

ROUTLEDGE • TAYLOR & FRANCIS

Translation Studies *from* Routledge

A Curated Chapter Collection



Contents

Introduction: Emancipation, secret histories,
and the language of hegemony
by Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández
*From: The Routledge Handbook of Translation and
Politics, edited by Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández*



Introduction: Translation and culture
by Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding
*From: The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture,
edited by Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding*



Introduction
From: Translation and Paratexts, by Kathryn Batchelor



Introduction
by Kirsten Malmkjær and the contributors
*From: The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and
Linguistics, edited by Kirsten Malmkjær*



Introduction
From: Fictional Translators, by Rosemary Arrojo



20% Discount Available

Enjoy a 20% discount across our entire range of Linguistics and Translation books. Simply add the discount code **IATIS** at the checkout.

Please note: This discount code cannot be combined with any other discount or offer and is only valid on print titles purchased directly from www.routledge.com.

Introduction

Emancipation, secret histories, and the language of hegemony

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

Translation and politics: setting the stage

A Soviet joke claims that Karl Radek (1885–1939), a leading figure of the Communist International (Comintern) and a well-known polyglot, was once asked by a visiting delegate how he was able to interpret and translate so fluently between several languages. Slightly surprised, Radek answered, ‘I just know what people here are allowed to say’ (Lewis 2008: 60). Although probably apocryphal, the anecdote has the power to illuminate to what extent ‘translation’ and ‘politics’ have interacted through history; in just one punchline, multiple questions can be raised about communication within multilingual organizations and empires, the impact of direct and indirect censorship, or the evolution and transformation of political ideologies across languages and cultures.

For many years, the strength of this long-standing bond and mutual dependency between ‘translation’ and ‘politics’ was subject to a peculiar academic contradiction: while interest in the political role of translation grew across disciplines like social movements studies, history, sociology, diplomacy, and international politics, it was palpable that these disciplines were not necessarily engaging with the field of translation studies, and that translation studies was, conversely, not always very receptive to a dialogue with them. Thankfully, the tide seems to be changing and this *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*, which brings together scholars from a great diversity of fields, aims to make a decisive contribution to this momentum.

Locating the spaces of interaction between ‘politics’ and ‘translation’ is, however, no easy task. For a start, defining ‘politics’ has been considered a political act in itself (Leftwich 2004: 2). Like any definition, this definition will be dependent on an understanding of what its content and limits are and should be: for example, while certain approaches restrict politics to the act of governing (Peters 2004), others argue that ‘politics is everywhere’, since ‘no realm of life is immune to relations of conflict and power’ (Squires 2004: 119). As will be seen in this handbook, different objects of study favour different understandings of politics: the study of policies, for instance, has received more attention in a relatively institutionalized field like audiovisual translation (see Gottlieb, this volume) than in an all-encompassing way of life and protest such as feminism (see Castro and Ergun,

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

this volume). In spite of this, we feel that a working definition of ‘politics’ could be set out by adopting Jacques Rancière’s understanding of ‘the political’ (2004: 112–113) as a site of tensions between ‘police’ (i.e. the process of governing and organizing humans in communities subject to hierarchies and power relations) and ‘emancipation’ (the set of practices aimed at asserting and exerting equality between individuals). ‘Politics’ is, therefore, a space of oppositions between systems and individuals, hierarchy and equality, police and emancipation, that is always subject to contestation and expansion.

Similarly, ‘translation’ is also a disputed concept. First, it is frequently used to encompass two related practices: ‘translation’ and ‘interpreting’, as we will do in this introduction for convenience. At a deeper level, both researchers and ordinary users seem to be expanding the concept beyond a purely ‘linguistic’ sense to a wide understanding that also involves the translation of practices, ideologies, concepts, and values (see below and in Ban, Doerr, Liu, Xie, and Marais, among others, this volume).

Both in a restricted and an expanded sense, the interaction between ‘translation’ and ‘politics’ has been a constant throughout history, which this handbook tries to capture through the combination of historical and contemporary approaches. Following the Rancièrian understanding of ‘police’ and ‘emancipation’, it could be argued that two main lines cut across this area of study: on the one hand, how translation has contributed to the evolution and transformation of political practices (what could be properly called the ‘translation of politics’); on the other, the place of translation within political structures (‘politics of translation’), as both a political means and a politicized object. It should also be taken into account that these lines of analysis are not mutually exclusive: a political praxis largely shaped by translation, such as Marxism (Boothman 2010), can eventually evolve into a political structure that impacts and shapes translation (see Ertürk and Serin 2016 for an excellent overview; and Lacorte, Lygo, Luong, Popa, and Wang, this volume, for specific case studies). Our aim in this introduction is to consider existing work on the political nature of translation and the uses of ‘translation’ as a concept in political science and praxis, in order to set the stage for the discussions of translation and politics in this volume.

Translation as political activity

Translation is political as it affects the interactions among groups and communities (in relation to both Rancière’s notions of ‘police’ and ‘emancipation’), as well as between states, and in supranational organizations such as the European Union. Like most human actions, translation can have intended and unintended effects on other people and the environment, and what was not intentionally political can have political effects. In addition, translation and interpreting are used in many situations that are explicitly political, from state visits (where heads of state meet and use interpreters) to war (e.g. the use of interpreters by occupying forces), as well as on a daily basis in organizations like the United Nations or European Parliament. While we cannot cover every possible example of the ways in which translation has political effects in this part, we aim to demonstrate some ways in which the act of translation is political.

One of the key ways in which translation intersects with politics is by providing increased accessibility to information and services. In England, for instance, doctors’ surgeries often provide information in languages other than English for people whose home language is not English (often those who are immigrants to England). This allows access to health information and can improve quality of life. The decision to provide such translated materials is political, however, as it intersects with debates about immigration policy and questions

of multiculturalism. Not only that, but the decisions over which languages and services to offer (as it would cost too much to offer all possible ones) mean that, while some groups have improved access, others do not (or have to learn English to receive it). In different circumstances, the translation into another language of official documents and web pages, and even road signs, can affect a sense of national or local identity (see Cronin 2006). For instance, many official documents in England and Wales are available in English and Welsh, recognizing the standing of Welsh as a national language. In Ireland, there is institutional support for Irish Gaelic, including the dual presentation of road signs in English and Irish. In other instances, translation is used to make areas accessible to travellers or immigrants. In Charles de Gaulle Airport in Paris, for instance, signage now tends to be available in French, English and Chinese, while the metro in Shanghai is signposted in Chinese and English. These examples demonstrate how translation policy cannot be fully separated out from other forms of language policy (see González Núñez and Meylaerts 2017) and research on multilingual states (e.g. Wolf 2015, Meylaerts, this volume) has demonstrated the complex interplay between languages and translation in such states. Given the complexity of global demographics, with high volumes of movement of people, the political importance of translating (or not translating) for speakers of languages other than the local, national, one can only grow.

While translation can serve to include, it can also exclude. Translators can exclude material that they deem ‘unfit’ and thus stop target language readers accessing aspects of a text. An example is Howard M. Parshley’s translation of Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le deuxième sexe/The Second Sex*, which cut over ten per cent of the work, including a chapter on married women (Simons 1983). This has had an effect on the understanding of this work in anglophone academia due to the omissions made (Moi 2002). Translation can also obscure the specificity of cultures in different locales by eliding the differences between them (Mignolo 2000: 1). This may take place in any number of ways. Gayatri Spivak, for instance, argues that there is a risk that translation can make all non-Western writers sound the same, with differences between genders, statuses and ethnicities erased (Spivak 2012: 315). Emily Apter (2013) puts forward a similar critique of the discipline of world literature (where texts from around the world are generally read in translation), arguing that it can elide the differences between texts and cultures. While Spivak and Apter are dealing with literature, Eric Cheyfitz (1991) demonstrates how translating concepts of property in the North American context allowed European settlers to appropriate land, erasing Native American concepts of land use, which were not exclusive in the same way as ‘property’ is understood in English terms (Cheyfitz 1991: 57). Other postcolonial translation scholars (e.g. Niranjana 1992; Rafael 1988) have also demonstrated the potential for translation to be used as a tool of colonial rule by excluding local populations from the colonial discourse unless translated into the language of the colonizer.

One way of approaching the point between inclusion and exclusion is the idea that translation performs ‘bordering.’ This term is used by Naoki Sakai (2009: 83) to discuss the way in which translation creates borders between languages and people. Translation effectively posits that one language is different from another (see Evans and Ringrow 2017: 5); translating implies that one language is not intelligible by speakers of another. The effect of this is double-edged: it can increase access to texts through making them available in translation, but the necessity of translation can have the effect of separating out and distinguishing speakers of another language. This is especially important given the connection found so often between national language and national identity (Sakai 2009: 73), where speakers of other languages become excluded from the national public sphere or placed in a subordinate

position in it. So, translation can effectively cross borders, but at the same time it can create borders. The same action can both include and exclude.

Translation can also have a significant effect on how communities are represented and, consequently, understood. The question of representation has been addressed by many scholars not working directly on translation (e.g. Hall 1997; Said 1978), but there is also work within translation studies on the ways in which translation can affect the representation of communities (e.g. Cronin 2006). A particularly politically focused approach can be found in Mona Baker's *Translation and Conflict* (2006). Baker uses narrative theory as developed in the social sciences (as opposed to narratology: the study of narrative forms) to explore how understandings of the world are created, maintained and contested. Translating texts can alter narratives about specific communities in other communities as well as the narratives communities tell about themselves, thus affecting the ways in which people understand situations and act. This is the case for non-political texts as much as political texts, as they all contribute to a narrative understanding of a community or group.

The political potential of translation is recognized by the expanding body of work on activist translation (Boéri and Maier 2010; Tymoczko 2010; Baker 2016, among others), feminist translation (e.g. Simon 1996; von Flotow 1997; Castro and Ergun 2017; von Flotow and Farahzad 2016, among others), as well as the practices of translation in political institutions such as the European Union (Wagner, Bech and Martínez 2002; Koskinen 2008), the United Nations (Baigorri-Jalón 2004), and non-governmental organizations (e.g. Schäffner, Taciuc and Tesseur 2014). In the next part, we shall review the work in translation studies on the politics of translation.¹

A secret history of translation studies

There is a rich body of work on the relationship between translation and politics, yet it tends to belong to a 'secret history' of translation studies. This term comes from Greil Marcus's *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (1989), where Marcus uses it to discuss the history of artistic and political movements throughout the twentieth century that coalesce in punk rock. The history is 'secret' as it is not obvious: it forms, in some ways, a counter-history to the standard histories of the twentieth century (although, arguably, Marcus's history has now been incorporated into more mainstream history). The study of political aspects of translation is also a secret history that is often submerged in overviews of the discipline, but still present. By thinking of it as a 'secret history', we posit its continuity and avoid the sense of it as a new 'turn' in translation studies (see Snell Hornby 2006). It is impossible to survey all the work on translation and politics (the BITRA Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation lists over 600 items); what follows focuses on presenting key ideas and moments rather than aiming to be comprehensive.

There is a great deal of writing on translation from before the twentieth century (see Robinson 1997 for a selection from the European tradition; Cheung 2006 offers a selection of the Chinese tradition). Some of this discourse is written by diplomats, missionaries, and other politically active individuals, and deals with political aspects of translation. However, more sustained theoretical work on translation begins in the mid-twentieth century, after the Second World War, and is strongly interwoven with political events. Wartime interests in code-breaking and in the relationship between language and power affected the nascent discipline of translation studies (Tymoczko 2007: 21). Supranational organizations like the United Nations (founded 1945) and the European Economic Community (the future European Union, created in 1957) also brought a renewed interest in translation, as

such organizations, which are multilingual in nature, require translation and interpreting to function (see Schäffner this volume). At the end of the 1940s, the use of interpreters during the Nuremberg trials (1945–46) and the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal (1946–48) – both war crimes tribunals following the Second World War – greatly contributed to the development of conference-interpreting as a profession (see Gaiba 1998 on the Nuremberg Trials; Takeda 2010 on the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal). At the same time, Area Studies was developing as a subject in American academia (Rafael 2016: 149–161). Area studies trained students in languages and cultures, in order to provide area specialists for the military and intelligence services (although these cultural and linguistic skills were and are also useful for businesses, trade and diplomacy).

Despite this early connection of language learning and language services with political ends, work on translation in the 1960s (e.g. Mounin 1963; Catford 1965) often excludes the political, focusing instead on formal linguistic issues. Eugene Nida's (1964) work, in contrast, while drawing on linguistics, is based within a missionary tradition of Bible translation and the politics of that drive many of his recommendations: 'dynamic equivalence,' for example, is designed in many ways to make texts readable and understandable by new readers in order to convert them to Christianity (see Liu this volume for a discussion of the politics of missionary translation). In another example of the way in which political viewpoint influences theorizing about translation, Anthony Pym points out that the sorts of translation strategies proposed by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1958) posit a world in which languages are separate and where the translator's role is to maintain such separation through avoiding 'interference' (Pym 2016: 243). While Vinay and Darbelnet's position is not strictly political, Pym highlights an overlooked political aspect to the perception of the relationships between languages and cultures. As Pym (2016: 244) goes on to note, relationships between cultures and languages currently tend to be understood as 'asymmetrical,' meaning that those earlier strategies for avoiding interference may no longer be functional.

Analysis of the link between translation and politics increases significantly in the late 1980s and early 1990s as the discipline of translation studies expands and develops. Three main areas where this development occurs are ideology, postcolonial studies and minority languages (in reality, there is significant overlap between these topics but we have divided them here for clarity).

Translation has frequently been connected to politics through the concept of ideology. Ideology, as Ian Mason defines it, is 'the set of beliefs and values which inform an individual's or institution's view of the world and assist their interpretation of events, facts and other aspects of experience' (Mason 2010: 86). Mason's definition is very open and differs somewhat from the definition in political theory (see e.g. Althusser 1971; Žižek 1989), but also suggests that ideology can include politics, religion and other grand narratives, all of which can affect how a translation is written and received. André Lefevere's elaboration of the notions of patronage and ideology in *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992) develops an understanding of how external factors influence translations, both through financial and other forms of support (patronage) and through the ideological position of translators and other agents in the production of translation (publishers, editors, etc.). These may lead to (self-) censorship in explicit or implicit forms (see Merkle, this volume). Also published in 1992, *Rethinking Translation*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, aimed to bring questions of ideology into the discussion of translation, focusing on ideas of gender, postcoloniality and alterity (all key ideas in critical theory). These concepts have continued to be of strong interest in translation studies and all of them deal with the political nature of translation. Indeed, a powerful strand of politically engaged feminist

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

translation studies develops in the same period (see Castro and Ergun, this volume). Edited collections such as *Translation Power Subversion* (Álvarez and Vidal 1996) and *Translation and Power* (Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002) continued the analysis of ideology and politics in translation, bringing in questions of how power in various forms affects translation and how translators can resist it. Sonia Cunico and Jeremy Munday (2007: 141) criticized early work on translation and ideology for being focused on literature, while the study of ideology in other domains has much to offer translation studies (and has developed to some extent since their comments). While ideology is an umbrella term for political stances in translation, there is more specific work on different aspects of political translation.

Postcolonial approaches to translation, that is, those that study the effects of colonialism and its legacies on translation practice and, to a lesser extent, the role of translation in colonial practices and processes of decolonization, also developed rapidly in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Importantly, many of the pioneering scholars in this area worked in other disciplines than translation studies (e.g. anthropology, history, literature), though their impact has been clearly felt in translation studies. Talal Asad's essay 'The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology' (1986) is an influential early study that focuses on the asymmetries of power in anthropology, especially in terms of representing and speaking for the cultures under study. Asad does not deal specifically with translation in the written sense of one text translating another one in a different language, but the issues of representation and power that he highlights are equally important for interlingual translation. Books by Vicente Rafael (1988), Tejaswini Niranjana (1992) and Eric Cheyfitz (1991) offered nuanced and theoretically sophisticated approaches to translation as part of colonialism in, respectively, the Philippines, India and North America. They were complemented by investigations by scholars such as Samia Mehrez (1992) and Richard Jacquemond (1992), both working on the North African Arabic context, as well as Gayatri Spivak (2012, first published 1993), who combines feminist and postcolonial approaches. Anthologies from the late 1990s and turn of the century, such as *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (Bassnett and Trivedi 1999) and *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era* (Simon and St. Pierre 2000) helped to cement the importance of research on postcolonial aspects of translation in mainstream translation studies.

