

L'ANALISI LINGUISTICA E LETTERARIA

FACOLTÀ DI SCIENZE LINGUISTICHE E LETTERATURE STRANIERE
UNIVERSITÀ CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE

2

ANNO XVI 2008

EDUCATT - UNIVERSITÀ CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE

L'ANALISI
LINGUISTICA E LETTERARIA

FACOLTÀ DI SCIENZE LINGUISTICHE
E LETTERATURE STRANIERE

UNIVERSITÀ CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE

ANNO XVI 2008

SPECIAL ISSUE

Proceedings of the IADA Workshop
Word Meaning in Argumentative Dialogue

Homage to Sorin Stati

Milan 2008, 15-17 May

VOLUME 2

edited by G. Gobber, S. Cantarini, S. Cigada, M.C. Gatti & S. Gilardoni

L'ANALISI LINGUISTICA E LETTERARIA
Facoltà di Scienze linguistiche e Letterature straniere
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
Anno XVI - 2/2008
ISSN 1122-1917

Direzione

GIUSEPPE BERNARDELLI
LUISA CAMAIORA
SERGIO CIGADA
GIOVANNI GOBBER

Comitato scientifico

GIUSEPPE BERNARDELLI - LUISA CAMAIORA - BONA CAMBIAGHI - ARTURO CATTANEO
SERGIO CIGADA - MARIA FRANCA FROLA - ENRICA GALAZZI - GIOVANNI GOBBER
DANTE LIANO - MARGHERITA ULRYCH - MARISA VERNA - SERENA VITALE - MARIA TERESA
ZANOLA

Segreteria di redazione

LAURA BALBIANI - SARAH BIGI - ANNA BONOLA - MARIACRISTINA PEDRAZZINI
VITTORIA PRENCIPE - MARISA VERNA

Pubblicazione realizzata con il contributo PRIN - anno 2006

© 2009 EDUCatt - Ente per il Diritto allo Studio Universitario dell'Università Cattolica
Largo Gemelli 1, 20123 Milano - tel. 02.72342235 - fax 02.80.53.215
e-mail: editoriale.dsu@unicatt.it (*produzione*); librario.dsu@unicatt.it (*distribuzione*);
web: www.unicatt.it/librario

Redazione della Rivista: redazione.all@unicatt.it - *web:* www.unicatt.it/librario/all

Questo volume è stato stampato nel mese di dicembre 2009
presso la Litografia Solari - Peschiera Borromeo (Milano)

TRANSLATING THE LEXICAL ITEM: ARGUING OVER DOMINANCE, DOMINATION AND HEGEMONY

DEREK BOOTHMAN

1. *Introduction*

1.1 The background to hegemony

The present essay originates from a recently published study of the background sources for the concept of hegemony as developed in the notebooks that the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, wrote in a fascist gaol from 1929 until his strength gave out, two years before his death in 1937. These *Prison Notebooks* (*Quaderni del Carcere*) began to be published in Italy in the late 1940s and then in English, first in a couple of slim, very partial, and rather unsatisfactory volumes in 1957, followed by a substantial three-volume anthology in over 1300 pages (plus critical apparatus), beginning in 1971 with *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, and then by a still ongoing project to produce an English translation of the Notebooks in their integral form¹.

About half a dozen main sources feed into Gramsci's concept of hegemony: Marx's 1859 preface to *A Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy*; use of the word within the Italian socialist movement, sometimes with reference to the political situation around the Adriatic; use of the concept and word *gegemoniya* among the Bolsheviks², especially but not exclusively by Lenin; the philosopher Benedetto Croce's concept of «ethico-political history» (hegemony in an incomplete and mutilated form, according to Gramsci); Machiavelli's metaphor of the centaur – half man and half animal, representing consent and force – as well as his use of language³; Gramsci's own analysis of the various real situations considered; and of course his own university linguistic training (Boothman 2008a, 2008b). All these factors converged to produce “hegemony” as it emerged and developed throughout the six-year span that the *Notebooks* occupied, from its first appearance as «egemonia politica», glossed as «direzione» («leadership»), to the observation in the last *Notebook* (on Gram-

¹ Gramsci 1971, Gramsci 1985, Gramsci 1995. The integral translation is Gramsci 1992-present.

