subsequent generations of Latin Americans until the present day. In contrast to Anglo-American culture, Rodó urges Hispano-American youth to reclaim their own distinctive heritage and to define an independent cultural identity.

For Rodó, Latin America’s cultural identity should aspire to an ideal of vital aesthetics and moral sensibility associated with the Greco-Roman tradition, whose legacy he regarded as fundamental and inspiring. In contrast, he considered other ancient civilizations (such as the “Oriental” cultures) outdated and distant from his ideal (Riobó 2015). Nevertheless, Rodó did not advocate a mere imitation of European culture. As he wrote, “the civilizing Europe, which has indoctrinated us, which has nursed us on its ideas of liberty and justice, the fruit of its experience and its genius, has the right to expect that we, relieved of the overwhelming burden of tradition, will do something more than simply repeat them” (1913, 162). Rodó maintained that the new American culture should be original and self-defined. Yet, paradoxically, in what has become one of the most contested aspects of his thought, he refused to acknowledge the continuity and relevance of the indigenous heritage, which reflects the worldview of the Creole elites and their “Eurocentric modernization proposals” for the region at the turn of the century (Nagy 2023, 91).

Ariel also presents reflections on democracy as a political model for Latin America. Rodó maintains a fidelity to the democratic idea, but warns against its denatu-

ralization into a cult of the utilitarian, vulgarity, and mediocrity as the social norm (Gros Espiell 2001, 79–80). For him, a democratic state must create the conditions for the elevation of the human spirit by providing “all members of the society with the unspecified conditions that will lead to their perfection” (Rodó [1900] 1988, 66). In that sense, Rodó considers that, “[r]ationally conceived, democracy always includes an indispensable element of aristocracy, a means of establishing the superiority of the finest, achieved through free consent” (67). This formulation seeks to reconcile democratic freedom with a vision of meritocracy that would ensure cultural and civic vitality.

The program contained in *Ariel*, or *Arielismo*, has exerted a profound impact, and its ideas have been ceaselessly discussed by generations of intellectuals throughout Latin America since the 1900s, making Rodó a vector of regional integration (Fernández 2021). Yet, over decades of reception, his work has also attracted significant criticism. A common criticism argued that his idealism had become detached from real social and political life and that *Arielistas* had spent too long serving abstract ideals instead of confronting poverty, injustice, and the struggles of ordinary people (Sánchez 1933). Peruvian writer and philosopher José Carlos Mariátegui, although usually considered as *Arielista* in some respects – his ideas were sometimes labeled as “Arielist Marxism” – dismissed Rodó’s views as aristocratic and irrelevant to the region’s contemporary needs (Ferretti 2020). Other critiques focus on Rodó’s Eurocentrism, alleged anti-democratic tendencies, and disregard for indigenous populations. As Adolfo Garcé García y Santos observes, *Arielismo*’s “black legend” “misrepresented, trivialized, and caricatured many of its contents, confused others, and at times discussed postulates opposed to Rodó’s ideas as if they were Rodonian” (2001, 43).

In contrast to those allegations, many generations of Latin American intellectuals have read *Ariel* under a more congenial light. By the second half of the 20th century, *Ariel* had become intertwined with revolutionary movements and had been transformed into a symbol of anti-imperialism and resistance against US influence in the region (Devés Valdés 2000, 39). As shown below, these divergent elements have also shaped the recent Chinese reception of *Ariel*, compelling its translator to contextualize and neutralize certain elements of the text in order to better align it with their editorial perspectives and in anticipation of a critical reading by the intended readers.