One area where postcolonial theory had an immediate influence was the discussion of minority languages and translation. Minority languages – also called by some scholars *minoritized* languages, emphasizing the active role of power in their condition – posit an unequal relationship between two (or more) languages spoken in a nation, although the situation is often more complex than this, especially when one or more languages involved are the result of colonialism. The discussion of minority languages begins to gather weight in the French-speaking Canadian province of Quebec, where issues of translation were particularly visible. Early work by Annie Brisset (1989) focused on the problem of translating into French for the stage in Quebec. Taking a postcolonial position, the use of metropolitan ('French') French in Quebec was avoided in preference for a more local form of French. The literary politics of Canada are also discussed in early work by Sherry Simon (1990), where she examines the way in which translations are positioned in translators' prefaces. Further work on minority languages expanded the focus to look at relations between Irish and English (Cronin 1995), using a postcolonial perspective to discuss the position of Irish in Ireland and the role of translation into Irish. In other multilingual states, the position of the smaller or less spoken languages and translation is also politically fraught and translation theory increasingly responded to this throughout the 1990s. The special issue of *The Translator* on translation and minority, edited by Lawrence Venuti (1998), contains, for

instance, essays on African languages, Catalan, Eastern European languages and other case studies. A shift takes place in the scholarship to reading the political asymmetries of language usage globally, with English seen as the hegemonic language and other languages as having less cultural power; the ramifications of this for translation are explored in more recent scholarship on English as a lingua franca and translation (e.g. Taviano 2013; for interpreting, see e.g. Albl-Mikasa 2013). Other work on minority languages includes studies of language varieties used in audiovisual translation (e.g. Armstrong and Federici 2006), while Michaela Wolf's (2015) research on translation and interpreting in the Habsburg Empire gives the question an historical depth.

In the new millennium, translation studies has increasingly dealt with political aspects of translation in the form of translation and conflict. Mona Baker's *Translation and Conflict* (2006), mentioned above, is a significant contribution to this debate. Emily Apter explicitly links her reflections on translation in *The Translation Zone* (2006) to the aftermath of the September 11th 2001 attacks on New York (where terrorists hijacked planes and flew them into the World Trade Centre towers in lower Manhattan). The political scene of the early 2000s was also affected by the war on terror and wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. These have provided much food for thought for scholars working on translation and interpreting (see e.g. Rafael 2010, 2016; Salama-Carr 2007; Footitt and Kelly, this volume) and have caused a reassessment of the role of translators and interpreters in conflict. As mentioned earlier, research linking translation and activism has also expanded in the last 20 years in the areas of political activism (see Carcelén-Estrada, this volume) and feminism (see Castro and Ergun, this volume).

In parallel to much of this research on politics in translation, scholars working predominantly in other disciplines (such as area studies and comparative literature) have also built up a body of work that examines the political role of translation. Lydia Liu's work examines how translated concepts brought new ideas and terms into Chinese in early twentieth-century China (Liu 1995). Her *The Clash of Empires* (Liu 2004) explores the role of translation in the nineteenth century in China, focusing on the translation of international law and its discourse of sovereignty and how this was received in China. Liu's work seldom engages with mainstream translation studies (as was also the case for early scholars of postcolonial translation), but her writing demonstrates the sorts of critical work that translation can undertake. Naoki Sakai's work on translation investigates its influence on nation-building, especially in the context of Japan, where translation from Chinese was used in the eighteenth century to delineate differences between Chinese and Japanese (Sakai 1997: 40–72). Important innovations in Sakai's work include the notion of the 'regime of translation', which Sakai sees as an imaginary symmetry between languages (in Sakai's case, Chinese and Japanese) and which views languages as unities, even when they are heterogeneous and made up of multiple dialects, as both Chinese and Japanese are (Sakai 1997: 51–52). Combined with his 'schema of co-figuration' (Sakai 1997: 52), which posits the way in which languages and cultures construct each other (Sakai's example is how, by discussing Japanese thought, both Japan and the West need to be conceptualized), Sakai's work offers a profoundly political rethinking of many of the bases of translation theory. Sakai's notions of homolingual and heterolingual address (1997: 1–17) also complicate translation as a practice, questioning what sorts of community are addressed by texts (both in and out of translation; see also Sakai and Solomon 2006). Douglas Robinson has recently termed the research by Liu, Sakai and Jon Solomon as 'Critical Translation Studies' (Robinson 2017). However, this group can be expanded to include other scholars, such as Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, whose *Border as Method* (2013) analyses the proliferating borders of late capitalism and the role

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

that translators play in relation to them. Mezzadra and Sakai also edited a special issue of the journal *translation* on translation and politics (Mezzadra and Sakai 2014), containing essays by Liu and Solomon, among others. Other scholars working in comparative literature and film studies, on the political aspects of translation, include Emily Apter (2006, 2013) and Rey Chow (1995, 2014). All these scholars tend to overlook or not cite mainstream translation studies (with some occasional exceptions) but their work offers rich resources for deepening the understanding of the relationship between translation and politics, as does the work using the concept of ‘translation’ in political praxis and science.

Translation in political thought

Political science has seldom interacted with translation studies as a field, yet the centrality of translation and interpreting in politics has led many relevant thinkers to conceptualize political processes in terms of ‘translation’, which opens the path to potential areas of interdisciplinary exchange, but also exchanges between scholars and practitioners.

Although these reflections have emerged at different times and from different traditions within the global Left, a common thread runs through them: the need to establish a shared political language that allows understanding between a variety of social agents while encouraging social transformation. A central reference for this strand of thought is Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), a major Marxist thinker and a figure of central relevance in the Italian Communist Party. Gramsci had a keen interest in languages, dialects, and translation due to his political experience (see Carlucci 2013); as a Communist cadre, he dealt with a wide range of social classes (workers, peasants, intellectuals) that possessed highly diverging sociolects and worldviews, while as a delegate to the Comintern he engaged with other cadres from many other countries and languages.

During his years of imprisonment under fascism, Gramsci devoted an important part of his well-known *Prison Notebooks* (written 1929–1935, see Gramsci 1988) to the study of language and translation from a Marxist perspective; however, due to the fragmentary nature of these writings and sketches, his reflections on translation are far from systematic and, in some cases, might have aged less well than others. Hence the importance of Peter Ives and Rocco Lacorte’s edited volume *Gramsci, Language, and Translation* (2010), an invaluable reconstruction of Gramsci’s linguistic and translational thought that combines classic and contemporary studies of his work. Both Boothman (2010) and Lacorte’s (2010) contributions are fundamental to apprehend the full force of Gramsci’s ideas of ‘translation’ and ‘translatability’. Firmly rooted in a Marxist tradition that would also encompass Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin, Gramsci sees the possibility of translation between cultural, philosophical, and political paradigms as a central element for, but also a barrier to, intellectual and political development. In Gramsci’s view, the translation between systems has ‘limits’ that are ‘determined by the fundamental nature’ (Gramsci, cited in Boothman 2010: 122) of these systems; the superior nature of Marxism – or the ‘philosophy of praxis,’ as he calls it in his prison writings to avoid censorship – lies precisely in its ability to successfully translate concepts and elements from various other disciplines and paradigms. However, Gramsci was also clearly aware of the practical limits that Marxist political applications faced in the absence of a proper understanding of translation. Discussing a reflection by Lenin on the Comintern (‘We have not been able to “translate” our language into the “European” languages’, Lichtner 2010: 197–198), Gramsci remarks how certain Comintern resolutions were too strongly based on ‘Russian conditions’ and, therefore, were untranslatable to other European countries. Yet political change was not only dependent on translation at a

transnational level. As Gramsci emphasizes, translation between different political languages is essential in the successful construction of ‘hegemony’ – the moral and social leadership of one given class above the others (Gramsci 1988: 189–221) – as it allows the emergence of a new, shared political language that builds on the various theories and models that exist within a given society (Lacorte 2010: 218–221).

The use of ‘translation’ as a political concept progressively increased at the turn of the twenty-first century, due to a growing awareness to the importance of dialogue and understanding between different constituencies. Analyzing the role of intellectuals in the contemporary world, sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1987: 127–148) claimed that postmodernity established a decisive shift, as the intellectual is no longer understood as a ‘legislator’ (who provides the rules or laws that others must follow) but rather as an ‘interpreter’ who can facilitate communication between different social groups thanks to her/his expertise ‘in translation between cultural traditions’ (143). This notion of critical dialogue is also paramount in Judith Butler’s highly influential contribution to *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality. Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, a series of exchanges between Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek (2000). In her first two chapters of this book (2000a, 2000b), Butler argues that ‘universality’, i.e. reciprocal recognition between groups and cultures, will only be achieved in our time ‘of hybrid cultures and vacillating national boundaries’ if it is ‘a universality forged through the work of cultural translation’ (Butler 2000a: 20). Therefore, a fundamental task for democratic movements is to establish:

practices of translation among competing notions of universality which, despite any apparent logical incompatibility, may nevertheless belong to an overlapping set of social and political claims. Indeed, it seems to me that one of the tasks of the present Left is precisely to see what basis of commonality there might be among existing movements, but to find such a basis without recourse to transcendental claims.

Butler 2000b: 167, italics in the original

Translation is thus placed as a constitutive practice for political alliances, as it establishes both the limits and the commonalities between various political subjects; to a certain extent, this understanding of translation as a tool for the creation of political platforms seems to adapt the translational nature of Gramsci’s ‘hegemony’ for our times, yet with the crucial addition of placing inclusiveness and mutual recognition at its very core. This challenging formulation bears strong similarities with those formulated later by theorists such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2006: 131–147) in his study of the World Social Forum or Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2009: 340–351); for related discussions, see also Fernández (2018) and Xie and Doerr in this volume.

Finally, the notion of translation has also been fundamental for emerging actors in the political field during the wave of protests that have swept the world since the start of the current economic and social crisis (following the banking crisis that began in 2008). For instance, activist Mark Bray, who took part in the Occupy Wall Street protests of 2011, defined Occupy as ‘a vehicle for translating anarchy to a society that was generally receptive to many anarchist ideas but wary of its ideological trappings’ (Bray 2013: 5). This notion of ‘translation’ as a process of communication that goes beyond the limits of fixed ideologies in order to find commonality between social groups has also been central for the Spanish political party Podemos, founded in 2014 and inspired by the ‘indignados’ protests of 2011. A key part of Podemos’s strategy was in itself the product of multiple processes of translation, as many among its founders aimed at translating the Latin American ‘populist’ experiences

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

to the Spanish context using a political framework that was largely indebted to Gramsci and Laclau. At the same time, ‘translation’ has been a fundamental tool to conceptualize their political praxis. According to their Secretary General, Pablo Iglesias, ‘communication is a pivotal work of translation’, as politicians need to transform their ‘diagnosis into a discourse that people can understand, using words that are useful to explain things’ (Iglesias cited in Fernández, 2018). This notion of ‘translation’, which seems at first to be distant from the sort of linguistic translation familiar to translation studies, shares a common goal of finding ways in which to communicate ideas to different audiences.

Overview of this handbook

This handbook aims to link together these wide-ranging discussions of translation and politics. We have set out to provide an overview of the key ideas and tendencies. It is impossible to cover everything: while we have attempted to be inclusive, the content is shaped by our own interests as well as the sense of a critical mass of work in the field. The book consists of four thematic parts: (1) Translation and political ideas, (2) Translation and structures of power, (3) Politics of translation and (4) Case studies.

The first part includes essays which explore the dynamics of the translation and circulation of political ideas (such as Marxism, democracy, feminism, among others) and how these ideas intersect with and affect translation practice. The second part focuses on ways in which translation is used and affected by structures of power (which might have also been shaped by translation in the first instance), as well as the way in which it can be used to resist power. Chapters in this part analyse the effects of external events on translators’ and interpreters’ behaviour and the ways in which translators and interpreters are caught up in the currents of power, whether through resistance or compliance. Chapters in the third part focus on the politics of translation in specific fields and domains, ranging from the role of politics in translators’ associations to the politics of literary and audiovisual translation, localization and the translation of popular music. Finally, the fourth part focuses on case studies of the relationship between translation and politics at specific periods and in specific locales. These demonstrate through example the relevance of thinking of translation as a political act, making concrete in many ways the discussion in other chapters. Obviously, it is impossible to cover all time periods and locations, but we have aimed for a global selection and a historical range that extends from the Classical Mediterranean to contemporary India and Arab countries, via Medieval Europe, Meiji Japan, twentieth-century China and Vietnam.

Chapters throughout the book aim to give an overview of the issues at stake as well as examples demonstrating these in practice. Each chapter aims to provide a critical introduction to the topic at hand while suggesting potential future paths for study and research. Chapters should be accessible for undergraduate and postgraduate students, but also offer insights to researchers and scholars. We can see their use in a number of classroom situations, as initial readings to introduce students to a topic or as further reading that gives another perspective on the topic at hand. Not all readers will read the whole book and it has been designed so that readers can go straight to their area of interest. Chapters have suggestions for further reading and for other relevant chapters in the handbook; therefore, we encourage readers to explore topics beyond their own immediate interests, developing a wider understanding of the intersections between politics and translation.

The chapters in the handbook all focus on translation but are not limited to translation studies approaches; contributors work in a variety of areas across the humanities, including translation studies, literary studies, politics, economics, classics, modern and medieval

languages, development studies and area studies. As we argued at the beginning of this introduction, politics and translation have been strongly interwoven throughout history; going beyond fixed disciplines is, therefore, necessary to properly illuminate the bond between them. We hope that this handbook can further stimulate interdisciplinary dialogue about translation and politics.

Note

- 1 There are also the politics of translation studies to consider (see e.g. Pym 2006), both in terms of individual scholars (who can be more or less politically active individuals) and the institutionalised form of the discipline itself, which has often been criticised of Eurocentrism (see e.g. van Doorslaer and Flynn 2013). However, this is beyond the scope of this introduction.

References

- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2013) 'Teaching Globish? The need for an ELF pedagogy in interpreter training'. *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(1), 3–16.
- Althusser, L. (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books, pp. 121–176.
- Álvarez, R. and M. C.-África Vidal (eds), (1996) *Translation Power Subversion*. Cleveland, OH: Multilingual Matters.
- Apter, E. (2006) *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Apter, E. (2013) *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London: Verso.
- Armstrong, N. and F. Federici (eds), (2006) *Translating Voices, Translating Regions*. Rome: Aracne.
- Asad, T. (1986) 'The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology' in James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 141–164.
- Baigorri-Jalón, J. (2004) *Interpreters at the United Nations: A History*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Baker, M. (2006) *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (ed.) (2016) *Translating Dissent: Voices from and with the Egyptian Revolution*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. and H. Trivedi (eds) (1999) *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1987) *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Boéri, J. and C. Maier (eds) (2010) *Compromiso Social y Traducción/Interpretación Translation/ Interpreting and Social Activism*. Granada: ECOS Traductores e Intérpretes por la Solidaridad.
- Boothman, D. (2010) 'Translation and Translatability: Renewal of the Marxist Paradigm' in Peter Ives and Rocco Lacorte (eds), *Gramsci, Language, and Translation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 107–133.
- Bray, M. (2013) *Translating Anarchy: The Anarchism of Occupy Wall Street*. London: Zero Books.
- Brisset, A. (1989) 'In Search of a Target Language: The Politics of Theatre Translation in Quebec'. *Target* 1(1), 9–27.
- Butler, J. (2000a) 'Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism' in J. Butler, E. Laclau and S. Žižek (eds), *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality. Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, pp. 11–43.
- Butler, J. (2000b) 'Competing Universalities' in J. Butler, E. Laclau and S. Žižek (eds), *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality. Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, pp. 136–181.
- Carlucci, A. (2013) *Gramsci and Languages: Unification, Diversity, Hegemony*. Leiden: Brill.