² Leaving aside translations Gramsci commissioned from Russian in the 1919-20 period, the first use he himself made of the word “egemonia” is, it seems in letters written from Vienna (December 1923-Spring 1924) immediately after his stay in the Soviet Union and frequent contacts with the Bolshevik leaders there; a selection of these pre-prison letters, including the Vienna ones, is scheduled for 2009.

³ Machiavelli pays great attention to the attainment of consent by negotiation between leaders and led, thereby transforming the crowd (“multitudine sciolta”) into the people (“popolo”); see Fontana 1993, 130-1.

mar) that «every time the language question surfaces it means that a series of other questions are coming to the fore» that pose the «necessity ... to reorganize cultural hegemony»⁴.

1.2 Comparing “hegemony” in Italian and English: two corpora

The 1971 translation, fundamental as regards purely political aspects of the *Notebooks*, was instrumental in putting into circulation in the English-speaking world a number of innovative concepts, including crucially hegemony. These concepts found widespread application in various fields, among them history, sociology, ethnic and gender studies, cultural studies and political theory and science; the latter includes increasingly important disciplinary fields such as subaltern studies, International Political Economy and International Relations. Somewhat schematically, it may be said that from its ancient Greek historical origins as a military concept, hegemony then developed a near-purely political side, before undergoing a shift at the hands of Gramsci to include not only political aspects, but those of culture (in the broad sense, as understood by anthropologists or by critics such as Raymond Williams), language, economics and other sectors. To try to see how hegemony began to be interpreted and applied, in other words how the English-speaking academic community has *translated* hegemony from its Gramscian context, is a large undertaking and the present, necessarily provisional, essay examines just one aspect of this process. It makes use of the fortunate fact that the *British National Corpus*, assembled to give a fair and representative sample of British English, offering among other things a cross-section of academic writings, was compiled over a period of some dozen to twenty five years after the 1971 *Selections* anthology. This time lapse offered a near-perfect opportunity for Gramscian ideas to percolate through and be applied to conditions in Anglophone culture. The *BNC* therefore is a useful reference corpus to compare with the *Quaderni*, naturally to be used judiciously and, for a fuller study than the present one, together with other sources, but it contains material that helps understand how the concept “hegemony” has been understood and translated in an academic setting. As is known, the *BNC* includes a wide range of oral and written discourse (ca. 10% and 90% of 100 million words respectively), and, not surprisingly, the extracts of publications of the authors in whom the root *hegemon** occurs (extracts amounting to within 1% of 5 million words, as compared with ca. 1 million in the *Quaderni*) are limited, with a few exceptions, to written academic discourse. Together, the noun and adjectival forms appear 386 and ca. 350 times in the *Quaderni* and the *BNC* respectively.

This paper examines, through use of the *BNC*, whether one may detect a Gramscian influence, i.e. a *translation* of the term “hegemony” that differs from previous uses in Anglophone culture. It is far too easy – and inaccurate – to say that the English “hegemony” is just the translation of a Greek, or an Italian or Russian etc., term, of the same root. What

⁴ Gramsci 1985, 183–4 (translation slightly modified) for the language question in reorganizing hegemony; the first occurrence of “egemonia” is in *Notebook* 1, §44.

is relevant, instead, is translation in the sense of how the *meaning* of a term is modified and extended on going from one discourse or paradigm to another. Section 1 of this paper consequently reconstructs the meanings of hegemony contained in the *BNC*, attempting to trace, necessarily somewhat partially, how the uses of “hegemony” and “hegemonic” have – and in some cases have definitely not – been influenced by Gramsci’s writings, i.e. the basic consonance, or otherwise, of meaning in the *BNC* compared with the *Prison Notebooks* (for his general influence in Anglophone culture readers are referred to various studies on the subject. See Boothman 2004-05, Boothman (in press), Eley 1984a, Eley 1984b and Forgas 1989). In Section 2 we look at the fruitful application of the concept “hegemony” to new areas, crucial to the translation process given that a word, in acquiring its meaning from its overall linguistic-cultural context, then undergoes a partial semantic extension when used in new contexts.