THE CONTEXT OF THE CHINESE TRANSLATION

Ariel was translated into Chinese in 2021 as part of the “Latin American Thought Translation Series” (“Lāměi sīxiǎng yìcóng”, hereafter LATTS) that seeks to introduce the works of modern Latin American thinkers to China. Since 2020, besides *Ariel*, this initiative has published other three volumes: *El perfil del hombre y la cultura en México* (1934; Eng. trans. *Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico*, 1962) by Samuel Ramos published in 2020, *Seis ensayos en busca de nuestra expresión* (1928; Eng. trans. *Six Essays in Quest for Our Expression*, 2003) by Pedro Henríquez Ureña (2022), plus a *Lāding měizhōu shèhuì sīxiǎng shǒucè* (Handbook of Latin American thought,

2024) that compiles texts by different Latin American thinkers. All works are translated directly from Spanish.

Intellectuals in the People's Republic of China have historically shown a strong interest in the cultural production of other contexts, particularly that of Europe and the United States (Wang 2002). However, China's emergence as a geopolitical power, along with the crisis of Euro-American models of sociopolitical organization, has led to a renewed interest among Chinese intellectuals in exploring ways of understanding and organizing reality beyond Euro-American frameworks. The LATTs is an example of increasing Chinese engagements beyond the conventional centers of intellectual production. It also illustrates the central role that translation plays in them.

LATTs originates from the initiative of a group of scholars in the field of Hispanic studies based at academic institutions across mainland China, led by the main editors Teng Wei and Wei Ran, both specialists in contemporary Latin American literature and thought. The translation of *Ariel* was undertaken by Yu Shiyang, an associate professor in the Faculty of Spanish and Portuguese at Peking University and director of its Center for Hispanic Studies.

The field of Hispanic studies in China has traditionally been close to social critique. In the words of one of the editors, "the academic work and lives of our senior scholars in the Spanish language field have been immersed in the emotional structure of the Asia-Africa-Latin America alliance, and their translation work consciously embodies the awareness of Third World solidarity" (Teng Wei, in Teng and Wei 2021; see also Teng 2011). In this sense, in her general introduction to the series, Teng Wei connects LATTs with earlier similar initiatives. As she explains, apart from a few exceptions (translations of dependency theory, revolutionary thought, José Martí, and works by contemporary figures like Eduardo Galeano, often related to social movements and left-wing thought), the introduction of Latin American philosophy and critical theory in 20th-century China remained sparse and unsystematic. Therefore, she presents LATTs as an attempt at supplementing those earlier, fragmented efforts (Teng 2021, i–ii).

LATTs relies also on an advisory committee comprised of academics and specialists listed in the front matter of each publication. The Chinese advisors include scholars from the field of Hispanic studies, as well as other figures with a sustained intellectual interest in issues of the "Global South" and social justice. Notable among these are Suo Sa, known for her sociological work on Latin America, and Lau Kin Chi, a professor of cultural studies at Lingnan University in Hong Kong and an activist focused on Global South relations. The committee further lists two of China's most internationally recognized intellectuals: Wang Hui, a professor of intellectual history at Tsinghua University in Beijing, and Dai Jinhua, a professor of cultural studies at Peking University. The international advisors include academics Walter D. Mignolo, one of the main theorists of decoloniality, and Karina Batthyány, sociologist and executive secretary of the Latin American Council of Social Sciences, as well as figures with strong ties to social activism, notably Gustavo Esteva, an intellectual previously linked to Mexico's Zapatista Army of National Liberation, and João Pedro Stedile, an economist linked to the Landless Workers' Movement in Brazil.

Several members of the advisory board are affiliated with the Global University for Sustainability, an organization created in 2015 and based at Lingnan University in Hong Kong, that operates as “an experimental forum to support alternative forms of knowledge production and circulation that surpass commodified and subservient knowledge models,” according to its Chinese website.² This organization hosts regular forums and produces publications featuring Latin American intellectuals and Chinese academics, including members of the LATTs advisory board (Teng 2021, iii).