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

- Castro, O. and E. Ergun (eds) (2017) *Feminist Translation Studies: Local and Transnational Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Catford, J.C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheung, M. P. Y. (ed.) (2006) *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation, Volume 1: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Cheyfitz, E. (1991) *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chow, R. (1995) *Primitive Passions: Visuality, Sexuality, Ethnography and Contemporary Chinese Film*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chow, R. (2014) *Not Like A Native Speaker: On Linguaging as a Postcolonial Experience*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cronin, M. (1995) 'Altered States: Translation and Minority Languages'. *TTR* 8(1), 85–103.
- Cronin, M. (2006) *Translation and Identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cunico, S. and J. Munday (2007) 'Encounters and Clashes: Introduction to Translation and Ideology'. *The Translator* 13(2), 141–149.
- Ertürk, N. and Ö. Serin (2016) 'Marxism, Communism, and Translation: An Introduction'. *boundary* 2 43(3): 1–26.
- Evans, J. and H. Ringrow (2017) 'Introduction: Borders in Translation and Intercultural Communication'. *Transcultural* 9 (2), 1–12. <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/tc/index.php/TC/article/view/29356> (accessed 10 October 2017).
- Fernández, F. (2018) 'Podemos: politics as a "task of translation"'. *Translation Studies* 11(1), 1–16.
- Gaiba, F. (1998) *The Origins of Simultaneous Interpretation: The Nuremberg Trial*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- González Núñez, G. and R. Meylaerts (eds) (2017) *Translation and Public Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1988) *The Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916–1935*. Edited and translated by David Forgacs. New York: Schocken Books.
- Hall, S. (ed.) (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: SAGE.
- Ives, P. and R. Lacorte (eds) (2010) *Gramsci, Language, and Translation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Jacquemond, R. (1992) 'Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation'. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*. London: Routledge, pp. 139–159.
- Koskinen, K. (2008) *Translating Institutions: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Lacorte, R. (2010) 'Translatability, Language and Freedom in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*.' In Peter Ives and Rocco Lacorte (eds) *Gramsci, Language, and Translation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 213–224.
- Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Leftwich, A. (2004) 'Thinking politically: On the politics of Politics' in Adrian Leftwich (ed.) *What Is Politics? The Activity and Its Study*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 1–22.
- Lewis, B. (2008) *Hammer & Tickle: The History of Communism Told Through Communist Jokes*. London: Phoenix.
- Lichtner, M. (2010) 'Translations and Metaphors in Gramsci' in Peter Ives and Rocco Lacorte (eds) *Gramsci, Language, and Translation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 187–212.
- Liu, L. H. (1995) *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity – China 1900–1937*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Liu, L. H. (1999) 'Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century' in Lydia H. Liu (ed.) *Tokens of Exchange*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 127–164.
- Liu, L. (2004) *The Clash of Empires: The Invention of China in Modern World Making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Marcus, G. (1989) *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mason, I. (2010) 'Discourse, Ideology and Translation' in Mona Baker (ed.) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 83–95.
- Mehrez, S. (1992) 'Translation and the Postcolonial Experience: The Francophone North African Text' in Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*. London: Routledge, pp. 120–138.
- Mezzadra, S. and B. Neilson (2013) *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mezzadra, S. and N. Sakai (eds) (2014) *Translation and Politics*. Special issue of *translation*, 4. <http://translation.fusp.it/issues/issue-4> (last accessed 2 August 2017).
- Mignolo, W. (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Moi, T. (2002) 'While We Wait: The English Translation of *The Second Sex*.' *Signs* 27(4): 1005–1035.
- Mounin, G. (1963) *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Negri, A. and M. Hardt (2009) *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nida, E. (1964) *Towards a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Niranjana, T. (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Peters, B. G. (2004) 'Politics is about governing' in Adrian Leftwich (ed.) *What is Politics? The Activity and its Study*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 23–40.
- Pym, A. (2006) 'Globalisation and the Politics of Translation Studies'. *Meta* 51 (4), 744–757.
- Rafael, V. (1988) *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rafael, V. (2010) 'Translation in Wartime' in Mona Baker (ed.) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 383–390.
- Rafael, V. (2016) *Motherless Tongues: The Insurgency of Language amid Wars of Translation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rancière, J. (2004) *Aux bords du politique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Robinson, D. (ed.) (1997) *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Robinson, D. (2017) *Critical Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sakai, N. (1997) *Translation and Subjectivity: On 'Japan' and Cultural Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sakai, N. (2009) 'How Do We Count a Language? Translation and Discontinuity'. *Translation Studies* 2(1), 71–88.
- Sakai, N. and J. Solomon (2006) 'Introduction: Addressing the Multitude of Foreigners, Echoing Foucault'. *Traces* 4, 1–35.
- Salama-Carr, M. (ed.) (2007) *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Santos, B. de Sousa (2006) *The Rise of the Global Left: The World Social Forum and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.
- Schäffner, C., L. Sabina Taciuc and W. Tesseur (2014) 'Translation practices in political institutions: a comparison of national, supranational, and non-governmental organisations', *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 22(4), 493–510.
- Simon, S. (1990) 'Translating the Will to Knowledge: Prefaces and Canadian Literary Politics' in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds). *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Cassell, pp. 110–117.
- Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge.

Jonathan Evans and Fruela Fernández

- Simon, S. and P. St. Pierre (eds) (2000) *Changing the Terms: Translation in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Simons, M. A. (1983) 'The silencing of Simone de Beauvoir guess what's missing from the second sex'. *Women's Studies International Forum* 6(5): 559–564.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Spivak, G. C. (2012). 'The Politics of Translation'. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 3rd edition. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 312–330.
- Squires, J. (2004) 'Politics beyond boundaries: a feminist perspective' in Adrian Leftwich (ed.) *What is Politics? The Activity and its Study*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 119–134.
- Takeda, K. (2010) *Interpreting the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal: A Sociopolitical Analysis*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Taviano, S. (ed.) (2013). *English as a Lingua Franca and Translation*. Special issue of *Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7(2).
- Tymoczko, M. (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Tymoczko, M. (ed.) (2010) *Translation, Activism, Resistance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Tymoczko, M. and E. Gentzler (eds) (2002) *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Van Doorslaer, L. and P. Flynn (eds) (2013) *Eurocentrism in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (ed.) (1992) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*. London: Routledge
- Venuti, L. (ed.) (1998) *Translation and Minority*. Special issue of *The Translator* 4(2).
- Vinay, J-P, and J. Darbelnet (1958) *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier.
- Von Flotow, L. (1997) *Translation and Gender: translating in the 'era of feminism'*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Von Flotow, L. and F. Farahzad (eds) (2016) *Translating Women: Different Voices and New Directions*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wagner, E., S. Bech and J. M. Martínez (2002) *Translating for the European Union Institutions*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Wolf, M. (2015). *The Habsburg Monarchy's Many-Languaged Soul: Translating and Interpreting, 1848–1918*, trans. Kate Sturge. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Žižek, S. (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.

Introduction

Translation and culture

Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding

The last four decades of development in translation studies have witnessed a great revolution that some authors have termed a ‘cultural shift’. Far from being simply a matter of contrastive linguistics, translation is now regarded as a complex interlinguistic and intercultural process where the context of communication is of foremost importance. This has spawned several diverse lines of research that have contributed to the coming of age of the discipline.

Through translation, other voices and other cultural realities enter and interact with the target culture(s). Thus, the many and varied relationships between source and target cultures, including cultural representations, the circulation, selection, adaptation and intervention of narratives in and about cultures, and the roles of translation and interpreting in mediating, appeasing and inflaming conflict situations between cultures are all of primary interest in contemporary translation studies. The cultural view in translation studies also emphasises how translation is fundamental to the development and evolution of cultural identities and traditions, in the establishing of canons and their transformations, as a site of creativity and subversion, or a tool for the powerful and the disempowered, the majority status quo and minority voices.

Contemporary translation studies, therefore, has developed a significant body of literature investigating various connections between translation and culture. Some of these deal with broad definitions and key concepts, including ‘culture’ and ‘translation’ themselves, as well as others such as ‘identity’, ‘meaning’, ‘power’, ‘space’, ‘nation’, ‘religion’, ‘ideology’, ‘censorship’, ‘conflict’ and ‘resistance’. These are all large abstractions used across disciplines that, nevertheless, sometimes acquire specific meanings in translation studies. Others are theoretically and empirically related to neighbouring fields of intellectual inquiry, such as anthropology, area studies, critical discourse analysis, history, intercultural studies, international geopolitics, literature and the arts, narrative theory, organisational and professional environments, postcolonialism, sociology, religious studies, etc. Here, the discipline of translation studies brings a critical eye to translations and translators often overlooked in these fields.

Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding

The aim of this handbook is to collect into a single volume a comprehensive overview of these developments and ways in which translation studies has both informed, and been informed by, these diverse approaches to culture and their key debates. Thus, the volume of 32 chapters is organised into five sections dealing with essential aspects of the theory and practice of translation from a cultural perspective: (1) core issues and topics; (2) translation and cultural narratives; (3) translation and social contexts; (4) translation and cultural creativity; and (5) translation and culture in professional settings. With these broad topics, we have deliberately avoided, where possible, overt overlaps with other perspectives (such as translation and linguistics or translation and cognitive science) that are likely to be the subject matter of other volumes in the handbook series. The sections in our book are specifically related to cultural approaches proper.

We are aware that the section and chapter headings are not as typical or as conventional as those found in the comparable handbooks described above. This is intentional. We have, through considered conversation, purposely designed the headings of each section and of each chapter in such a way as to bring new insights and original approaches into the description and discussion of these topics. While from the beginning of the project, we understood that this makes each chapter a challenging and demanding commission for each of our contributors—a deliberate mix of established academics, emerging scholars and promising new voices—we were also convinced that this will make each assignment more inviting and interesting, giving authors a space in which to innovatively explore topics and ideas and bring something fresh to the field. We wanted our contributors and readers alike to not only find the grounding overview of a topic expected from a reference book such as this one, but also to discover new connections, interstices, overlaps, resonances, contradictions and differences between familiar topics, that is, new paths by which to traverse familiar terrain. That during the editing process many contributors entered into conversation with us about the titles of their commissioned chapters and the ways in which they might approach and respond to their task, is some evidence, we hope, that our initial aims to facilitate and encourage fresh thinking have been met. We also trust the volume will continue the realisation of these aims among a wide audience now that it is, at last, in the hands of our readers.

Trying to find a correlation between modes of translation and cultural manifestations is not easy by any means. In fact, any attempt at a theory of cultural translation tends to identify itself with a theory of translation proper, or a theory of cultural communication at large. Isn't translation always *cultural*? There is indeed a danger that a handbook of cultural translation would, therefore, perilously coincide with a general overview of translation.

However, it is possible to present a personal mapping of what we understand about the relationships between translation and culture in the context of contemporary approaches. Thus, this collection explores and presents a comprehensive overview of those aspects recently developed in translation studies that tackle cultural issues as one of their prime concern. We have also endeavoured to include perspectives that are marginal to translation studies or which have been altogether developed in other fields, but that cross-cut the study or application of translation from a cultural point of view, and that also contribute to the expansion of our discipline.

Nevertheless, our view—or rather what we consider to be the shared contemporary understanding of the relationship between translation and culture—is contingent and in this sense has to be provisional. It cannot be otherwise. It depends on the moment (and even the geographical location) in which the structure and ideas of the handbook were conceived, the moment in which the authors have written their chapters, the position of their subfield in the discipline, their physical habitation in specific places and institutions, their (often complex)

location between languages, cultural traditions, academic traditions, and even national definitions. In this sense, we can say that this moment (like all moments) is a moment of transition and incompleteness in translation studies, and our handbook reflects it to a great extent.

Perhaps the most crucial aspect is to provide a working definition of *culture* (and, obviously, of *cultural translation*) that lays the backbone and articulates the volume's overall approach. Is culture a *factor*? Is culture a *dimension* of translation proper? Does *culture* even exist at all? In one of the chapters included in this volume (Chapter 13), Martín Ruano warns that 'culture' 'is never more than a totalising fiction'. In fact, a common thread throughout the volume is the notion that culture is a social construction, configured as sets of knowledge practices that are epistemically specific (that is, specific to locally coherent social domains). Other master lines might be the construction of a signifying setting or what we might call a *state*: a state of belonging (identity), a state of meaning, positioning, a status quo, and the power of translation in facilitating the appearance of new states, new transactional instances of social meaning that by convention are called cultures.

Our approach is eclectic. It is functional, in the sense that translation is an activity that responds to particular needs to act in particular contexts: the translated text—the translative action—is driven by contextual requisites, ideological and pragmatic purposes. It is constructivist, in the sense that translation is a creative force that is socially construed, and it definitely points to the provisional and contingent nature of (cultural) equivalence. Indeed, a common feature of all authors in the handbook is the acknowledgement that many of the concepts commonly used in translation theory, starting with translation and culture themselves, are problematic.

Some areas still need more development, but they fall beyond the scope of this volume for now and may be the subject of specific handbooks or a revised future version. The textual construction of culture, language and translation, for example, has been hinted at throughout this volume (see references to CDA, ideology, etc.); however, a comprehensive account of the textual construction of culture in translation could be found in a specific volume dedicated to discourse analysis and translation. We are also aware that, in spite of our best efforts to diversify perspectives, contributions remain overwhelmingly from scholars and practitioners affiliated with European and North American institutions. This perhaps reflects the limitations of our own positions in the field as well as the challenge to successfully commission specialised chapters from already over-committed academics and professionals. Nevertheless, even European and North American institutions are culturally diverse places and one should never assume a flat correspondence between national borders and academic and professional interests and expertise. The following chapter summary that makes up the remainder of this introduction provides ample evidence, we trust, of this heterogeneity and the inter- and intra-cultural work that characterises our ever-growing field.

Part I: Core issues and topics

The volume is divided into five broad parts. Part I includes five chapters that revolve around concepts which we consider fundamental to understanding the dimensions of culture in the recontextualisation of meaning that we call 'translation'. The four dimensions included as separate chapters are intertwined: power is closely related with identity and space; space with positioning; meaning with social and discursive constructions, and all of them contribute to the establishment of meaningful and coherent shared frames that we conventionally call 'cultural'. In this volume's approach, culture is created through translation at the same time that translation is determined by cultural factors. All chapters in this part share a critical

questioning of old concepts that were once widely, if problematically, accepted, chiefly the concepts of equivalence and fidelity above cultural differences,

The first chapter, **David Katan**'s 'Defining culture, defining translation', starts with the caveat that the task of defining culture and translation can move 'from difficult to extremely political', yet he attempts a definition of both complex ideas. As regards translation, Katan's discussion takes the reader from a first emphasis on 'similarity, difference and mediation', to the crisis of the 'conduit metaphor' and hence of 'equivalence', a central concept for most of twentieth-century translation studies, and finally the thoroughgoing idea that translation is 'no longer defined as a derivative activity', but as a 'creative rewriting', a 'transcreation'. From the concept of translation as ideology and politics, he traces the evolution towards the active participation of the translator in the construction of reality, and then to translation as activism, engagement and resistance. In its turn, defining culture, Katan investigates some key definitions and fluid models of culture from anthropology, sociology and cultural studies as well as the ways translation studies has been itself influenced by them: technical culture, formal culture, informal culture, culture as dynamic, and very relevant theoretical frameworks such as Goffman's frame analysis or narrative theory, among others.

The second chapter, **Esperança Bielsa**'s chapter on 'Identity', focuses on the importance, but also the challenges, of the idea of 'identity' to define the relationship between translation and culture. Bielsa carries out a deconstruction of identity's essentialism—and therefore a problematisation of the concept of 'culture'—into the idea of 'strangeness' as a consequence of globalisation: 'Under these circumstances, identity can easily devolve into an experience of globalisation that leads to disconnection and closure rather than openness.' It is worth noting her key idea of translation and transformation in a dynamic exchange rather than monolithic binary relations, which leads her to refer to a politics of translation, that can provide 'a vital alternative to a politics of identity', so that the key to coexistence in heterogeneous societies would lie in the very practices of cultural translation, rather than in the emphasis of difference and the entrenchment of identity traits.

In the third chapter, 'Meaning', **Ricardo Muñoz Martín** and **Ana María Rojo López** provide a different perspective of the interaction between translation and culture. Meaning, as they say, 'is a social phenomenon'. From a cognitive point of view, meaning—and therefore cultural meanings, understood as 'the systematisation of accumulated experience'—are negotiated in communication. The chapter is a very useful instrument to situate how we build meanings both in communication events and in our shared (cultural) representations, and how views on meaning have been essential in the theorisation of translation and its underlying ideas: fidelity, literality, translatability or untranslatability, equivalence in classical, twentieth-century and previous theories of translation, and the more recent cognitive-oriented approaches that explore cognitive structures and operations like categorisation, salient structures (prototypes) and the empirical instruments and methods to assess them.

M^a Carmen África Vidal Claramonte's chapter on 'Power' draws from fertile theorisations influenced by contemporary epistemology, in which old concepts and definitions, such as fidelity, neutrality, equivalence and homogeneity, have been challenged, resulting in 'new approaches and redefinitions of translation resulting from culturally determined and power-related interpretations'. Drawing from Foucault, she defines power as a 'strategy', as 'manoeuvres and tactics'. Therefore, if at all, the interaction between translation and culture, if not the actual 'reality' of culture, is characterised by dynamism. Culture, in the end, whether understood as adscription and belonging (identity), as the creation and management of signic value (meaning), or as the deployment of politics (power), is characterised by translation, by translative processes. Vidal's discussion about power as an essential dimension of

translation and culture is based on the wider critique of reality: for her, power is the control or, rather, ‘exercise of re-presentations’, through which identities, beliefs, and also authority and political interests, are defended and constructed. She traces the connection between translation and power and also how this dimension has become a focal point of interest in contemporary translation studies for the past two decades. Power is then the galvanising concept that has opened up ‘new avenues of research . . . such as translation and travel, translation and space, translation and globalisation, translation and hybridity, translation and conflict, new critical approaches to legal translation, gender and queer studies, media and translation, and audiovisual translation’—most of which are the subject of specific chapters in our handbook.