<i>Quaderni del carcere</i>		<i>Quaderni del carcere</i>		<i>BNC</i>	
SEMANTIC AREA: COLLOCATION WITH <i>EGEMONIC*</i> (56 OCCURRENCES)	USE (EXPRESSE D AS %)	SEMANTIC AREA: COLLOCATION WITH <i>EGEMONE/I</i> (33 OCCURRENCES)	USE (EXPRESSE D AS %)	SEMANTIC AREA: COLLOCATION WITH <i>HEGEMONIC</i> (99 OCCURRENCES)	USE (EXPRESSE D AS %)
funzione	20			mission/function/role	7
		classi/gruppi sociali	33	class/fraction/bloc	21
costruzione/sistema/ elemento	11			structure/model/ control/authority	14
		forza (militare/politica)	15		
Stato/nazione	13	Stato/nazione ecc.	33	State/country/ nation etc. ⁵	4
		gruppi territoriali	6		
quistione/influenza/ atteggiamento/esponente	8			theory/ideology/claim/ tradition/project	8
lotta (tra principii)	4			Struggle	2
				power (not sense of nation)	5
		cultura	3	culture	8
Posizioni	2			Position	5
Other uses of concept	42		10		26 ⁶
Total	100		100		100

Table 1: Comparative collocations (expressed as a %) between the adjectives *egemone/i*, *egemonic** (*Quaderni del carcere*) and *hegemonic* (*BNC*) and the semantic areas of their respective nouns⁷.

The table indicates the similar fields for which the English “hegemonic” and its Italian equivalents are used; “hegemonic” – ignoring the rare idiosyncratic variant “hegemonial” – cov-

⁵ Strangely, there are no occurrences of the adjective “hegemonic” in references to ancient history and pre-modern history (*BNC*) although, as observed, there are frequent usages of the noun “hegemony”.

⁶ Including “hegemonic practice”, perhaps a convergence, as some attempted especially in the 1970s, between Gramsci’s historicist and Althusser’s structuralist approaches.

⁷ Adjectives only are considered in this table. The noun form (ca. 330 occurrences in the *BNC* and 297, including ten in the plural) is dealt with in the second part of the paper.

ers both adjectival forms “egemone/i” and “egemonic*”. By highlighting major fields of use, Table 1 gives some hint of where developments may have taken place in translating the concept into Anglophone culture. Given that “hegemony” occurs rarely outside the confines of “cultural”-political-academic discourse, it may be assumed that, within limits, the use of “hegemonic” reflects usage at the time the *BNC* was compiled and, presumably to a great extent, is still currently being used. First, “State/nation/power” is found with both Italian adjectives in Gramsci, but more frequently with *egemone/i*; in this collocation it *is* found, but to a much lesser extent in English (only 4%). However in probably under-representing the recent disciplinary field of International Political Economy, the *BNC* sample may be somewhat skew for current use of “hegemonic”, and the percentage reported may therefore be an underestimate of current use in this semantic-academic field. Second, “class”, together to a lesser extent with “culture”, is the only notion (with a minor exception for State/nation/power) for which “hegemonic” here corresponds to “egemone/i”, the collocation with “class” accounting for 29% of the *BNC* occurrences of “hegemonic”. Third, for all other uses of “hegemonic” in the *BNC* (ca. 2/5 of the uses of the word) there is a correspondence between “hegemonic” and “egemonic*”. Last, “culture” appears to collocate more with “hegemonic” than “cultura” does with “egemone”, and thus at first sight culture and hegemony seem to be a more common coupling of concepts in English than in Italian. This however is misleading given the standard collocation “egemonia culturale” in Italian, which is also found eleven times in the *Notebooks*.