Accordingly, the editors underscore the series’ commitment to translating works rooted in intellectual currents like liberation theology, indigenism, nationalism, and Marxism, with “a special emphasis on the translation and introduction of theories and practical experiences that carry out a critique of and reflection on imperialism, capitalism, and globalization” (Teng 2021, vii). Regarding their goals and intended readership, the editors declare:

We want to observe how Latin Americans think about modernization, nationalization, and Europeanization; how they carry out decolonization; how they reconstruct theology; and how they construct cultural identity, etc. We will translate, little by little, the most important and influential intellectual achievements of the past century in Latin America as thoroughly as possible, allowing Chinese academia and general readers to understand Latin American problems, Latin American reflection on these problems, and the various imaginings of solutions. (Teng Wei in Teng and Zhang 2020)

The aforementioned Global University for Sustainability is a key sponsor of the series. Other supporting institutions include the China Public Education Group, a listed company in the education sector; the Contemporary Culture Research Center of South China Normal University (directed by Teng Wei, the collection’s general editor); the Film and Culture Research Center of Peking University (directed by Dai Jinhua); and two commercial publishers: Shanghai People’s Press and Luminaire Books (Teng 2020, viii).

Another noteworthy feature of this translation initiative is its emphasis on diffusion, including the organization of presentations, book clubs, conferences, seminars and other public activities. The editors and translators have also generated paratextual materials for the collection, including a general preface by the editors and introductory essays for each translation in which the translators articulate their interests and the challenges encountered in bringing these works into Chinese. Moreover, they have actively promoted the publications beyond academic circles through commentaries and interviews in cultural outlets, notably the magazine *Pengpai* and the weekly *Shenghuo Zhoukan*. These paratextual sources are helpful in clarifying the ideas that the promoters sought to foreground through translation.

THE TRANSLATION: MANAGING CONSONANCES AND DISSONANCES

The paratextual elements surrounding the translation of *Ariel* include peritexts such as the translator’s preface, as well as epitexts such as articles by the translator or the editors published in the aforementioned cultural outlets. Analyzing the content of these elements allows us to identify which aspects of the work the translator

has chosen to highlight in Rodó's text. As discussed above, *Ariel* also includes certain elements that are deemed dissonant, especially from what may be considered a critical or left-wing perspective. The translator does not refrain from addressing those problematic issues; instead, she points them out and comments on them in order to contextualize and neutralize them, and to highlight the legacy of Rodó's ideas in the history of Latin American social and political movements for justice.

The historical parallels between the experiences of Latin America and China appear to be a significant factor in the interest of the series' promoters in translating works of Latin American thought, and these consonances are explicitly mentioned. In the case of *Ariel*, the translator Yu Shiyang emphasizes the existence of a particular relationship between the two regions, stating:

I have always felt that the dilemmas, inquiries, and achievements of Spanish-speaking America after independence are very similar to those of China since the late Qing dynasty. The issues of cultural hegemony, the dominance of pragmatism and utilitarianism, and the lack of idealism that Rodó reflected on around 1900 could be read in China as issues that are not far removed from our own. Moreover, the situation we [in China] find ourselves in today, more than a hundred years later, can also serve as a powerful warning – provided we know enough about Latin America and do not allow ourselves to be deceived by triumphant and self-indulgent nationalism. (Yu 2017)

As for peritexts, the Chinese edition of *Ariel* includes the translators' introduction plus a set of supplementary translated documents after the proper translated text. These include excerpts of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* that clarify the intertextuality of Rodó's *Ariel* with the characters and the themes of Shakespeare's play; the essay "El triunfo de Calibán" (1898; Eng. trans. "The triumph of Caliban", 2005) by the Nicaraguan poet Rubén Darío; three letters sent by Rodó to the historian Rafael Altamira relating to the message of *Ariel*; the preface to *Ariel* written by the Spanish novelist Clarín (pen name of Leopoldo Alas); a review of *Ariel* by the Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno; excerpts of the essay "Calibán" (2004) by the Cuban historian Roberto Fernando Retamar; an article by the scholar Gordon Brotherston (2000) with a critical analysis of Rodó's views of indigenous culture; a chronology of Rodó's work, and the translator's afterword. This array of peritextual materials highlights the central role that *Ariel* played in the cultural and intellectual history of Latin America and the strong influence it exerted beyond the author's country of origin. The paratextual inclusion of the texts by Retamar and by Brotherston, as I will explain later, are particularly relevant for the positioning of the translation, since they are intended to neutralize or at least contextualize the problematic aspects of Rodó's thought (his views on indigenous cultures and his elitist outlook) that may be considered as dissonant within a broader translation project with a strong emphasis on social critique.