Sherry Simon’s chapter, ‘Space’, closes this section of core concepts and issues, examining the relationship between ‘culture’ and translation through a novel idea of space. The ‘translation space’, as she terms it, refers to the place where exchange happens—we could term this exchange *cultural*, in the broad and complex sense in which Simon uses it. From a spatial perspective, she explores the transfer of knowledge as power relocation, the necessary relativism of the concept, and even the contingency of translation theory to geographical conditions, centre and periphery in translation flows and even translation theory itself. In many ways related to the previous chapter on power (because power is spatially enacted), Simon discusses key spatial concepts and metaphors that have permeated translation theory in recent decades: in-betweenness; boundaries and borders; surveillance and ‘zones of forced translation’; dis-orientations and non-places; or specific spatial applications to cultural translation such as the concepts of *chôra* or public space in (post-)colonial settings, or the implications of translation and place in studies on urban social spaces or the intersections between language and architecture. Although often creative and enriching, the spatial dimension of translation, in her account, is also sometimes forced and may imply imposition, suppression, substitution and fracture.

Part II: Translation and cultural narratives

The first chapter in this section, ‘Translation, style and poetics’ by **Tomás Albaladejo** and **Francisco Chico-Rico**, explores artistic specificities of literary translated texts. In their chapter, literary translation is a form of literary mediation (others are literary criticism and text edition), in which mediators ‘carry out an interpretation and communicatively transfer the outcome of their interpretation . . . thus projecting the literary event within which the source text is inserted into other communicative events, within a communication or transmission chain’. Translators, very much like literary critics, produce a new textual object. Drawing from classical and contemporary rhetorical and stylistic theory, the authors explain the literary translation activity as a *poietic translation strategy* that allows the translator to appropriate and assume the text ‘as a second producer of the work, as the producer of a literary work in the target language’, ‘transfer[ing] it in his or her act of production to the text-translation, so that the translation can be as equivalent to the original work as possible, understanding total equivalence as a desideratum’. In this process, translators carry out what Albaladejo and Chico-Rico term ‘the systematic practice of communicative exception’: the status of the literary text implies an exceptionality that is systematic and depends culturally on the literary and communicative system. Translators, who apply a kind of literary competence, appropriate, intervene and produce a new, substitute text, act ‘as an author who, despite being a producer who starts from a previously existing literary text, is also the author of a new text, insofar as the latter represents a linguistic creation in a language other than the

source language as the language of the literary work'. Among the cultural challenges of this task are the complexity of the translation of metaphor, the achieving of equivalent pragmatic effects, or the particular issue of self-translation. Albaladejo and Chico-Rico include a compelling discussion on translating literature in terms of literary canons, the cross-pollinisation and creative force across cultures; as they say, 'the canon is linked to the translation of literary works and it is inseparable from the global system of translated literature'.

Dagmar Schäfer brings a historian's perspective to the role of translation in nation building in China. Beginning from the position that the contemporary views of China as a monolingual nation arise (as in many other cases of nation states) from the largely political, social, economic and intellectual projects of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Schäfer argues for a more nuanced view of China as a multilingual country in which translation and interpretation were employed less for interlingual and more for diplomatic and ritual communication; 'as new research divulges China as a multilingual society the multiple historical purposes of translation practices and their historiographic and political role in nation building appear in a new light'. The chapter, 'Translation history, knowledge and nation building in China', provides a rich and thorough overview of that new research and several lines of inquiry into translation in a very diverse and multicultural region.

Sanaa Benmessaoud and **Hélène Buzelin**'s chapter, 'Publishing houses and translation projects', investigates publishing houses 'as actors that play a key role in the formation of cultural narratives through translation'. In their approach, a publishing house is a particular kind of translation institution. Again, ideology and power differentials across regions stand as a key issue. Among others, how do translators interact with 'the other agents involved in the process of book publishing, such as editors, publishers, and agents'; 'how do changes in book publishing affect translation flows and practices' and 'to what extent have the making and the trading of books, in the past and the present, contributed to fostering and diversifying cultural representations and narratives' are key questions addressed by the authors. Among various issues, they present a historical account of the development of translation book markets in Europe and translation flows from the sixteenth century; also, they discuss telling cases about the limits and dangers of market strategies, and the process of globalisation (see also chapters 2 and 32) in editorial translation practices. *Bestsellerisation*, the privileging of certain stereotypical cultural images and narratives, the shortening of the book cycle, the challenges of digitalisation, the centrality of certain languages above others within the world system of translation (see also Chapter 12), are some of the very important topics addressed in this chapter.

If Vidal's chapter discussed some problematic issues about the history of, and historiographic approaches to, translation, in 'Translation and cultural development: historical approaches', **Luis Pegenaute** provides a comprehensive account of the various efforts to achieve a history of translation, both at national and supra-national levels. It stands as a very informed guide to translation traditions in specific culture areas, but also a provocative critique about the methodologies of translation historiography, its problems and inconsistencies, but also its merits and offers very insightful proposals for the future. The translation historian should also deal with the often unstable 'dividing line between writing and rewriting', the cultural challenges of 'changing ethical and aesthetic codes', or the presence of false or pseudo translations. Pegenaute remarks that 'despite the obvious fact that translators are the creators of translation, only recently have they been the object of systematic study'. A focus on translation and exile, the difficulties of ascribing certain translators to particular cultural contexts and the 'conceptualisation of geographical space' link this chapter with considerations of place and power in Part I. Recent trends in the historical study of translation

(imagology and translation, microhistory, quantitative methods) as well as new directions for the future (the concepts of the ‘pushing-hands approach’, *histoire croisée*, ‘translation zone’, ‘eco-translatology’ and ‘genetic translation studies’, among others) bear witness to the great possibilities opened up by historically driven approaches to translation and culture.

Chapter 10, ‘Translation and religious encounters’, by **Piotr Blumczynski** and **Hephzibah Israel**, focuses on the religious dimension as another driving force in the dialectics of translation and culture. Relevant to the volume as a whole is how Blumczynski and Israel define encounters in general (and not only religious ones) as ‘translational phenomena’: since encounters involve ‘meeting and confronting’ and ‘being affected by [an] experience of otherness, they emphasise the ‘transformative and integrative effect’ emerging from the encounter with the Other. Among the issues discussed in this rich chapter, the reader will find historical perspectives of translation and conversion; the inevitable link of religion to language; the opposite approaches to translation in Islam, on the one hand, and Judaism and Christianity, on the other; and the inextricable relation between Christianity and translation (linguistic and cultural). Bible translation and its importance to the development of modern translation theory, and the translatability or untranslatability of sacred texts as a shaping concept in religious encounters are reviewed, replacing the concept of equivalence, following Theo Hermans, by that of ‘authorised agency’.

Part III: Translation and social contexts

This longer section is aimed at exploring ‘zones of engagement’ across some of the most important areas where translation, for the better or the worse, is instrumental in the continuance, transformation, creation or destruction of specific sociocultural and historical contexts. **Claire Gilbert**’s chapter on ‘Social contexts, ideology and translation’ provides the perspective of a historian and social scientist and should be read in conjunction with Bielsa’s chapter (Chapter 2) on ‘Identity’. As Gilbert very aptly argues, ‘[the] best practices for the study of social context, ideology, and translation are attentive to the disciplinary tradition(s) in which they were developed, and that all benefit from dialogue across fields and even disciplines’. In a truly interdisciplinary fashion, Gilbert takes us from general considerations about language, translation, culture and ideology, to work done in transdisciplinary fields that have cultural translation as its core. Scholarship in colonial and missionary linguistics, postcolonial studies, linguistic and social anthropology, or historiography; the latter having experienced what Gilbert names a true ‘translation turn’. In her chapter, as a specific case study, she analyses the use of the concept *reducción* [reduction] in sixteenth-century Spain ‘as a synonym for translation, conversion, and conquest’ in the context of the Nasrid kingdom of Granada after the Spanish conquest in 1492.

‘Translation, clashes and conflict’ by **Paul F. Bandia** reviews how through the history of humanity translation has always been at the centre of ‘the encounters of peoples and cultures whether for trade, negotiations, diplomacy, conflict resolution, or “clashes of civilisations”’. Translation and conflict are situated in frameworks of, for example, activism, resistance and narrative theory, with colonisation, decolonisation and post-colonialism, geopolitical conflict, globalisation, peace negotiations, conflict resolution and international war crimes tribunals as the main axes of the chapter.

M. Rosario Martín Ruano brings the focus from the global framework of previous chapters to the micro-level of textual practice—although directly linked to the macro-level of cultural acceptability. In her chapter, ‘Issues in cultural translation: sensitivity, politeness, taboo, censorship’, she presents an overview of significant contributions which have

Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding

explored to what extent translation ‘contributes to the promotion of new values, new visions and new sensibilities in societies and to the transformation of their conventional linguistic behaviour’.

Tarek Shamma’s ‘Translation and colonialism’ deals with the so-called ‘postcolonial trend’ in translation studies and how its various approaches have contributed to the theory and practice of translation. Shamma presents a panorama of the emergence and development of postcolonial translation studies. His is a critical approach, that questions overtly some tenets of postcolonial translation practice (especially the prescriptivism inherent in some postcolonial critics, as shown in literalist strategies), but also recognising the insights that postcolonial approaches have contributed to translation studies; like the idea that ‘political inequalities (epitomised by the colonial encounter) carry over into linguistic and cultural interactions, including translation’. Translation, in its turn, cannot be detached from the ‘history of representation’ that takes place between cultures and, with it, the ‘power differentials governing the translation act’. From the metaphor of [cultural] translation in other disciplines, to the key section ‘Postcolonial translation studies today: new challenges and future prospects’, Shamma’s chapter is a sure guide to interested readers.

Bearing witness to the fact that translation has become ‘a powerful means for mobilising women politically in an increasingly globalised, inter-dependent world order’, in their chapter ‘Cultural resistance, female voices: translating subversive and contested sexualities’, **Michela Baldo** and **Moira Inghilleri** set about examining forms of activism by women ‘who are in different ways involved in deconstructing traditional notions of female sexuality and gendered social roles’. In the first part of the chapter, Baldo focuses on performance artists and translators, ‘emerging queer transfeminist collectives in Italy’, whose work aims to critique ‘heteronormative views on genders and sexualities’, using translation as a tool of resistance against sexism, patriarchy, homophobia and trans-phobia. In the second half, Inghilleri examines the context of sex workers and domestic workers, with examples of grassroots organisations in Thailand and Hong Kong: how they re-narrate themselves and self-translate against the grain of what they term ‘powerful normative representations and understandings’ of femininity and sexuality.

Nana Sato-Rossberg takes the issue of translation and culture to the context of oral societies, oral traditions and oral narratives, including oral literature and oral history, and how these are made accessible through translation. Starting from the observation that orality has only sparsely been a subject of analysis in translation studies, Sato-Rossberg presents an overview of the translation processes involved in the work of travellers, missionaries, colonial administrators and other agents who collected narratives of oral societies, especially anthropologists, once anthropology established them as a subject of scientific study. From Malinowski and Boas to more recent approaches, Sato-Rossberg inquires about fieldworkers’ methodology, the primary materials used, the issue of participant observation, their knowledge of local languages (or lack thereof), and the new perspective of the informant in postmodern anthropology, as well as other core methodological issues, such as the intervention of fieldworkers editing and standardising materials, the translation of cultural meanings, or ethical issues about authorship and agency of storytellers.

In a similar perspective of translating the voices of indigenous cultures, **David Moore** and **Victoria Ríos Castaño** embark in a dialogical chapter that focuses on the cultural translation in two separate locations in colonial history: sixteenth-century Mexico and nineteenth-/early twentieth-century Central Australia. The objective of the authors, in discussing two so seemingly different case studies, is to draw attention to the very similar processes that took place when translating the indigenous material to their respective audiences (comprehending,

studying, codifying, selecting and displaying it). The first case is the work of the Franciscan Missionary Fray Bernardino de Sahagún in colonial Mexico, who wrote the first description of the Nahuatl language and compiled translated collections of Nahuatl sources; the second case is that of the German Lutheran Carl Strehlow and his colleagues as regards the Aranda language and culture in Australia. Both scholars undertook the study of respective religious texts with the colonial agenda of replacing, or altogether deleting, their cultural object of translation. The authors claim that rather than being considered ‘anthropologists’ *avant la lettre*, as they have respectively been dubbed, their work should be considered the consequence of a process of ‘cultural translation’ with no ethnographic-like interests, but rather an ideological aim for evangelisation (Catholic, in Sahagún’s case; Lutheran, in Strehlow’s case), with striking methodological parallels despite their distance in space and time.

Turning to contemporary themes, in ‘Translation and collaborative networks’, **Julie McDonough Dolmaya** explores the relationship of translation with connectivity and the development of networks of translators: professional networks, practice-oriented networks, education-oriented or research-oriented translation networks. After a historical introduction, she focuses first on networks of literary translators to show how translators and other agents like publishers or literary critics determine the ‘selection, publication and dissemination’ of translated works and the development of translation projects. Second, she focuses on networks of activist translators, and finally on what she terms ‘translators in online environments’: the collaboration and interaction of translators ‘via online resources such as internet distribution lists, blogs, online databases/social networks and crowdsourced translation initiatives’. All in all, this chapter opens the door to what is undoubtedly becoming one of the driving forces in contemporary translation practice, and provides guidelines for its scientific study, mainly through Social Network Analysis, Actor-Network Theory, Historiography and Narrative Theory.

Robert Neather’s chapter, ‘Museums, material culture, and cultural representations’, introduces museums as key sites of cultural translation, essential institutions as they are ‘for the public presentation of culture’. Since museums select and combine ‘objects, texts and other representational apparatus in the exhibitionary space’, they enact a type of ‘cultural translation’ by which the original cultural context is represented and reinterpreted metonymically or ‘synecdochically’—a given object may stand for the culture represented—and selectively. Neather distinguishes between ‘museums as translations’ (i.e. as actors for cultural translation) and ‘translations in the museum’ (i.e. the processes of translating texts and other signic content within them) and explores both dimensions. He provides various historical examples, from Western-influenced nineteenth-century Chinese museums, to the evolution of museums in recent times, to more innovative and inclusive forms of curation that try to breach the translative gap between scholars and visitors, translators (narrators) and readers, and to approach critically the power relations involved.

Part IV: Translation and cultural creativity

This part is centred on the creative dimensions of translation and culture. Although the volume as a whole considers translation a creative force, and shuns a perspective of translation as mere reproduction or conduit, this part focuses on how translation determines the creation or development of specific discursive genres.

Cecilia Rossi inaugurates this part with ‘Translation as a creative force’, a study of creativity as a fundamental aspect of linguistic competence, in which she argues for the existence of a ‘literary creativity’ as part of the ‘transfer competence’ of literary translators. Besides

Ovidi Carbonell Cortés and Sue-Ann Harding

providing a compelling discussion on creativity in general and in translation, with multiple references to poets and writers, and the reflections of translators themselves on the creative process, Rossi introduces creativity as a dimension of the ‘analogous’ character of a translated poem to its original (following Susan Bassnett’s reading of Octavio Paz), and provides an account of various metaphors of translatorial creativity, such as crystallisation, interior journey and interiorisation.

Georgina Collins and **María López Ponz** examine ‘Translation, hybridity and borderlands: translating non-standard language’, drawing attention to the cultural translation taking place in contexts where two or more languages meet, interact and change as a result. A situation that is more the norm than the exception in human social and linguistic history, plurilingual contexts, or language contact, may be explained through processes of cultural translation that often draw distinctions of a socio-political nature. The distinction between standard and non-standard varieties, between major or minor languages, or the appearance of hybrid varieties or languages, involve translation processes while posing challenges to translators. Focusing on the translation of dialect and also hybrid forms used in postcolonial literature, the authors showcase debates on translatability, standardisation, authenticity or artificiality, from literary texts to audiovisual texts.

The theme of museums as texts and sites of cultural translation is revisited by **Josélia Neves** in her chapter on ‘Cultures of accessibility: translation making cultural heritage in museums accessible to people of all abilities’. Deliberately located in this part on Translation and Cultural Creativity because of its call to rethink so many of the assumptions we hold about translation and access, the chapter draws on recent research in the fields of museum and visitor studies to argue convincingly for a User-Centred Design approach that considers accessibility for all an integral component of the curation of culture and cultural heritage. Audiovisual translators, Neves argues, are uniquely trained, not only in interlingual but also intralingual and intersemiotic translation. Thus, they are in a position to contribute their expertise and technical know-how to the design and layout of museums so that all visitors are able to access and engage meaningfully with cultural sites and contents, constructing their own narratives through whatever multimodal manner they choose.