2. *The uses of the word “hegemony”*

2.1 The historians of the Early Middle Ages

First, what was actually understood by “hegemony” up to recent times, i.e. the last three or four decades? The full OED (CD-ROM version) gives the meaning as «leadership, predominance, preponderance; esp. the leadership or predominant authority of one state of a confederacy or union over the others [...]», with reference to ancient Greece in particular, the meaning here being very close to the one Gramsci was familiar with through use by Italian socialists. Such is also the use among the *BNC* entries relating to ancient through to early medieval British history. On this latter, the *BNC* contains very interesting comments linking political and military power with the concepts of overlordship and hegemony for some of the major regions of what was eventually to emerge as England and Scotland. “Overlordship” is akin to “hegemony”, but explicitly includes the formal recognition of a hierarchy between rulers or petty kingdoms, i.e. suzerainty. Schematically, it may also be suggested that “hegemony” and “domination” are used *almost* synonymously, “domination” having more military overtones and “hegemony” a more political – “civil” or “proto-state” – sense, except when hegemony is defined in the Greek sense of military hegemony. An example of this is seen in the comment, referring to interpretations of Ecgrifith’s reign that «there was undoubtedly a tendency to push back in time the establishment of a far-flung military hege-

mony». The contrast made by the same author between the two concepts “dominance” (or “domination”) and “hegemony”, the latter linked but not equivalent to military power, emerges from the explanation that «the creation of a Midland hegemony was achieved by a remarkable series of expansionist campaigns [...]» and the inconceivability that «Eadwine was able to extend his hegemony southwards without first achieving domination of the Mercians» (Kirby 1992: 68). The political-state aspect of hegemony is emphasized by another author who, in a comment on late antiquity, notes that Theudebert claimed «his hegemony [...] stretched from Visigothic Spain to Thuringia, from the North Sea to the Danube and Pannonia» (Wood 1994).

Given the origins of “hegemony” in the ancient world, it is not surprising that there is no detectable influence of Gramsci in these extracts. The use in English of the concept by the historians here cited appears to be an unmediated translation of a meaning originating in classical antiquity. Further, the same historians often conceive hegemony to be one aspect of a wider use of power within suzerainty or overlordship, opposed to or complementing dominance by force. In this sense there is sometimes fairly full compatibility between the uses of the term in these historiographical extracts and some of Gramsci’s, with the proviso that, for Gramsci, hegemony includes force allied to consent (cf. the centaur metaphor taken over from Machiavelli), with the latter normally predominating. One may note what is either a natural conservatism on the part of the historians, militating against innovative uses of the concept or, indeed, a lack of necessity felt for such innovation.

2.2 Use of the concept “hegemony” in the analysis of present-day society

2.2.1 Explicit Gramscian usages in the BNC

The ways in which different typologies of society are ruled are different, and thus so are the ways in which hegemony operates, and indeed what it – and what dominance – are in such societies. Thus, moving forward in time from the pre-feudal societies of section 1.1 to present-day “Western” society, we note a radical shift in the meaning of “hegemony”, as is indicated in a number of *BNC* extracts that make specific reference to Gramscian uses of “hegemony”. Young, for example, states that «as Gramsci pointed out ..., *hegemony* is not universal and ‘given’ to the continuing rule of a particular class» (Young 1991), while Furlong *et al.* state that «Gramsci’s most original contribution to Marxism lies in his analysis of the ways in which the state transforms coercive force into a structured more consensual domination to which he gives the name ‘hegemony’» (Furlong, Cox & Page, 1985). The latter authors thus explain, at least to a wide readership in the social sciences, how “hegemony” has been incorporated (translated) into Anglophone sociological discourse. They also define hegemony: «For Gramsci, class domination is not achieved through the state being dominated by the ruling class; it is achieved through a complex process of coercion and consent. This is achieved via the use of force (individuals being coerced into accepting the capitalist mode of production) and hegemony. Hegemony implies the mobilisation of the

active consent of those dominated by a ruling class through the use of intellectual, moral and political persuasion and leadership» (as elsewhere in this paper, we leave aside eventual differing interpretations of Gramsci, here whether acceptance of the capitalist mode of production is coercive or consensual.) The fundamental difference between rule in modern and pre-feudal societies emerge clearly, with the meaning attached to “hegemony” – i.e. its translation into a modern setting, with explicit reference to Gramsci’s conceptualization – being very different in the two types of society.