The translator's introduction highlights Rodó's critique of modernity, most notably his condemnation of the US-derived utilitarianism and materialism that had started to permeate Latin American elites as appealing ideals. The translator situates Rodó's anti-utilitarianism within the context of late 19th-century Uruguay, when liberal educational reforms led by figures such as José Pedro Varela (1845–1879), the National

Director of Public Instruction, sought to adopt a US-inspired educational model. These reforms introduced frameworks informed by social Darwinism and promoted utilitarianism, positivism, and the pursuit of material wealth as the prevailing intellectual ideals, elevating science and technology above humanistic education (Yu 2021, 18). In response to this trend, *Ariel* is presented as a humanist manifesto directed at Latin American youth, urging awareness of the dangers inherent in the life philosophy being imposed upon them. As Yu explains, Rodó called for the suppression of materialistic aspirations and for the cultivation of an aesthetic spiritual ideal in Latin American societies, standing in deliberate opposition to the vulgarity associated with utilitarianism.

Yu also highlights Rodó's critique of emerging Latin American industrial and mercantile classes and "the utilitarian partisans who serve them," contrasting them with a cultural and educated elite that should, in his view, assume leadership of the region (18–19). Although Yu concedes that Rodó's ideas may appear "classical and ethereal" (12), she nonetheless affirms the "optimistic and constructive spirit of resistance" that *Ariel* inspired in later generations, encouraging them "to resist the United States as well as oppose dictatorship and corruption in their own countries, even triggering waves of university education reform" (30).

Alongside these consonances, some of Rodó's ideas in *Ariel* produce dissonances with respect to the translator's and the editors' outlook. The translator does not hesitate to point out those aspects she finds problematic in this work, which she describes as "conservative" and in which she detects "a racist undertone" (12). In this sense, Yu reproaches Rodó for maintaining an elitist and "quasi-medieval" conception of society in which social position seems predetermined: "[Rodó] defends order, hierarchy, a top-down structure of governance and authority, without mentioning a single word about the natives or the black population, as if they were left locked away at the bottom of society" (27). Instead of silencing it, the translator acknowledges this problem and reinforces her criticism by including as a paratext in the volume the translation of one article by Gordon Brotherston in which he offers a review of Rodó's negative opinions about the cultural legacy of indigenous populations in Latin America (in Rodó 2021, 174–193).

Interestingly, in an article about her experience working on the project, Yu comments on the discomfort she felt with various aspects of *Ariel* and how strange it seemed for her to constantly have to ponder, during the translation process, whether some passages might be taken out of context (Yu 2017). Given this experience, it is interesting to observe how the translator uses her introduction, first, to highlight the problematic and potentially sensitive aspects of *Ariel*, and then to offer a broader perspective on the long-term influence of Rodó's work, drawing on later commentaries by intellectuals who presented *Ariel* as the seed of revolutionary and anti-imperialist impulses across 20th-century Latin America. In this way, the problematic aspects mentioned earlier appear to be neutralized. For instance, Yu quotes Mario Benedetti (1920–2009), who edited a series of articles to commemorate the centennial of Rodó's birth and who concluded that *Ariel's* greatest achievement was "to turn a gaze of admiration [toward the US] into a gaze of vigilance" (Yu 2021, 32).