‘Translating popular fiction’ is the title of **Ellen Carter**’s chapter. It focuses on the cultural aspects of the translation of popular fiction as a literary field on its own, going beyond the dichotomic labels that downgrade these genres in contrast to ‘higher’ or canonised art forms, and engaging with ‘the interaction of popular fiction and translation’. Among the topics investigated by Carter are the role of translations in popularising a genre in a given target culture, as well as the role of pseudo-translations, especially in countries where national authors could be considered ‘less marketable’, or where, in an authoritarian political climate such as Franco’s Spain, authors and publishers would resort to the strategy of producing pseudo-translations instead of translating censorable imported texts. Censorship, culturally related textual features of popular fiction (irony, slang, gender identities, etc.), and the rise of non-professional translation, are some of the interesting topics explored in this chapter. A final section about metacritical reflections on translation and translators in popular fiction is also included.

Federico Zanettin’s chapter complements Carter’s as regards the genres of comics and graphic novels. Pointing to the fact that, in many instances, comics end up being more popular in translation, in countries or languages different from the one in which they originated, Zanettin provides an overview of comics translation from a cultural perspective. Like the translation of popular fiction, Zanettin also draws attention to the existence of both pseudo-translations and what he terms ‘pseudo-originals’ (translated comics disguised as original

works to circumvent censorship). The case of Japanese *manga*, which raises many issues of cultural translation, receives special attention, as well as the development of graphic novels, as a more sophisticated art form akin to written literature. Among the critical issues discussed by Zanettin as regards translation and culture in these genres, the intersemiotic adaptation of visual display, the modification of textual content, cultural and political identities, and the relationship with other arts, are topics that have attracted interest in translation studies from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Part V: Translation and culture in professional settings

The final section of our handbook does not aim to present a comprehensive account of all professional settings where the practice of translation takes on relevant cultural aspects. That would be an impossible task. We have, however, chosen a few areas that reveal the intricate ways conceptualisations of ‘culture’ influence or shape translational behaviour, or where translation itself is fundamental in the creation of the professional setting: law, medicine, science, international relations and diplomacy, business and economics, media and journalism, language teaching and globalised education. The reader will acknowledge, as in the rest of the volume, that in many of the cases presented here, the use of the concept of ‘culture’ is fluid and dynamic and context-specific.

The first chapter in this section by **Esther Monzó-Nebot** takes us to the key cultural issues in legal translation practice: the very definition of legal translation can change according to the social setting in which it is applied; the profile and background of the translator as a ‘jurilinguist’; or the debate about the legal translator’s training. Monzó-Nebot challenges the ‘myth of authority’ in translation and the assumed ‘authorlessness’ of translations, which lead to a machine-like, ‘conduit role’ of the practice of both written translation and court interpreting professionals. If this perception is overturned, interpreters might be considered ‘real agents and, as such, parts of the legal process’, ultimately leading to a ‘new turn’ in legal interpreting and translation in which court recruitment of untrained or uncertified professionals ‘may be approaching a much-awaited reassessment’. A very useful account of the conflicts between functionalist and critical approaches, the application of genre and textual analyses, the challenges of the future roles of legal translators and interpreters as participants for translation studies theory, inequalities between individuals, societies and even languages, are issues very relevant to translation and culture in the globalised world of legal translation.

Reyes Albarrán Martín provides an overview of ‘Translation and culture in medical settings and institutions’, focusing on the social construction of health and illness, an ‘emic’ approach that contrasts with the supra-cultural ‘etic’ concept of disease as a biomedically measurable phenomenon. From the coexistence of various narratives and understandings of the medical experience in contemporary multicultural societies, to the interaction between health professionals from different cultural backgrounds, Albarrán introduces to translation studies the very relevant cross-disciplinary field of medical anthropology, perhaps in need of confluence with more linguistically- and translation-oriented approaches that open up new perspectives for future research. In a vast field such as this, Albarrán offers a brief historical approach of the dissemination of medical knowledge and culture through translation, and the importance of intercultural communication in medical settings, providing also a summary of current contributions in translation in healthcare settings and international organisations.

Maeve Olohan brings us to ‘Translating cultures of science’. Following the latest culturally oriented, constructivist perspectives of science as ‘knowledge-as-practice’, and providing

an overview of postcolonial science studies, Olohan introduces readers to the issues that can be addressed when construing, and translating, ‘science as culture in global settings’. Science is no longer considered as ‘singular or unitary’; being socially constructed and ‘locally negotiated’, knowledge is no longer universal or unitary. However, there are still many traces of previously prevailing positivist views in which ‘scientific facts’ are ‘communicated’ or ‘disseminated’ to the public. Some lesser known but highly relevant issues, such as ‘the negotiation of knowledge claims and controversies’ in less studied genres, types and modalities such as drafts, articles, grant proposals and referee reports; the recent increase in contributions to the analysis of scientific translation, or the more trodden path of the historiography of science translation—a field that is experiencing a surge with the application of critical approaches, postcolonial approaches or women’s studies perspectives—or the thorny question of the dominance of English, are aspects studied in Olohan’s very relevant chapter.

In ‘Translation, international relations and diplomacy’, **Toby Osborne** focuses on the processes and practice of translation that take place in international relations not only from the point of view of the ‘state’ as an abstract entity, but also as a social practice, a ‘socially constructed view of diplomacy’ that looks at ‘interactions between individual people, with their personal identities and characteristics, acting as representatives of others, including (though not necessarily exclusively) “states”’. This practice entails both intercultural mediation and negotiation, and also ‘the translations of different languages and codes’, from the actual practice of language transfer, with specific shared languages and terminologies, to the symbolic process of cultural translation proper enacted through diplomatic mechanisms. Osborne starts with a historical overview of the development of modern diplomacy in sixteenth-century Europe and examines the links between issues of identity and community belonging, and the challenges met to come to terms with outside powers, or to restore relations between different confessional communities shattered by religious conflict. Foremost is Osborne’s call to take into account the ‘connected histories’ of people and the ‘rich variety and frequency of cultural translations’ occurring parallel to the more abstract operations of state diplomacy, often carried out by actors such as artists or merchants before the full establishment of diplomacy or interpreting as a profession.

David Jemielity’s chapter, ‘Translation in intercultural business and economic environments’, goes beyond the sometimes hackneyed conventions of genre translation to explore—from a holistic perspective that we term ‘cultural’—what constitutes translation in business and economic contexts. His point of view is broad, extended to what he terms ‘multilingual communications practitioners’. Focusing first on the translation market as a thriving sector, the chapter moves then to the status of translation in the business-management environment and the ‘disconnects’ ‘between translator-culture and businessperson-culture’, and the idea of ‘information asymmetry’ as a possible explanation for some of the challenges facing translators working within business and economic cultures. Besides a cogent discussion on the debates about the use of English in business settings, Jemielity provides very useful recommendations aimed, not at practitioners, but rather to the academic translation studies establishment ‘to realign itself, at least to some extent, to the realities and needs of practice’.

Roberto A. Valdeón’s chapter, ‘Translation and culture in mainstream media and journalism’ addresses ‘the importance of translation in global mass media networks and products’, focusing specifically on the sub-areas of audiovisual translation and journalistic translation. Foremost in his first part are issues such as the management of otherness: multilingualism and the choice of languages, stereotypes, the function of languages and accents to highlight cultural differences instead of attesting diversity; the translation of cultural specifics; ideology and censorship in AVT (centred on Spain and Portugal); amateur translation (fansubbing,

volunteer and activist translation). The second part of Valdeón's chapter addresses journalistic translation. Valdeón gives an account of the growing interest in translation studies for translation in the news, especially in recent years.

Sara Laviosa addresses a not-so-well-known aspect of the interaction between language and translation: their implications in language teaching. This interdisciplinary object of research lies at the intersection between foreign language teaching, educational linguistics, and translation studies (namely, translation in other learning contexts). The use of translation to foster translangual and transcultural competence is gaining ground in the context of plurilinguism and multiculturalism of modern societies; Laviosa introduces us to the revival of *educational translation* in several areas (second language acquisition, language pedagogy, bilingual education and, of course, translation studies) and through various perspectives (psycholinguistic, social-psychological, intercultural) in the framework of the ecological model of language learning to which she adheres, where translation is emphasised 'both as a means of honing translangual and transcultural abilities and a skill in its own right', following the recommendations of the MLA Report. After an overview of the main contributions and research in cultural translation applied to language pedagogy, Laviosa presents a case study of her own language teaching practice using poetry translation from Italian into English, and ends her chapter reviewing future developments in the interdisciplinary study of cultural translation in language teaching.

The last chapter in this section and the handbook is **Nicholas Cifuentes-Goodbody's** 'Culture and translation in the rise of globalised education'. He undertakes the difficult task of assessing the challenges that contemporary globalisation poses to culture in general, and the crucial role that translation has in it. His cue is from Cronin's conceptualisation of 'globalisation as translation', whereby translation is not simply 'a by-product of globalisation', but 'a constituent, integral part of how the phenomenon both operates and makes sense of itself'. On this premise, he addresses the dilemmas of globalisation as a neutral process or not, as a process leading ultimately to global convergence or divergence, weighing in on the tension between whether globalising tendencies bring about translational processes, or whether they are using global trends as a justification for home-made policies. Cifuentes-Goodbody's bold conclusion is that 'narratives of progress often mask or fail to confront their own imperialist tendencies'. His case-study of Arabic education versus English education in the MENA countries is enlightening indeed.

The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture is a kaleidoscope of a book that collects into a single volume comprehensive literature reviews, original essays, case studies and extensive references. Our intention as editors is to provide a starting point for all those working in areas where translation and culture are so clearly contingent: for students approaching the topics in the handbook for the first time, teachers requiring an overview of literature and debates, and for scholars venturing into the interdisciplinary areas that are increasingly the hallmark of original research. This handbook, we believe, provides a wealth of resources, information and ideas, bringing a critical eye to translations and translators often overlooked. We are grateful for the expertise of our authors, who so often delivered chapters much richer in scope than we could ever have anticipated, and we would like to thank them for their work, their patience and their generosity.

We are also very grateful to Nazia Barani, who kindly gave us permission to use 'Longitude', a photograph by her late husband John, for the cover image. John was a translation scholar at the University of Salamanca, a keen photographer, and a friend. He translated the world with words, and light and colours; his photographs tell us of meanings, of paradoxes, of stories built in our mind's eye across contexts and cultures. He is greatly missed.

INTRODUCTION

Paratextuality . . . is first and foremost a treasure trove of questions without answers.

Gérard Genette, Palimpsests (1997a, 4)

A few months ago, I had the privilege of hearing the Hallé Orchestra perform Mussorgsky's *Pictures at an Exhibition*. Before lifting the baton, the conductor told the audience about Mussorgsky's close friendship with Viktor Hartmann, an architect and artist. Mussorgsky and Hartmann were roughly the same age, and both were struggling to achieve success in their careers. When Hartmann died, aged 39, his friends organised a posthumous exhibition of his work, and it was this that Mussorgsky turned into music, writing the piece as a memorial to Hartmann. The conductor explained that the works on display at the exhibition were not as we might imagine: most of them were small simple sketches or drawings rather than the more significant kinds of art works that – knowing Mussorgsky's lengthy and masterful music – most listeners assume. With this at the front of my mind, I heard the final movement in a completely new way: the majestic return of the promenade theme was no longer simply Mussorgsky striding through the exhibition, but an exhilarating celebration of his friend's life, however unsuccessful a life in other people's eyes; and the carillon bell of the Great Gate of Kiev that sounds alongside the promenade became the bell tolling Hartmann's death. The meaning of the movement, in other words, changed for me: it became about celebrating life in grief, and by extension about living life alongside the knowledge of our own deaths – a *memento mori* of sorts. How valid this interpretation of Mussorgsky's piece might be is not the point that I want to explore here; rather, I want simply to show that the threshold through which I entered the piece – the conductor's introduction – influenced how I interpreted it.

Introduction

When thinking about the final form that this book might take, I was keen for the front cover to feature Hartmann's design for Kiev's Great Gate. My reasons for this were multiple: the image of the gate indicates something about the topic of the book, gesturing in particular to the key metaphor of the threshold; the fact that it is specifically Hartmann's gate rather than any other lends further texture to the story told in the previous paragraph; having an image-based cover rather than a blank or generic one makes the book more attractive (an aesthetic motivation) and appealing to readers (a commercial motivation). Like the conductor's introduction, I was aware that the cover of this book would serve as a threshold, and I wanted that threshold to serve its various purposes effectively.

If there has long been a basic awareness that we form opinions about texts based on surrounding or apparently superficial elements, it was not until the publication of Gérard Genette's book *Seuils* [*Thresholds*] in 1987 that scholars began to pay sustained attention to them. Genette labels such elements *paratexts* and, with great wit and erudition, analyses their importance to literary texts, anchoring his discussion in French publishing practices. Scholars have subsequently adapted Genette's term and theoretical framework to other kinds of texts, affirming the importance of the concept in allowing us to account more fully for the way in which texts are both produced and received.

While the notion of the paratext has gained some currency in translation studies, this book represents the first in-depth attempt to explore Genette's concept and its importance for translation studies research. The book is divided into three parts. Part I introduces Genette's theory, paying particular attention to the role accorded to translation within it (Chapter 1), and summarises existing research into paratexts in translation studies (Chapter 2) as well as in neighbouring disciplines (Chapter 3). The proliferation of research into paratexts in digital and media studies is particularly striking, and one of the goals of this book is to bring it to the attention of translation studies scholars in the hope of stimulating further interdisciplinary dialogue. Part II presents three case studies of paratexts in translation contexts, deliberately selecting genres that are relatively unexplored in existing translation studies research into paratexts. Chapter 4 thus interrogates connections between authorised translations and paratextual relevance and explores the strategies used to claim or contest authorisation in the paratexts of philosophical translations; Chapter 5 demonstrates the usefulness of paratexts for interrogating the discourses that surround the importation of scholarly works, combining this with a meta-reflection on the discipline of translation studies itself; and Chapter 6 investigates the shift in paratexts around subtitled films in the UK, drawing on concepts developed in media studies. The final part of the book draws together the insights gained in Parts I and II in order to propose a theory of paratextuality for translation studies, addressing questions of terminology and typologies (Chapter 7) and research topics and methodologies (Chapter 8).

Like all volumes in the Translation Theories Explored series, this book has been written with both graduate students and researchers in mind. The topic of paratexts cuts across a wide range of research domains, and many students and researchers

may find themselves wanting to devote a relatively small part of their thesis or research work to a discussion of paratexts, rather than making paratexts the main focus of the enquiry. In such cases, it is unlikely that they will be able to spend a year researching and reflecting on relevant scholarship and developments, as I have had the privilege to do. I hope that the theory outlined in this book will offer such scholars a framework that is, in a basic sense, usable and useful. To this end I have proposed definitions and terminology that are underpinned by sustained critical reflection, and have addressed methodological issues that are relevant to a range of research topics. At the same time, the book is intended to serve as an invitation to further discussion, much like Genette's own work, which sees itself as 'an introduction, and exhortation, to the study of the paratext' (Genette 1997b, 404). In particular, I hope that scholars working in areas of translation studies touched upon only briefly in this book will take up Genette's exhortation, even if its promise and reach seem less obvious there. These include the domains of translation process research, news translation, and interpreting. As the framework continues to be debated and adapted in light of cultural differences and technological developments in these and other domains, it should continue to serve as a treasure trove of questions, to the further benefit of our discipline.

References

- Genette, Gérard. 1997a. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1997b. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Introduction

Kirsten Malmkjær and the contributors

This handbook highlights, explicitly and unapologetically, in each of its chapters, relationships that obtain between Translation Studies and Linguistics; and each chapter generally assumes that this relationship is mutually beneficial. In this respect, the volume echoes stances adopted by many members of both the Translation Studies community and of the Linguistics community before the 1980s. In that decade, a sense arose in parts of the Translation Studies community that Linguistics was a malevolent bedfellow for their young discipline to snuggle down with. The worry has generally been that the “stronger”, older discipline of Linguistics would hijack Translation Studies and obscure its special nature; but this volume illustrates that since the discipline of Translation Studies has overcome its youthful reticence, the benefits of mutual interaction between the disciplines have become recognized, just as, indeed, the benefits of mutual interaction between the study of translation and the study of languages were in the days before Translation Studies acquired its name (see Chapter 1).

Each of the contributors or pairs of contributors to this handbook has been able to illustrate this mutual relevance of the disciplines in ample measure and they were, of course, approached with their ability to do this in mind. If there remains, nonetheless, a bias in favour of the Translation Studies community, this is a reflection of the greater likelihood of finding scholars within Translation Studies with an understanding of and interest in Linguistics than of finding scholars within Linguistics with an understanding of and interest in Translation Studies. Perhaps this handbook will encourage more evenly balanced cooperation between our fields than has been achieved to date.