Another extract from Furlong *et al.* illustrates one particular school of thought: «the capitalist ruling class are able to ensure their dominance over society and economy through the unequal competition between different ideologies. In this way, thought and action are conditioned to serve the interests of capitalism through an ideological hegemony» (Furlong, Cox & Page 1985: 266). This has a Gramscian ring to it, although Gramscian scholars will not be surprised that the syntagm “egemonia ideologica” is nowhere to be found in the *Prison Notebooks* (searchable electronic Italian version consulted). What one sees there instead are explicit references to «dominant ideology/ies»⁸, and to «a struggle of political ‘hegemonies’»⁹. The notion of “ideological hegemony” introduced here by Furlong and co-workers is, then, an extension and development of the conceptual nexus contained in the *Notebooks* (and possibly a modification of the interrelationship between its various terms), i.e. a translation of Gramsci’s ideas which, it may be said, seems to remain within his paradigm¹⁰. Other authors included in the *BNC* use yet another term in speaking of a professional development that merely serves «the interest of the dominant hegemony» (McCormick & James 1990: 40). Given that Gramsci’s reference to struggles between hegemonies, it is legitimate to think that a particular hegemony is indeed dominant even though, again, the syntagm “egemonia dominante” is not in the *Notebooks*. One does, however, find there a comment on a situation (termed Caesarism or Bonapartism)¹¹ in which «the forces in conflict», thus including their rival hegemonies, «balance each other ... in such a way that the conflict can only terminate in their reciprocal destruction»; in other words there is a struggle for dominance. A similar concept of competing hegemonies is found in the *BNC* in a work on women, medicine and sexuality in Britain, in which Frank Mort writes of «a much more unstable hegemony [...] successfully challenged by competing groups» (Mort 1987: 116). While not using Gramscian syntagms, it may be said that the authors of these extracts creatively translate Gramscian meanings into their particular setting.

⁸ For the singular see Notebook 4, §7 (first draft) and Notebook 11, §37 (final version), the definitive latter version being in Gramsci 1995: 293. For the plural see Gramsci 1996, p. 33 (i.e. Notebook 3, §34), which gives the precise translation (“dominant ideologies” rather than the “ruling ideologies” preferred in Gramsci 1971, 276).

⁹ Notebook 11, §12; see Gramsci 1971, 333.

¹⁰ Cf. Liguori’s essay “Ideologia” in the authoritative collective volume of Rome’s “Seminario gramsciano”, *Le parole di Gramsci* (Liguori 2004, 131-49, especially pp. 142-3 and 147).

¹¹ Notebook 9, §133; the rewritten version (Notebook 13, §27: Gramsci 1971, 219) omits the “Bonapartism” of the first draft, retaining only “Caesarism”.

2.2.2 Non-Gramscian uses of “hegemony” in the BNC

Different from Furlong *et al.*, what appears to be a minority of the sociologists of modern societies use “hegemony” to mean merely “dominance”, a use – at odds with most previous ones in English – which, given the entire history of the term, leaves the present writer somewhat nonplussed. As representative quotations, one may cite Smith and Hollis’s contention that «the critical mechanism employed by Neo-Realism is termed ‘hegemonic stability’ (‘hegemony’ meaning ‘domination’, from the Greek *hegemon*, a leader)» and Sheard *et al.*’s explanatory glosses «The structuration of the business class as a whole has, to a considerable extent, been determined by the hegemony [dominance] within it of the establishment families», and «containment of capitalism within a patrician hegemony [ideological dominance] which never [...] actively favoured the aggressive development of industrialism or the general conversion of society to the latter’s values and interests» (Smith & Hollis 1990; Sheard, Stanworth, Bilton, Jones & Bonnett 1992). Another synonymous use of the two terms comes in a collectively authored volume: «The Conservative hegemony of the interwar years still awaits an adequate explanation, and the Conservative dominance between 1951 and 1964 [...] has escaped the white heat of historical investigation» (Green 1991). Sometimes, instead, one wonders whether dominance and hegemony, rather than being considered as synonyms, have perhaps been interchanged, as in R.J. Johnston’s comment «The reason for ... the consequent Conservative dominance of Dukeries’ politics, was the colliery companies’ hegemony» (Johnston 1991). “Dominance” might possibly here be used loosely in a non-technical sense, but one important view of mining holds that, before nationalization, most British miners regarded the colliery companies as exerting coercive domination rather than hegemony based on consent. Johnston, while using the terms “coercion” and “consent”, then reiterates the view that the employers were hegemonic, thereby partially confirming that his non-Gramscian use of the concept.