The translator especially emphasizes the views of the Cuban poet and essayist Roberto Fernández Retamar (1930–2019) on the revolutionary ferment in Rodó's work. To do so, she includes the full translation of the famous chapter "Calibán" by Retamar (in Rodó 2021, 161–173), in which the Cuban poet pays homage to Rodó's text while subverting its metaphors to address the five centuries of conquest and colonization in the Americas. Moreover, in her introduction, Yu also highlights Fernández Retamar's idea that *Ariel* "provided the first launchpad for the revolutionary movement" in Cuba (Yu 2021, 30) and quotes the Cuban poet's statement that, in the revolutionary history of the continent, Rodó stands alongside José Martí (1853–1895) in that both sounded a prescient warning against growing US power (Yu 2021, 32). Thus, the conservative, racial and elitist components of *Ariel* seem to be neutralized (to a certain extent) in view of this anti-imperialist reading and of the longer-term revolutionary and liberating readings of the work.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the Chinese translation of *Ariel* and its positioning within contemporary intellectual frameworks in China show that Rodó's work remains relevant, with all its complexities and its problematic views. Through her use of paratexts, translator Yu Shiyang negotiates the tensions between the ideas articulated in the original work and the conditions of the receiving context and its intended readership. Although she critiques certain aspects of Rodó's thought, Yu situates *Ariel* within anti-imperialist and resistance discourses that continue to resonate especially among left-leaning intellectuals in both Latin America and China. Her approach underscores the enduring significance of *Ariel* as a text that warns against the dangers of utilitarianism and imperialism, linking its message to shared experiences of anti-hegemonic struggle in the two regions.

As shown, the circulation of Latin American thought in China contains a deeply political and ideological impulse, reflecting the historical commitment of Chinese Hispanic studies to South-South cooperation. While the LATTs is sponsored by non-governmental and academic bodies, the anti-imperialist and anti-US-hegemonic stance of a work like *Ariel* makes it particularly vulnerable to co-option in a context of geopolitical tensions and contests for influence over the Global South. Therefore, cases like the one analyzed here are relevant for the study of translation dynamics in relation to geopolitics.

On a final note, in a time when AI looms over human translators, understanding translation as including the positioning of the text is also a way to vindicate the work of human translators, since the mechanisms required for positioning are irreducible to artificial translation or text generation systems. Positioning requires a dual understanding, first of the source context to grasp the historical-political weight of texts like Rodó's *Ariel*; and second of the target context, to identify relevant contemporary debates and tropes, thereby activating the translated text's critical potential. This process involves a social immersion and strategic human judgment and critical thinking skills (that AI currently lacks) to ensure the texts function as active agents in the target socio-political sphere rather than mere textual artifacts.

NOTES

- ¹ Unless otherwise stated, all translations from languages other than English are by the present author.
² See <https://our-global-u.org/oguorg/zhs/可持续发展全球大学-2/>.