One of the joys of working in Translation Studies is the international nature of the scholarly community engaged with it, as illustrated in this handbook. The contributors originate from a large number of different nations, and many live and work outside their countries of origin. They are members of a field of scholarship that is generally collegiate and mutually supportive, in which friendships and collaborations outnumber competitions. This may reflect the fact that just as language is a shared human trait, so are translating and interpreting. There is no nation where these activities are not valued, and we would like to believe that benevolent reasons for their perceived value – e.g. enabling friendly and knowledge-sharing intercultural

Introduction

communion – outnumber reasons relating to international distrust and enmity. It is important for the continuing progress of translation and interpreting studies to keep abreast of developments in the study of languages, including in Linguistics, and it is important for the study of languages and for Linguistics to draw upon insights from translation and interpreting studies. We hope that this handbook will encourage continuing and enhanced interaction between Linguistics and translation and interpreting studies so that each will continue to benefit from interaction with the other, as the chapters in this volume amply demonstrate that they have since their naissance as disciplines.

The handbook has six major sections: I. The nature of language, translation and interpreting; II. Meaning making; III. Texts in speech and writing; IV. Individuals and their interactions; V. Translation, interpreting, media and machines; and VI. Applications. A different division would of course have been possible, but the one selected was chosen because it seemed to us to prioritise neither discipline at the expense of the other, while reflecting the diversity of areas in which interaction between the two takes place. An exception to this rule is the title of section V, which, in the interest of brevity, neglects to mention Linguistics while mentioning both translation and interpreting; but the content of the individual chapters is not similarly negligent of Linguistics.

The four chapters in Part I on the nature of language, translation and interpreting cover the main, traditional areas of Linguistics: “general” theory, semantics, semiotics and the sound system in relation to the discipline of Translation Studies. Chapter 1, “Theories of linguistics and of translation and interpreting”, charts the history of the relationship between the study of languages on the one hand and of translation and interpreting on the other hand, in the 20th and 21st centuries. Linguists have studied languages in contact with each other in situations involving translation or interpreting in order to identify the similarities and differences between the languages, while some Translation Studies scholars have drawn upon linguistic theories in order to develop theories of translation. Some scholars fall equally comfortably into both the linguistic and the Translation Studies disciplines; however, a number have striven to keep their discipline firmly independent of Linguistics and to develop theories and research methodologies of their own. Given that it would not be possible in this chapter to deal in detail with every version of linguistic theory, the chapter emphasises theories and concepts from Linguistics that have especially resonated within Translation Studies, such as systemic functional grammar, the theory of linguistic relativity, the search for universals and the notion of language as social semiotics. More “formal”, transformational accounts of language have not been included, despite Nida’s (1964) early, brief infatuation, because although they have much to contribute to our understanding of human language, they have tended to avoid considerations of multilingual minds and have had little appeal within the community of translation and interpreting studies.

Chapter 2, “Semantics and translation”, is concerned with meaning, which is a central concept in both Translation Studies and in Linguistics. The chapter deals with accounts of the nature of meaning, and with the comfort translators may draw from Austin’s (1962) and Searle’s (1969) accounts of speech acts. It is, however, within analytical philosophy of language that the concept of translation or, more accurately, interpreting, between languages is central, and this is also where we find a decisive argument against malevolent relativism. Quine’s (1960) thesis of the indeterminacy of translation raises this spectre unintentionally, but Davidson’s (1973; 1974) response lays it permanently to rest. In the current climate where factuality is being seriously questioned as a concept, this is an immensely important contribution to the life of nations. More pragmatic, application-oriented discussions of aspects of meaning are presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

In Chapter 3, “Semiotics and translation”, Henrik Gottlieb deals with the communication of meaning through systems of signs, including not only the linguistic sign system, but also translation between linguistic signs and signs belonging to other systems. He presents a taxonomy that covers both intrasemiotic and intersemiotic types of translation, and he emphasises that most texts employ more than one type of sign, as for example audiovisual texts do (sounds and images); and that the non-linguistic signs may belong to a “text” that is translated from linguistic signs, as in the case of the “translation” of a novel into film. Here, the written text is translated into speech on the one hand but also into pictures of physical phenomena like landscapes and buildings, which, in the novel, will have been described using linguistic signs. Nor need there be any linguistic signs present in a translation between signs. For example, numerical relations can be presented as, translated into graphics, as is commonly done during PowerPoint-style presentations.

The final chapter of Part I, Chapter 4 “Phonetics, phonology, and interpreting” by Barbara Ahrens, introduces the linguistic sub-disciplines that focus on communication through spoken language, namely phonetics and phonology. Phonetics is concerned with the sounds of speech and with the ways in which they are produced by the human vocal organs and perceived by the auditory mechanisms. Phonology considers sounds as parts of language systems. The chapter explains the role of speech sounds in interpreting, focusing on pauses, speech rate and segmentation, intonation and fundamental frequency, and accentuation and stress. These elements affect the comprehensibility of the interpretation because they contain clues to how the message is to be understood, but they may be difficult to produce naturally and fluently in interpreting, especially in simultaneous interpreting, where the interpreter must listen to and produce speech at the same time. Often, an interpreter is compelled to wait for information that s/he needs before s/he can begin to interpret, and this can cause pausing followed by a sudden rush in delivery once the information has been made available, as the interpreter rushes to keep up with the development of meaning in the speaker’s output. As a consequence, the interpretation may sound forced and unnatural to the listener, and this may impair their comprehension.

The chapters in Part I having covered large-scale, general aspects of language: its nature, meaning, signification and sound in relation to translation and interpreting, Part II, on meaning making, enters into details about the second and third areas especially, that is, meaning and signification. We are accustomed to thinking of translation and interpreting as dealing with the verbal: with texts in writing or in speech, although as Henrik Gottlieb clearly shows in Chapter 3, “Semiotics and translation”, numerous other channels of communication are used by humans. In Chapter 5, “Non-verbal communication and interpreting” by Benoît Krémer and Claudia Mejía Quijano, non-verbal elements that are present in contexts of spoken communication are discussed. As also made clear in Chapter 4, these include prosody, intonation and aspects of the situation in which the interpretation takes place. An interpreter needs to perceive, comprehend and decode these non-verbal elements in order to understand the speaker fully, but speech is ephemeral and fast, and given the need to pass the speech on to another audience, interpreters often have to make quick decisions about what can be missed out and what must be conveyed. Furthermore, in situations that involve distance or remote interpreting, the myriad contextual elements that are available in face-to-face interpreting are missing, so that an interpreter may be forced to assume aspects of the information that they are required to convey. This is clearly challenging for interpreters, while for scholars of both Linguistics and Interpreting it is intriguing and promising of important insights about the effect of context on communication. Remote interpreting is also discussed in Chapter 24 in Part V of this volume.

Introduction

In Chapter 6, “Relevance Theory, interpreting and translation” by Magda Stroińska and Grażyna Drzazga, we return to issues of meaning, but also to the issue just discussed, of how an interpreter can best decide what can be missed out and what must be included in order to convey within the time available a text that is optimally representative of the original. The chapter focuses on cases in which this is especially problematic, namely cases in which the interpreter works without previous knowledge of the texts to be translated. The authors argue that Relevance Theory offers insights into two aspects of messages that need to be understood in communication: explicatures, which are inferences about information required to make complete sense of utterances (elaborations on meaning); and implicatures, which are inferences that add extra propositions to the speaker’s utterance (implied meaning). While implicatures may seem more problematic to resolve in real-life situations than explicatures, explicatures often pose significant difficulty in interpretation, as illustrated in this chapter with examples from courtroom interpretation.

Implicature features again, along with the notion of presupposition, in Chapter 7, “Implicature and presupposition in translation and interpreting” by Ying Cui and Yanli Zhao. The chapter discusses two major types of presupposition, the semantic and the pragmatic. Semantic presuppositions arise on the basis of logical relations. They tend not to be affected in translation or interpretation, because linguistic items which give rise to semantic presuppositions are very similar in different languages. In contrast, pragmatic presuppositions, which are concerned with speakers and the communicative situation, are subject, in translation, to the vagaries of situations, many and varied across languages and cultures. From the perspective of translation and interpretation, presuppositions can be regarded as translators’ and interpreters’ assumptions about the target context and about the needs and expectations of the target readers or audience. The authors propose that presuppositions in relation to a translation or an interpretation can be analysed on the basis of three features: audience needs analysis, communication principles and textualisation principles, the last of which relate to text organisation.

In the final chapter of Part II of the volume, Chapter 8, “Rhetoric, oratory, interpreting and translation”, Siobhán McElduff and James Luke Hadley discuss the intersections between rhetoric, oratory and a range of translation practices and theories. The chapter begins by examining the culturally loaded Classical language traditionally used to describe diverse oratorical and rhetorical traditions, before moving to an historical examination of rhetoric from Greece and Rome through modern China and Japan. Situating rhetoric and its concerns historically, the first half of the chapter examines the important role of translation in Greek and Roman rhetorical education, before discussing the problematic position Greek language and culture had for Rome and the Roman elite. The chapter also investigates a number of East Asian rhetorical traditions, and the effect that the importation of European rhetorical paradigms had on these traditions, before discussing the later rejection of Greek or Latin terms as appropriate translations for Asian forms of rhetoric and their discussion. The chapter concludes by examining the need for and interest in historically and culturally grounded studies of rhetoric and translation that focus on regional and contextual differences, and that do not assume a starting point in Classical Greece, along with suggestions for further investigation.

The rhetorical tradition formed the foundation for the types of textual analysis that are the foci of Part III of the volume entitled “Texts in speech and writing”. In Chapter 9, “Discourse Analysis, interpreting and translation”, Stefan Baumgarten and Melani Schröter draw a distinction between Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, and discuss their relevance and applicability to Translation Studies. Discourse Analysis analyses language as a social practice by accounting for discursive, situational and (inter)textual dimensions of

communicative exchanges, while Critical Discourse Analysis highlights the ideological dimensions of language with reference to the way in which discourse shapes and is shaped by manipulative and discriminatory practices that readers and listeners may not be aware of. Both approaches tend to concentrate on ideologies embedded within patterns of communication within one culture; but in this chapter, a case is made for contrastive, intercultural and Crosscultural Discourse Analysis. The authors argue that a method of enquiry which they label Contrastive Cultural Discourse Analysis could counteract the bias that they perceive within Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis in favour of intracultural analyses, as well as their Eurocentrism and overreliance on dominant languages, especially English. The crosscultural dimension of Contrastive Cultural Discourse Analysis would focus on translation and interpreting as instances of crosscultural communication based on linguistic mediations through cultural recontextualisations and examine the ways in which translation and interpreting are embedded in crosscultural networks of social and economic power, influence and authority against the backdrop of globalisation.

One of the purposes of the analysis of discourse is the identification of types, or genres, of text, and in Chapter 10, “Genre analysis and translation”, Łucja Biel discusses the applications of genre analysis in translation research and training. A genre is a text or discourse type which is recognised by its characteristic formal, stylistic features and by the functions of texts belonging to the genre. Genre analysis identifies these distinctive features, known as generic conventions, and the social, communicative, cultural, cognitive and ideological factors behind the use of genres. The main methods used in genre analysis in the past were qualitative but more recently quantitative, corpus-based methods have been used, especially to study lexico-grammatical patterns. The chapter discusses three major models of genre analysis: the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) model, the Sydney School that emerged from systemic functional linguistics, and the New Rhetoric model. The ESP approach and the Sydney School are oriented towards preparing learning resources for non-native speakers of English whereas the New Rhetoric model has a special interest in North American native writing and focuses on social purposes. Translation-oriented genre analysis has focused on identifying differences in generic structures, conventions and expectations across languages and cultures. Genres develop in recurring situations which prompt responses in the form of “inaugurals, eulogies, courtroom speeches and the like” (Miller 1984, 152), which become conventionalised through repetition and precedent. But the rhetorical situation, which is “a complex of persons, events, objects and relations” (Bitzer 1968) may vary across cultures, and so may the concomitant generic conventions. For example, a PhD examination in most European countries is a public event, whereas in the UK it takes place behind closed doors with only the candidate and the examiners, and possibly the supervisor and a chairperson present. In China, an intermediate situation is common, where the candidate presents their research to a panel along with a smaller audience, usually consisting of the candidate’s fellow students and any interested members of staff. Naturally enough, the rhetorical structures used by a PhD candidate when presenting their research will differ in these situations. But even across cultures which share the open examination convention, the forms of address that candidates use to address and greet their audience are likely to be culture specific. Since an understanding of genre is important for our ability to react appropriately to a text, the internalisation of genre knowledge is important for professional translators’ ability to perform effectively, and genre analysis is an important component in the training of translators in both source text interpretation and target text production.

Retaining a focus on text organisation, in Chapter 11, “Text linguistics, translation, and interpreting”, Gregory M. Shreve considers translation and interpreting as non-random

Introduction

activities that function through groupings of words in sequences of sentences. These groupings are assembled deliberately for communicative purposes and become texts as a consequence of this selection process. Texts are “interaction structures”, whose formal and semantic properties are structured to suit the communicative purposes of situated social interactions, and they have specific language characteristics that can allow, for instance, for classification into text types. Any actions taken by the translator or interpreter in the process of creating a new vehicle for situated communication in the target culture must account for these characteristics or properties and for the cultural differences in them. Much of text linguistics developed in parallel with Translation Studies. Both had early and continuing relationships to systemic functional linguistics and were concerned with the nature of textuality. Their core concepts are coherence, cohesion, intentionality, situationality, acceptability, informativity and intertextuality. Text linguistics is a means to examine the transformations that a text undergoes when it is translated, beyond the scope of the rendition of individual words and sentences. Texts have structural and semantic features that reflect relationships between sentences, and the chapter asks to what extent translation preserves, alters or destroys those relationships. When dealing with translation, text linguistics places our focus squarely on the nature of texts – textuality – and how the textuality of a source text is related to the textuality of its target.

In Chapter 12, “Narrative analysis and translation”, Mona Baker offers an overview of socio-narrative theory and some of its applications in translation and interpreting studies, beginning with an account of the theory’s basic assumptions. She explores some of the main differences between the concept of narrative, as defined and applied in this approach, and the concept of discourse, as understood and applied in Critical Discourse Analysis, and explains the theoretical and research implications of these differences. This is followed by an explanation and detailed exemplification of two sets of conceptual tools elaborated in socio-narrative theory. The first is a fluid typology of different types of narrative that has been revisited and adapted in a number of studies. The second is an interdependent set of dimensions that define narrativity and are deployed in any attempt to make sense of experience by embedding it within a narrative world. The typology proposed in Baker (2006) consists of four categories: personal, public, conceptual and meta-narratives. The chapter draws on existing studies to exemplify the meaning of each category and demonstrate the dynamic interplay between them. The set of dimensions discussed and exemplified are temporality (covering both time and space), relationality, selective appropriation, causal emplotment, particularity, genericness, normativeness/canonicity and breach, and narrative accrual. The typology and the set of dimensions are both exemplified with reference to a diverse set of materials, including poetry, theatre translation, political advocacy programmes of translation, author branding and subtitling. The chapter ends by acknowledging the difficulty of applying this version of narrative theory in the context of existing research traditions in Translation Studies, and proposes a number of avenues and genres that lend themselves readily to narrative analysis and that may be explored in future research.

Whereas the previous chapter eschews the concept of narratology, which is focused mainly on literature, Chapter 13, “Stylistics and translation”, by Jean Boase-Beier, answers the questions that it raises largely with reference to works of literature, poetry in particular. The questions are the following: How do style and translation interact? What is a stylistic approach to translation and what is a translational approach to stylistics? The chapter begins by considering the location of stylistics with respect to both Linguistics and to the study of literature, tracing its origins in early work of the Prague and Moscow Linguistic Circles, and setting its development alongside that of the discipline of Translation Studies. Both disciplines are

concerned with similar linguistic issues: the relation of meaning to form; the choices the originator of a text makes; and how these choices are reconstructed by the reader. For stylistics, we can gain interesting insights into the minute detail of a text, and the relations between its form and its meaning, by confronting the text with its translations. For Translation Studies, conversely, we can consider what a stylistic approach involves and what questions it raises: questions about the role of style in the production of the translation and in its reception. We must also ask in what sense stylistics can affect the practice of translation; one way of doing this is to consider how a stylistically aware translation might differ from one that takes less account of the nuances of style. Future research might take this practical question further, paying more attention to the way a reader processes the stylistic detail of a translated text, and exploring the differences between (a) reading on the assumption that a translated text does not differ in any interesting way from its source text and (b) a reading experience that takes full account of the fact that the translation has changed the text stylistically, and incorporated elements of the style of the translator.