2.2.3 The spread of Gramscian influence

As compared with Section 2.2.2, where a radically different conceptualization of hegemony emerges is in a volume edited by John Allen and Doreen Massey. Through the reviews *Marxism Today* in the 1980s and *Soundings* today, Massey has long been involved with Gramscian sectors of the British left, and “hegemony” as used in this book is indeed the (or “a”) Gramscian translation of it into British culture. In contrast to the examples in 1.2.2, the Marxist economist Laurence Harris, author of one of the book’s essays, introduces a distinction between “hegemony” and “dominance”, making them near-rivals. Especially in the light of the other usages of “hegemony” in the *BNC* extracts from this book, “or”, in the comment that «This system in turn rests on and reflects the domination (or hegemony) of particular nations» (Harris 1988: 33)¹², is to be read as a choice between alternatives, not an explanatory gloss. His point here is, seem-

¹² Allen & Massey (eds.) 1988; the essays included in the BNC extract are by Laurence Harris, Doreen Massey and John Allen, in that order.

ingly, that the hegemony of a particular national economy within the world economy *leads* other nations to adopt features of the economically hegemonic nation, whereas dominance may not imply this. In the score of times “hegemony” and “hegemonic” are used in the *BNC* extracts from the book, usage conforms fairly well to the Gramscian distinction between dominance and hegemony, with perhaps three examples of overlap.

Moving from economics to education, we have a classic example of implicit Gramscian (opposed here to Althusserian) influence in Thomas’s observation: «Traditional Marxist explanations, such as that of Althusser [...] had seen education as reproducing the relations of dominance and subordinacy necessary to the maintenance of the capitalist state [... L]ater Marxist explanations [...] move away from a deterministic model towards a looser one, which emphasizes hegemony and cultural resistance» (Thomas 1990: 15). The distinction between dominance and hegemony is fundamental, with a strong implicit reference to Gramscian concepts (Thomas 1990). The extended title of Mort’s volume, commented on above, indicates a very interesting contraposition: “Dangerous sexualities. The Sanitary Principle in Dominance: Medical Hegemony and Feminist Response 1860-1880. 1. Medical Hegemony And Social Policy 1850-1870” (Mort 1987). Hegemony, of the medical hierarchy here and “purity” elsewhere, is apparently part of an overall “dominance”. This dominance (or domination)-hegemony coupling may be compared with the similar juxtaposition of Gramsci’s: «the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as ‘domination’ and as ‘intellectual and moral leadership’» (Gramsci 1971: 45) over the adversary and the allied groups respectively. The context is that of the Risorgimento, “leadership” being linked through parliamentary “transformism” to «the action of intellectual, moral and political hegemony»¹³. This latter phrase is almost certainly the source of the definition of hegemony by Furlong *et alii* (see above), who also note, in a similar conceptual juxtaposition, that «the power bloc is working to maintain the hegemony of the dominant class» (Furlong *et alii*, 1985: 69).