REFERENCES

- Antuña, José G. [1952] 1969. *Un panorama del espíritu. El "Ariel" de Rodó*. Volume I. Montevideo: Biblioteca Artigas.
- Baert, Patrick. 2018. "Reflections on the Use of Positioning Theory in the Sociology of Intellectuals." In *Questions of Practice in Philosophy and Social Theory*, ed. by Anders Buch and Theodore R. Schatzki, 225–235. London and New York: Routledge.
- Batchelor, Kathryn. 2018. *Translation and Paratexts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Beorlegui, Carlos. 2010. *Historia del pensamiento filosófico latinoamericano. Una búsqueda incesante de la identidad*. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2002. "Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 145, 3–8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3406/ars.2002.2793>.
- Brotherston, Gordon. 2000. "La América de José Enrique Rodó: sus banderas y sus silencios." In *José Enrique Rodó y su tiempo: Cien años de "Ariel"*, ed. by Ottmar Ette and Titus Heydenreich, 59–72. Frankfurt am Main and Madrid: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783964562685-004>.
- Castro, Belén. 2023. "Introducción." In *Ariel*, José Enrique Rodó, 11–127. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Devés Valdés, Eduardo. 2000. *El pensamiento latinoamericano en el siglo XX. Entre la modernización y la identidad. Tomo I: Del Ariel de Rodó a la CEPAL (1900–1950)*. Buenos Aires: Biblos, Centro de Investigaciones Diego Barros Arana.
- Dussel, Enrique, Eduardo Mendieta, and Carmen Bohórquez, eds. 2009. *El pensamiento filosófico latinoamericano, del Caribe y "latino" (1300–2000). Historia, corrientes, temas y filósofos*. México: Siglo XXI and Centro de Cooperación Regional para la Educación de Adultos en América Latina y el Caribe.
- Fernández, Cristina Beatriz. 2021. "Rodó transplatino. Diálogos asimétricos con la revista Nosotros." *Revista de Culturas y Literaturas Comparadas* 12: 1–14.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. 2004. *Todo Calibán*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Ferretti, Pierina. 2020. "El mito de Rodó no ha obrado nunca. Notas a propósito de Mariátegui y el arielismo latinoamericano." *Revista Latinoamericana del Colegio Internacional de Filosofía* 7: 79–91.
- Garcé García y Santos, Adolfo. 2001. "El arielismo, más allá de su leyenda negra." *Prisma* 17: 43–55.
- Gros Espiell, Héctor. 2001. "La idea de igualdad en Ariel." *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Letras* 8: 71–86.
- König, Irmtrud. 2008. "Apuntes para una comparatística en Latinoamérica. El simbolismo de Ariel y Calibán en Rodó." *Atenea* 498: 75–95.
- Mellado, Luciana. 2006. "El modernismo y el positivismo en el Ariel de José Rodó." *Alpha* 22: 75–87.
- Nagy, Marcel. 2023. "La Europa de José Enrique Rodó." *Acta Hispanica* 28: 91–104. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14232/actahisp.2023.28.91-104>.
- Rilla, Jerónimo. 2025. "The Leviathan of the Pampas: Sarmiento's Facundo as a State Personification." *Global Intellectual History* August: 1–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2025.2542361>.
- Riobó, Enrique. 2015. "Antigüedad y modernidad en el Ariel de José Enrique Rodó." *Revista Pléyade* 15: 41–68.
- Rodó, José Enrique. [1900] 1988. *Ariel*. Trans. by Margaret Sayers Peden. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Rodó, José Enrique. [1900] 2021. *Aili'èr*. Trans. by Yu Shiyang. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

- Rodó, José Enrique. [1900] 2023. *Ariel*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Rodó, José Enrique. 1913. *El mirador de Próspero*. Montevideo: José María Serrano Editor.
- Sánchez, Luis Alberto. 1933. “El anti-Rodó.” In *Aprismo y religión. El anti-Rodó*, Luis Alberto Sánchez, 43–47. Lima: Editorial Cooperativa Aprista Atahualpa.
- Teng, Wei. 2011. *Bianjing zhi nan: Lading Meizhou wenxue Han yi yu Zhongguo dangdai wenxue (1949–1999)*. Beijing: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe.
- Teng, Wei. 2021. “Lamei sixiang yicong zongxu.” In *Aili'er*, José Enrique Rodó, i–viii. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.
- Teng, Wei, and Weijie Zhang. 2020. “Lamei zuowei wenti: women weishenme yao du Lamei?” *Pengpai* December 18.
- Teng, Wei, and Ran Wei. 2021. “Jiangzuo. Teng Wei, Wei Ran duitan ‘Lamei sixiang yicong.’” *Pengpai* March 11.
- Wang, Xiaoming. 2002. “The Politics of Translation: Modes of Organization in the Chinese Translation Movement of the 1980s.” In *Traces 1: Specters of the West and the Politics of Translation*, ed. by Naoki Sakai and Yukiko Hanawa, 269–300. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Yu, Shiyang. 2017. “Weile yinjie ‘Aili’er’ de daolai: yi ci caifang de liangci jiangshu.” *Shenghuo Zhoukan* May 19.
- Yu, Shiyang. 2021. “Daodu.” In *Aili'er*, José Enrique Rodó, 1–34. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.