Chapters 9 to 13, having dealt with theories of text writ large, and with the structuring of texts into specific types or genres, the two remaining chapters in Part III address details of texts that often present translators with particularly inviting opportunities for creativity in the form of tropes and wordplay. Chapter 14, “Tropes and translation”, by James Dickins, identifies and defines a set of key tropes and presents a number of notions which are essential for trope analysis. The chapter provides a preliminary analysis of non-lexicalised tropes, including metaphor, simile, metonymy and synecdoche, followed by an analysis which is necessary if lexicalised tropes are to be accounted for. In a lexicalised trope, the figurative sense depends on the semantic conventions of the language. For example, in “That argument’s rubbish”, “rubbish” acquires a secondary lexicalised metaphorical sense “Worthless or absurd ideas, talk, or writing; nonsense” in addition to its basic lexicalised sense of refuse, which, however, limits the sense of the metaphor. By contrast, in “The past is a foreign country”, “foreign country” is a non-lexicalised metaphor; there are no basic semantic conventions of English which limit and specify the sense of “foreign country” used non-literally. The chapter discusses Goatly’s categories of core, periphery, approximation and transfer in relation to tropes, concluding that these represent a continuum rather than categorical differences, and that the differences between metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche are also matters of degree rather than of category. It offers a revised analysis of non-lexicalised tropes, taking into account the continuum arguments, and considers metaphorical force, mainly using Goatly’s dead, sleeping, tired and active scale, before discussing Lakoff and Johnson’s influential conceptual metaphor theory. Turning more specifically to translation issues, the chapter surveys works on the translation of tropes, and provides a chronologically oriented overview of approaches to the translation of metaphor, which is typically thought of as the most challenging trope to translate.

In Chapter 15, “Wordplay and translation”, Ida Klitgård discusses the nature of wordplay, especially the pun, in relation to translation. The pun manipulates sounds and senses that produce meanings that are taken for granted within cultures, in such a way that unexpected combinations ensue, which typically make us laugh. Translating puns may be difficult if cultural references differ between the two languages. The chapter provides a thorough account of wordplay from a lexico-grammatical point of view where the pun is defined as a bisociation formed through an acoustic knot. The secondary, unexpected meaning of the pun takes us by surprise as it challenges lexical priming in terms of the principles of collocations and colligations. Following the exposition of definitions, the chapter discusses methods and current debates on the translation of puns. The article concludes with examples from the

Introduction

Danish translations of James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* (1922), which is a playful fabric of interconnected multilingual imagery, motifs and extensive wordplay.

Part IV of the volume "Individuals and their interactions" moves from a focus on texts to a focus on the users of language. It is divided into four chapters. In Chapter 16, "Bilingualism, translation, and interpreting", John W. Schwieter and Aline Ferreira discuss the role of individual bilingualism in translation and interpreting research. The chapter begins by presenting definitions of translation, interpreting and the complex notion of bilingualism followed by a brief historical account of important research in this area. Next, several core issues are discussed, including language proficiency and translation direction, lexical-conceptual representation and mediation, a dynamic view of bilingual and trilingual memory, and working memory and lexical retrieval. Investigations of these topics have moved translation and interpreting studies forward significantly, and many of these investigations have been informed by theoretical models in bilingualism, which are also presented. The chapter reviews interdisciplinary methodologies that demonstrate how techniques from cognitive science have situated themselves effectively within translation and interpreting studies. Finally, the chapter discusses how technologies affect translation and interpreting research and practice and suggests how future work in bilingualism can continue to inform translation and interpreting studies.

Chapter 17, "Language disorders, interpreting, and translation" by Alfredo Ardila, addresses situations in which all is not well with an individual's language, and the consequences for the person's ability to translate and interpret. The chapter presents a clinical description of the language disorders associated with brain pathology and introduces a distinction between the fundamental or major aphasic syndromes, known as Wernicke's and Broca's aphasia, that impair phonology, lexicon, semantics and grammar, on the one hand; and other aphasic syndromes that affect the ability to produce language, or the executive control of the language, on the other. The chapter examines the organisation of language in the bilingual brain, emphasising crucial variables, such as the age of acquisition of the second language, that significantly affect the patterns of organisation of language in the brain. The final section approaches the question of aphasia in bilinguals. It distinguishes between different patterns of clinical manifestation and recovery, and considers disturbances in the translation ability observed in bilinguals.

In Chapter 18, "Language processing in translation", Moritz Schaeffer considers the investigation of linguistic processing during translation in unimpaired individuals. He focuses on the methodological issues that have arisen and play a role in the quest for a model of the translation process. The advantages and disadvantages of each method are considered and compared. Key findings from both Bilingualism Studies and Translation Process Research are explained and highlighted. Findings from experimental studies, eye movement corpus studies, product-based translation corpus studies and brain imaging studies are discussed. The relationship between research methods in Translation Process Research and those employed in Psychology and Bilingualism Studies are examined in detail and future avenues of research are identified.

The final contribution to Part IV of the volume moves from the individual into the wider context of society, with Federico M. Federici's chapter, Chapter 19, on "Sociolinguistics, translation, and interpreting". The chapter considers translating and interpreting as sociolinguistic activities, and starts by presenting an account of interaction between early translation and interpreting scholarship and concepts from sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics focuses on how social and linguistic factors influence communication and organise meaning, and these issues are of crucial importance for any language and culture mediator. Concepts

such as register, which covers the choice of appropriate language given a particular constellation of discourse participants and the relationships between them, topic and message function, are central in translating and interpreting and the chapter reflects on the influence of sociolinguistic concepts on approaches to translation and interpreting research and practice. The chapter reviews debates focused on topics that demonstrate the interrelationship between the two disciplines, and new perspectives on translation and interpreting emerging in sociolinguistic scholarship. As translators and interpreters operate in ever more technologically complemented contexts, in which social interactions occur in mixed modes and on a number of physical and virtual platforms, the chapter suggests that a competent grasp of sociolinguistic concepts is likely to remain an intrinsic part of the skillsets of translators and interpreters.

This focus on technology moves us towards Part V of the volume, which considers the relationship between humans and machines in the context of translating and interpreting. In Chapter 20, “Language and translation in film”, Rocío Baños and Jorge Díaz-Cintas discuss the professional practices that are usually considered part of audiovisual translation (AVT), including accessibility to the media for audiences with sensory disabilities. After a brief historical overview, the chapter outlines the main characteristics of AVT, in particular the semiotic nature of the source text and the technical issues that constrain the translation solutions that can be adopted in subtitling and dubbing. Special attention is paid to the pre-fabricated nature of the dialogue found in audiovisual texts and to the transition that takes place from the oral to the written mode in the case of subtitling. Interdisciplinarity is a distinctive trademark of AVT and the chapter discusses the main research methods traditionally used to investigate this area, emphasising the Descriptive Translation Studies paradigm and the use of corpora to identify the features and patterns of translated films. The chapter explores the efforts made by AVT scholars to test the validity of their theories experimentally, to explore the cognitive effort involved in the translational process and to measure human behaviour by means of instruments such as eye trackers, in order to acquire a better understanding of their target audience. The final section of the chapter focuses on the automation of subtitling through the application of statistical machine translation technology, the potential of AVT for foreign language teaching and learning and the proliferation of amateur practices like fansubbing and fandubbing on the net.

In Chapter 21, “Language, interpreting, and translation in the news media” Christina Schäffner explores the effect of globalisation on the translation of news-related material. Globalisation has resulted in rapid developments in the professional practices involved in multilingual communication and in a growth of non-professional translation. Journalists often resort to a type of translation when information initially provided in another language becomes a source for their own text production. In Translation Studies, the unique role translation plays in the production and dissemination of international news has been addressed systematically since the mid-2000s, and the chapter comments on this tradition of research, which explores linguistic and textual aspects of news texts in different languages and cultures, the translation strategies used and their effects, the practices in specific media settings and the agents involved and their understanding of translation. The chapter discusses the conceptual challenges news translation poses to Translation Studies, especially in relation to the concept of transediting, the activity of editing the text one is translating, a practice often engaged in by journalists.

Moving away from specific text genres, Chapter 22, “Corpus linguistics, translation and interpreting” by Silvia Bernardini and Mariachiara Russo, explores the effect of corpus linguistics, an approach to the study of language that developed in the late 20th century, on

Introduction

research methodology in translation and interpreting studies. The development of corpus linguistics enabled researchers to move away from analytical methods that relied mainly on introspection and on decontextualised, artificial examples. Access was made available to vast quantities of examples of texts in use, which could be collected according to explicitly defined criteria, stored electronically and searched using dedicated software known as corpus query tools. The chapter reviews the origins and basic assumptions of corpus linguistics, drawing attention in particular to the interest in phraseological and lexical perspectives on language that it brought about. Surveying the main analytical methods, insights and practical applications of corpora in the fields of translation and interpreting studies, the chapter focuses on widely used corpus designs. It identifies three issues of special relevance to corpus-based studies of translation, here intended in the narrower sense, i.e. written translation, namely typical features of translated language, translation shifts and translator style. Concerning the specificities of corpus-based interpreting studies, it draws attention especially to the triangulation of methods from corpus linguistics and other disciplines such as sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication. The chapter identifies challenges, debates and future directions in both research areas, and concludes with an outline of uses of corpus research and of corpora in the translation and interpreting professions, including corpus use for machine and computer-aided translation, translator–learner corpora and corpora for the training of translators and interpreters.

The World Wide Web can in many ways be considered the biggest corpus of all, and in Chapter 23, “Language and translation on the Web”, Mark Shuttleworth shows how translation may be implemented, supported, promoted, facilitated, discussed and made available over the Web. The chapter locates its topic within web studies and provides an overview of linguistic issues relating to the Web, with particular reference to translation. Topics such as the characteristics of web-based discourse and how different languages are represented on the Web are covered, along with a range of different translation practices, such as crowdsourced translation, translation in Wikipedia, web localisation and fansubbing. The chapter also discusses the online medium itself and the kinds of material that are typically being translated online. It reports on how the Web is used as a site for translation activities, focusing on machine translation and post-editing, web-based software and online translation resources such as translation memories and terminology. In addition, the chapter examines the social context in which translation takes place on the Web, as represented by blogs, translation portals and translators’ websites.

Concluding Part V of the handbook, Chapter 24, “Translation, interpreting and new technologies” by Michael Carl and Sabine Braun, sets out how new developments in information and communication technologies (ICT), have sparked a technological revolution in the translation and interpreting profession. They identify three strands of development. First, machine translation (MT), automatic speech recognition (ASR) and speech-to-speech translation (SST) systems are increasing in speed, diversity, accuracy and availability. Second, as more documents are translated than ever before, the translation profession is diversifying and adapting to changing market needs, including by using a plethora of tools to assist the process of translating and the production of translations. This has led to the expansion and diversification of computer-assisted translation (CAT) and human-assisted machine translation (HAMT). Third, the demand for interpreting services has grown rapidly along with requirements for the timeliness and sustainability of their delivery. This, combined with an increase in the required language combinations and local shortages of qualified interpreters, has encouraged the development of ICT-supported solutions including teleconference interpreting (TCI) and remote interpreting (RI) via telephone and videoconference.

The chapter explains the key terms and concepts associated with each of these areas and provides an overview of their historical development and an outline of the main current trends, issues, debates and future directions in relation to translation and interpreting technologies, referring to current and emerging practice and to insights from research. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the practical implications that the developments outlined are likely to have for translation and interpreting.

The chapter on technologies leads us naturally towards the concluding part of the volume, which focuses on applications of research in Linguistics and translation and interpreting to teaching, lexicography and the use of languages for specific purposes. The section opens with Chapter 25, “Linguistics, translation and interpreting in foreign-language teaching contexts”, by Anthony Pym and Nune Ayvazyan. The chapter outlines the history of the use of translation and interpreting in language teaching from the Renaissance through to the present day. Before the late 19th century, translation was a regular part of the teaching of foreign languages, alongside spoken and picture-based activities. This practice was challenged by Romantic learning theories that sought to imitate the “natural” learning process of the young child, and subsequently, and more significantly, by language teachers who had migrated to the United States and wanted to replicate their own experience of immersion. A method like Berlitz’s, dating from the end of the 19th century, still shuns translation. However, translation has maintained a key role in language teaching and learning in Eastern Europe and in Asia, and is increasingly advocated by new generations of teachers and scholars elsewhere, including in Western Europe, where research in the 21st century has shown no empirical evidence that judicious use of communicative translation has a negative effect on language learning. The chapter suggests that the lack of research into the use of translation in language teaching and learning in the late 20th century can be attributed to the limited attention that translation scholars paid to language education at that time, when Translation Studies was developing as an independent discipline.

Chapter 26, “Translation, Interpreting and Lexicography”, by Helle V. Dam and Sven Tarp, explores another important area of interaction between translation and interpreting studies and another discipline. Although translation, interpreting and lexicography are three separate areas of human activity, each with its own theories, models and methods and, hence, its own disciplinary underpinnings, all three disciplines share a marked interdisciplinary dimension: their practice fields are typically “about something else”. Translators may, for example, be called upon to translate medical texts, and interpreters may be assigned to work on medical speeches. Similarly, practical lexicography may produce medical dictionaries. In this perspective, the three disciplines frequently come into contact with each other. This chapter discusses and explores some of the basic aspects of this interrelationship, focusing on the (potential) contribution of lexicography to translation and interpreting. In the mutual relation between translation, interpreting and lexicography, translation and interpreting represent the main activity in which translators and interpreters are engaged, whereas the consultation of dictionaries is a secondary activity which is only relevant to them when experiencing information needs during the translation or interpreting process. As such, lexicography is above all viewed as an auxiliary discipline. The relationship between (written) translation and lexicography is strong and well established, whereas the link between interpreting and lexicography is much weaker. The chapter shows that there is no reason that this should continue to be the case, especially because the current introduction of disruptive technologies into lexicography is creating new possibilities of satisfying both old and new user needs.

The handbook’s closing chapter, Chapter 27 on “Language for Specific Purposes and translation”, by Stefanos Vlachopoulos, begins by outlining the historical background and

Introduction

major trends in the interaction between domain-specific language use, or Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) and translation. The chapter also discusses practical issues and illustrates how translators of specialised discourse perform by way of examples of translated legal texts, the cultural extremes of domain-specific discourse.

References

- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, M. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- Bitzer, L. F. 1968. The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, pp. 1–14.
- Davidson, D. 1973. Radical interpretation. *Dialectica* 27, pp. 313–328.
- Davidson, D. 1974. On the very idea of a conceptual scheme. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 47, pp. 5–20.
- Miller, C. R. 1984. Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, pp. 151–167.
- Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Quine, W. V. O. 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Introduction

This book has been engendered by my long-held conviction that fictional representations of the work of translators will shine a special, often unexpected light on the scene of translation as an asymmetrical encounter between different languages, interests, and perspectives. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, these representations are likely to allow some glimpses into what might be lurking behind the prevailing clichés associated with such an encounter and, therefore, into what is often repressed, barely theorized, or even acknowledged by conventional narratives about translators and their practice, particularly when this practice involves texts highly valued like those labeled as “literary.” In contrast to the usually sober discourse of scholarly studies, fictional texts focusing on issues of translation, authorship, and reading can provide a more nuanced frame of reference as they introduce us to translator characters that oftentimes reveal their inner struggles while facing the ethical conundrums associated with their work and the relationships they are expected to establish with author and/or reader figures that also have a stake in the process.

The storylines examined in this book feature intriguing versions of the all too familiar dilemmas that have informed the common discourse on questions of translation and interpretation for millennia and are mostly associated with the “suspicious” status of the translated text as the translator’s potentially inaccurate replacement of somebody else’s original in another language and context, a replacement that inevitably fails to repeat sameness and for that is often perceived as a threat that can unsettle the alleged authority of the original and/or its author. A critical examination of these issues is especially relevant in the context of contemporary viewpoints that recognize the interfering role of translators not as something that needs to be curtailed or penalized, but as part and parcel of the process that inevitably transforms texts across languages and whose circumstances and motivations should be carefully investigated. I am referring to the importance of post-Nietzschean thought for an understanding of interpretation, often represented by approaches associated with deconstruction, poststructuralism, gender, and postcolonial studies that challenge essentialist conceptions of language and text and underscore the interpreter’s and the translator’s

Introduction

authorial role in the shaping of meanings and identities. As the translator's visibility became the focal point of such trends within the discipline of translation studies, we started paying closer attention to the strong link that binds questions of language to power, and, therefore, to what ultimately anchors the hierarchical relationships that have defined the production and the reception of translations.