3. *Creative translation: the new fields of application of “hegemony”*

Section 2 of this paper has tried to illustrate the various current meanings of “hegemony” in Anglophone culture and, by comparison with the *Prison Notebooks*, show the influence there of Gramsci’s writings. We now go on to single out a number of new fields, relying again on the *BNC*, in which the concept of hegemony is presently being used in Britain, where hegemony manifests itself and where there are hegemonic struggles. This exercise helps demonstrate the application in a non-Italian culture of a concept, not uniquely but partially, and probably to a large extent, influenced by Gramsci. The proviso must however be added that, without a detailed analysis of the whole of the various extracts in which “hege-

¹³ See the extended note in Notebook 19, §24, translated as “The problem of political leadership in the development of the nation and the modern state in Italy” in Gramsci 1971, 57-58.

mony” and its adjectival forms occur, the immediate context of a few lines might on occasion lead to some uncertainty. Here we select just some of the fields where the use of hegemony seems innovatory as compared with the *Prison Notebooks* and which thus represent, as noted, not the straightforward use of the word but a creative translation of the concept, through extension of its connotations, into a target culture. Among the representative examples are the fields of the social sciences and sexuality, gender and ethnicity (where not included above); religion; the arts, including various literary and musical genres; institutions and professions, including feminist critiques of hierarchies of power and knowledge; fashion and food; and science and technology.

Referring to the most widespread ideology of all, religion, rival “catholic nationalist” and “protestant-loyalist” hegemonies figure in an analysis of Northern Ireland (Fulton 1991). Critiques of academic power structures, and the claimed subaltern position of their authors, emerge forcefully in the comment that none of the «elements of Women’s Studies material» introduced «into the curriculum which [...] has also made space for Black Studies, the teaching of race relations and working-class history [...] has posed any particular threat to the hegemony of traditional discipline and patterns of academic thought and women can be incorporated as easily as the rest» (Lovett 1988: 200). On racism and ethnicity, it is observed that ideology has created «the perceptions and beliefs in individuals deemed necessary to reproduce the political and economic structures of class and/or ethnic hegemony». Consequently «forms of discourse and power [...] establish a pervasive framework of values, beliefs, ideals and aspirations. As a result, the ideology of the dominant class – or ‘race’ – comes to be accepted as self evident ‘common sense’ by large sections of society” (Donald & Rattansi 1993: 79); this particular notion of “common sense” is quite evidently of Gramsci derivation.

In literary studies we read of one genre fighting for «its own hegemony in literature; wherever it triumphs, the older genres go into decline» (Bakhtin 1981: 3), and «anthropology, psychoanalysis, philosophy, history, cybernetics, information theory, semiotics and, of course, linguistics have all left their mark on structuralist discourse about literature. The hegemony of the linguistic model (the premise of all structuralist thought) acquires a special significance in the sphere of literature» (Jefferson & Robey 1986). On fashion and food, Diana Simmonds refers to the «hegemony of dowdiness» and that of «French cuisine (cuisine ancienne)» (Simmonds 1991: 129). Just one of many comments on hegemony in the music sphere (here relating also to ethnicity) is Sebba’s «The interpretive community formed around Rasta language and symbols, presided over and tutored in dread ethics by Marley and other outernational reggae artists, simply could not withstand these changes. Its cultural and political hegemony began to dissolve’ (Gilroy 1987: 190)» (Sebba 1993: 8). “Hegemony”, as used for literary and musical culture, is somewhat innovatory compared to Gramsci, who in these fields discusses hegemony, not so much explicitly as implicitly, often in terms of a national-popular culture partly characterized by melodrama and its manifestations in either novels or nineteenth-century opera.

4. *Some general conclusions*

This paper has analysed the uses of the terms “hegemony/egemonia” and their corresponding adjectives in the *Prison Notebooks* (*Quaderni del carcere*) of Antonio Gramsci and the *British National Corpus*. First, one notes a natural conservatism regarding the use of hegemony in one field (ancient through to early mediaeval history) that seems exempt from Gramscian influence. Second, in the *BNC* categorization of the social sciences and world affairs, Gramsci is sometimes explicitly quoted on hegemony, while at other times his influence, although evident, is implicit; in a small minority of cases, however, the use of “hegemony” is quite at odds with that of Gramsci. Third, of interest for the translation of the concept of hegemony from his paradigmatic discourse to those of Anglophone culture are the modifications, sometimes quite subtle, that the concept undergoes in this latter culture in fields analogous to those he analysed. Finally, what is of great interest for the history of ideas and the question of translation between paradigms are the ways in which, in extending the first Gramscian uses in Anglophone culture of the concept “hegemony” in fields common to those of the *Notebooks*, “hegemony” is then fruitfully employed in fields other than those in which Gramsci originally used it.

References

- Allen, John & Doreen Massey (eds.) (1988). *The Economy in Question*. London: Sage.
- Boothman, Derek (2004-2005). Le traduzioni di Gramsci in inglese e la loro ricezione nel mondo anglofono. In *TRAlinea* 7 [online], www.intralinea.it.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich (1981). Toward a methodology for the study of the novel. In: Bakhtin, Mikhail Mihailovich. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, M. Holquist (ed.), trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 3-11.
- Boothman, Derek (2008a). The Sources for Gramsci’s Concept of Hegemony. *Rethinking Marxism* 20 (2), 201-15.
- Boothman, Derek (2008b). Hegemony: Political and Linguistic Sources for Gramsci’s Concept of Hegemony. In: Howson, R. & Kylie Smith (eds.). *Hegemony. Studies in Consensus and Coercion*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Boothman, Derek (forthcoming). Gramsci nel mondo anglosassone. In: Proceedings of the conference “La lingua/le lingue di Gramsci e delle sue opere”, University of Sassari, October 2007.
- Donald, James & Ali Rattansi (1993). *Race, culture and difference*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Eley, Geoff (1984a). Reading Gramsci in English. Some Observations on the Reception of Antonio Gramsci in the English-Speaking World, 1957-1982. *CRSO Working Paper 314*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Social Organization.
- Eley, Geoff (1984b). Reading Gramsci in English. Some Observations on the Reception of Antonio Gramsci in the English-Speaking World, 1957-1982. *European History Quarterly* 4, 441-78.

- Fontana, Benedetto (1993). *Hegemony and Power. On the Relation between Gramsci and Machiavelli*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Forgacs, David (1989). Gramsci and Marxism in Britain. *New Left Review* 176 (1), 70-88.
- Fulton, John (1991). *The tragedy of belief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Furlong, Paul, Andrew Cox & Eduard Page (1985). *Power in Capitalist Society*. London: Wheatsheaf.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1985). *Selections from Cultural Writings*, ed. D. Forgacs and G. Nowell-Smith, trans. W.Q. Boelhower. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1992-present). *Prison Notebooks*, ed. by J.A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1992). *The Prison Notebooks*, vol. 1, ed. J.A. Buttigieg, trans. J.A. Buttigieg and A. Callari. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1995). *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. D. Boothman. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1996). *Prison Notebooks*, vol. 2, ed. and trans. J.A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Green, E.H.H. (1991). The Strange Death of Tory England. *Twentieth Century British History* 2, 67-88.
- Harris, Laurence (1988). The UK economy at a crossroads. In: Allen, John & Doreen Massey (eds.). *The Economy in Question*. London: Sage, 7-44.
- Jefferson, Ann & David Robey (1986). *Modern Literary Theory*. London: Batsford.
- Johnston, R.J. (1991). *A Question of Place*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kirby, D.P. (1992). *The Earliest English Kings*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Liguori, Guido (2004). Ideologia. In: Frosini, F. & G. Liguori (eds.). *Le parole di Gramsci*. Roma: Carocci, 131-49.
- Lovett, Tom (1988). *Radical approaches to adult education: A Reader*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- McCormick, Robert & M. James (1990). *Curriculum evaluation in schools*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mort, Frank (1987). *Dangerous Sexualities*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sebba, Mark (1993). *London Jamaican*. Harlow: Longman.
- Sheard K., M. Stanworth, T. Bilton, P. Jones & K. Bonnett (1992). *Introductory Sociology*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Simmonds, Diana (1991). What's next? Fashion, foodies, and the illusion of freedom. In: Tomlinson, Alan (ed.). *Consumption, identity and style: marketing, meanings, and the packaging of pleasure*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 121-138.

Smith, Steve & Martin Hollis (1990). *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, Kim (1990). *Gender and subject in higher education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Wood, Ian (1994). *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450-751*. Harlow: Longman.

Young, Malcolm (1991). *An inside job*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.