The rationale inspiring the eight chapters that constitute this book is directly associated with what has been labeled as “the fictional turn” in translation studies to signify the recognition of fiction as an appropriate source of reflection “on translation and other hermeneutical processes,” a “turn” that might indeed represent “one of the main contributions to translation theory” put forth just before the close of the twentieth century (Pagano 2002: 81). As proposed by Else Vieira in the mid-1990s, “the fictional turn” reflected her interest in highlighting the pivotal role played by translation-related issues in the fiction of key Brazilian and Latin American authors such as João Guimarães Rosa, Mário de Andrade, Jorge Luis Borges, Julio Cortázar, and Gabriel Garcia Marques, as well as the dialogue that a few scholars, including myself, had been trying to establish between fictional texts by these authors and theoretical discourses associated with Western thinkers such as Jacques Derrida, Charles Peirce, and Luce Irigaray (Vieira 1995: 50; cf., also, Gentzler 2008: 109–111). Obviously, though, with the growth of translation studies as an interdiscipline and the proliferation of translator characters in world literature intensifying at the turn of the millennium, the scholarly interest in representations of translators and translation-related issues in fiction began to produce an abundance of critical material elsewhere as well.

This output, by scholars with various agendas and from multiple cultural and scholarly backgrounds, has covered mostly contemporary fiction from an array of traditions and has provided a plethora of significant insights into translation practices and concepts as well as trends and themes in world literature (see, for example, Strümper-Krobb 2003, Wakabayashi 2005, Wilson 2007, Ben-Ari 2010, Baer 2005, Goldbort 2014, Wozniak 2014, just to name a few scholars among the many who have published in English). In recent years the exploration of fictional representations of translation has expanded to motion pictures, opening up new and exciting possibilities not only for research on translation but also for its teaching (cf. Cronin 2009). The vitality of this kind of study, which is bringing much needed visibility to the ever growing role of translators in our everyday lives and calling attention to the far-reaching implications of their practice in times of intensified globalization, has also been showcased in pioneering collections of articles such as Delabastita and Grutman (2005) and Kaindl and Spitzl (2014). The latter is a direct result of the “First International Conference on Fictional Translators and Interpreters in Literature and Film,” held at the University of Vienna's Centre for Translation Studies in 2011, and whose success prompted the organization of two others: “Translators and (Their) Authors,”

Introduction

held at Tel-Aviv University, Israel, in 2013; and “The Fictions of Translation,” at Concordia University in Montreal, Canada, in 2015.

In the introduction to “Fictionalizing Translation and Multilingualism,” the special issue Dirk Delabastita and Rainier Grutman edited for *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, they recognize that there has been, in recent years, “a growing number of fictional representations of translation and multilingualism, as well as an upsurge in their study,” and directly associate this upsurge with the view of translation “as a cultural and historical phenomenon” that many specialists have “gradually” come to accept since the 1970s (2005: 29). As they argue, such a view has led to a new interest in “older and ‘pre-scientific’ discourses on translation,” by which they mean “anthologies and discussions of historical statements” such as Douglas Robinson’s *Western Translation Theory from Herodotos to Nietzsche* (2002) (*ibid.*). For them, it is in this category, that is, as “statements *about* translation,” that fictional representations of translation should be included and, for the examination of “historical concepts and practices of translation,” both fictional and non-fictional narratives are as “worthy of research” as translations themselves (*ibid.*). Since it takes into account the full implications of the fact that translations as well as their theories, like everything else we know, cannot be dissociated from the cultural and historical circumstances that produce them, my perspective obviously distrusts any attempt to consider what some scholars may still view as “scientific” and “pre-scientific” translation discourses in terms of a universally accepted hierarchical opposition. Consequently, while I generally agree with Delabastita and Grutman’s perceptive commentary, I do not endorse their classification of literary representations of translation as a “pre-scientific” type of discourse, particularly if that implies that fiction may not be as legitimate or relevant as “science.”

The storylines studied in this book have been treated as exceptional representations of the ways in which translation and/or interpretation tends to be experienced in different contexts, revealing implicit and explicit interests and concerns that can be productively analyzed and bring significant insights into the usual conceptions found in prevalent non-fictional discourses on texts and translations as well as the relationships that produce them. If we are willing to consider the notion of theory more broadly and in terms that would be compatible with the etymology of *theoria*, that is, as a way of seeing or looking, we are likely to learn a great deal on translation and translation-related questions from fictional narratives, whose plots usually defend or side with a certain point of view and play out some of its most impacting consequences, offering unique opportunities for reflection that can be potentially more insightful than those associated with what specialists tend to classify as “real” theory. As Thomas O. Beebee has succinctly put it, in an article on Abdelkebir Khatibi’s *Love in Two Languages*, if fiction “is distinguished from other forms of discourse in its propensity to ‘play’ with the given ideologemes of its cultural context,” that

Introduction

is, if fiction can be freer and more creative in the ways in which it conveys or represents concepts and values, then, “the best place to trace the ideology of translation is through its fictional embodiment” (Beebee 1994: 72). Beebee’s position on the reading of fiction as a space of theorization, like mine, is compatible, for instance, with Jacques Derrida’s defense of literature as a privileged site for the kind of reflection generally associated with philosophy or theory. For him, “the thinking that takes place in philosophy” is not “confined to technical philosophy, or to the canonical history of philosophy,” but can also be found “in many other places, in law, linguistics, and psychoanalysis. Above all, the thinking that occurs in philosophy communicates in a very special way for Derrida himself with literature” (Caputo 1997: 57–58).

In consonance with this line of argument, I have examined short stories and novels by several authors from different backgrounds, not in the position of a supposedly non-biased exegete determined to describe as faithfully as possible what they have to say, but with the explicit goal of highlighting (and learning from) the contradictions and the aspirations associated with their implicit and/or explicit views on language, texts, interpretation, authorship, and translation. In my readings of these stories and novels, I have often been confronted with the fact that what is usually described as surreal or fantastic in fiction is indeed quite similar to what allegedly sober discourses on translation are trying to defend as “rational” or “objective.” At the same time, I cannot think of any scholarly text on the translator’s (in)visibility, for example, that could be more eloquent, or more convincing or touching than some of the fictional plots I have examined. It is thus my belief that the chapters that follow will offer specialists, even those who may not agree with my premises, stimulating material for reflection not only on the processes associated with translation but, also, on the common prejudices and idealized expectations that have characterized it as a secondary, mostly mechanical activity that should blindly attempt to reproduce sameness. Some of the authors whose fiction is studied in the following pages are widely known among educated readers of world literature – Jorge Luis Borges, Miguel de Cervantes, Franz Kafka, Edgar Allan Poe, Oscar Wilde, Julio Cortázar, Isaac Babel, José Saramago, and Italo Calvino. Others may not be so well known worldwide, but are outstanding figures in their own national contexts – the Argentine Rodolfo Walsh, the Brazilian Moacyr Scliar, and the Hungarian Dezső Kosztolányi. With the exception of Walsh’s “Nota al pie” (“Footnote”) (Walsh 2008) and Scliar’s “Notas ao pé da página” (“Footnotes”) (Scliar 1995), which I will be quoting from my own unpublished translations, all the fictional texts studied in the following pages are available in the English versions that constitute the actual texts I have analyzed. In the privileged company of these distinguished authors, I invite readers to follow the vicissitudes of a few writer figures, several translator characters, a proofreader, two painters/translators, and a handful of reader characters, all of them deeply involved in the pursuit of some form of textual mastery.

Introduction

As these engaging storylines can obviously count on the appeal of fiction's creative resources – colorful, contradictory characters; humorous or unpredictable intrigues; surprising events and revelations; dramatic twists and turns – they are quite efficient in enticing non-specialists to begin probing some of the theoretical concerns that have defined the practice of translation and captured the attention of scholars. As I suggest in Chapter One, their use for pedagogical purposes is perfectly suited for the teaching of key theoretical notions to undergraduate or graduate students interested in a variety of fields involved with issues of language such as translation studies, comparative and world literature, classical and modern languages and literatures, philosophy, and linguistics. The use of fictional representations of translation for pedagogical purposes has been addressed by Michael Cronin in his study of film and translation in terms that are quite compatible with my own view. As he suggests, “neglecting to use cinema in translation studies is neglecting to use a highly engaging and effective medium for soliciting responses on a wide variety of topics directly related to the business of translation,” topics such as “[e]quivalence, fidelity, infidelity, domestication, foreignization, control, invisibility, identity, untranslatability, positionality” (2009: xi; see also Kaindl 2014: 13).

My readings have been influenced most of all by Borges's “Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*” (Borges 1998a, trans. Hurley), the quintessential story about the impossibility of translation as the repetition of the same, whose focus is an unforgettable portrait of the translator as a Quixotic figure fully invested in an absurd mission to defeat difference and the passing of time. The translator in Borges's irreverent, thought-provoking plot is the Frenchman Pierre Menard, who dedicated his life to composing, in the first decades of the twentieth century, the exact same text Cervantes had produced in his native Spanish of the early 1600s. As the story so superbly illustrates, it is impossible to separate the translator's seemingly commendable goal of being totally faithful to the original he chose to reproduce from the apparent madness that led him to consider actually *becoming* Cervantes. In only a few pages, Borges has created, as has been shrewdly observed, not only “the most acute, most concentrated commentary anyone has offered on the business of translation” (Steiner 1975: 70), but, also, a wealth of material on the dynamics of reading, which, like translation, is viewed by the story's narrator as a practice that actually produces meaning rather than merely reproduces it. As the most important source of inspiration for this project, “Pierre Menard,” which can also be read as an inspiring synthesis of postmodern notions of translation and interpretation, has supplied the backbone and the main direction of my basic arguments. It also underscores some of the multiple ways in which fiction can be read as a deconstructive instrument that helps us reevaluate mainstream statements about the relationships that should be established between texts and what is routinely repressed or ignored by such statements, that is, the premises, the illusions, as well as the anxieties and the desires that often underlie the ways in which we deal with issues of language and the subject.

Introduction

“Pierre Menard” has been crucial not only for this project, but for my own growth as a scholar as well. It was, for instance, the topic of my very first publication (Arrojo 1984) and the focus of a few other pieces I have written throughout the years (cf., for example, Arrojo 1986: 11–24; Arrojo 1993: 151–175; Arrojo 2004; Arrojo 2010; and Arrojo 2014), some of which have also been rethought for this book (cf. Chapters One, Four, and Eight). When I first read the story, as an inexperienced teenager used to reading more conventional forms of fiction, and, thus, long before being exposed to theory or philosophy, I found it dull and could not quite understand why Borges was such a celebrated author. However, when I reread it in the 1980s, in the wake of my early exposure to poststructuralism, I became instantly infatuated with Borges’s wit and the possibilities his work seemed to offer for the reading of fiction as a form of theory. Since then, “Pierre Menard” has been a constant companion in my teaching and in the development of my own thinking about questions of literature and translation. Furthermore, these different readings can be viewed as compelling evidence of the fact that no text can be read in a vacuum. Besides exploring some of the many ways in which the story can be interpreted, my comments on “Pierre Menard” also exemplify the kind of dialogue I have tried to establish, throughout the years, between Borges’s work and seminal texts by major thinkers such as Plato, Friedrich Nietzsche, Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Sigmund Freud, and Jacques Lacan, texts that have played a defining role in the ways in which I read fiction and reflect on its relevance and its implications.

In my preparation of the chapters that follow, I have made sure that each of them can also be read as an individual essay. At the same time, since they all feature storylines that revolve around overlapping themes and concerns, these chapters build on one another and, together, can hopefully offer a solid reflection on the fantasies and assumptions that seem to be involved in the notions of authorship and translation that have defined mainstream views and the institutions that support them. In Chapter One, “Introducing Theory through Fiction,” my main goal is to show how Borges’s “Pierre Menard” can inspire students to reflect on the nonsensical positions on originals and authors, translators and readers, which are commonly taken for granted by our persistent essentialist tradition and its belief in the possibility of fixed meanings and ideally neutral, non-interfering subjects. Besides the material about “Pierre Menard,” which is based on a previously published essay (Arrojo 2010), Chapter One presents a reading of Julio Cortázar’s “Letter to a Young Lady in Paris” (Cortázar 1985, trans. Blackburn), another short story that never fails to captivate students and stimulate them to rethink the basic issues involving translation and how it should relate to the writing of originals. Cortázar’s story is a poignant narrative in the format of a letter that turns into a suicide note addressed to Andrea, the young lady of the title. It is being written by the story’s narrator, who works as a translator and tells Andrea about the ambivalence he feels

Introduction

towards the little rabbits he must often vomit up and that, little by little, transform and finally destroy her apartment, which can be interpreted as a compelling metaphor for the original text on which the translator is allegedly working. While in “Pierre Menard,” we learn about the French translator’s peculiar decision to become Cervantes in order to repeat the *Quixote*, in “Letter to a Young Lady in Paris,” we are exposed to the translator’s gripping narrative of his own failure to protect the author’s textual space from his agency and relentless creativity. Both pieces are quite effective in getting students to ponder the issue of (in)visibility in translation and whether translators could indeed repress or ignore who they are while devoting their efforts to someone else’s text. My reading of the two stories in the same chapter also intends to emphasize the value of a comparative approach, in which the interpretation of one piece illuminates and complements the interpretation of the other.

This is an approach that I have adopted in all the chapters, with the exception of Chapter Two, “Fiction as Theory and Activism,” a revised version of a recently published essay (Arrojo 2016), which proposes a reading of Rodolfo Walsh’s “Nota al pie” (“Footnote”) (Walsh 2008), a unique, moving story that, unlike the other fictional texts studied in the book, features a narrator who openly sympathizes with the plight of the underpaid, silenced translator, and unequivocally defends his right to be visible and recognized. The focal point of Walsh’s story is a suicide letter written by a translator character and intercepted by the narrator who turns it into a footnote that grows larger on every page until it literally takes over the narrative and exposes the dead translator’s miserable life in the Argentina of the late 1950s. Even though I have not commented on how Walsh’s story could be read together with (or against) other stories, I encourage readers to further explore the many possibilities of a comparative approach when examining all the fictional texts featured in this book. In my discussions of these pieces with students, I have explored, for instance, some of the obvious similarities between Walsh’s and Cortázar’s stories, beginning with the fact that Walsh’s translator figure, like Cortázar’s, can no longer bear to repress his agency, but is only able to express himself after deciding to take his own life. Thus, in both cases, the only acknowledged, visibly signed piece of writing they leave behind is a suicide letter.

In Chapter Three, “The Illusive Presence of Originals,” readers will find a critique of the idealized conception of originals typically cultivated by tradition. It focuses on Oscar Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (Wilde 2014) and Edgar Allan Poe’s “The Oval Portrait” (Poe 1983) (the material on the latter is based on Arrojo 2003). Their well-known plots can be read as revealing explorations of the metaphor of translation as portrait painting, a metaphor that reflects the long-established hierarchy separating fetishized conceptions of the original as a fully present, reliable bearer of its author’s acknowledged meanings and intentions, from its allegedly inadequate representations in other languages or media. As this metaphor is normally

Introduction

meant to suggest, while the original as a live model is multidimensional, but supposedly predictable and immune to change, its translations, like painted portraits, will always be lacking since they cannot possibly do justice to whatever glorified plenitude they may be required to reproduce. The conceptual frame behind this metaphor is radically challenged in both Wilde's and Poe's plots, which play with the idea that painted portraits could in fact be more authentic, and even more alive, so to speak, than the live models/originals that they are supposed to reproduce. Considering that these narratives dare to defy the customary, age-old opposition between originals and their reproductions, it seemed fitting that I preface my readings of Wilde's and Poe's pieces with a brief introduction to "Book X" from Plato's *Republic* (Plato 1991, trans. Jowett), a foundational text that famously addresses, among other issues, the relationship between the unattainable, absolutely perfect original, understood here in its broadest sense, and its reproduction in painting. Hopefully, the commentary on Plato's "Dialogue" will also help readers unfamiliar with this kind of thinking to follow the introduction to Nietzsche's philosophy featured in Chapters Four and Five.

The focus of Chapter Four, "The Translation of Philosophy into Fiction," in which I revisit and expand on previously published material (Arrojo 2014), is the exploration of what I see as a close connection between key notions from Nietzsche's philosophy and Borges's "Funes, His Memory" (Borges 1998b, trans. Hurley), the story of the young Uruguayan who became famous for his prodigious memory, and which can be read as a creative translation of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (Nietzsche 2006). The chapter starts with an introduction to Nietzsche's conception of language, which I find to be quite compatible with Borges's views on translation as they are represented not only in several of his stories, but also in his essays on the subject, "The Homeric Versions" (Borges 1999a, trans. Weinberger) and "The Translators of *The One Thousand and One Nights*" (Borges 1999b, trans. Allen). An important goal of the chapter is to show how the reading of Borges's fiction can be illuminated by Nietzsche's philosophy and how both can help us develop a deeper understanding of the essays just mentioned. Furthermore, while my reading of "Pierre Menard" in Chapter One sets up the context and serves as a kind of prologue to my comments on Cortázar's story, in Chapter Four it is "Funes, His Memory" that will guide me in further reflecting on "Pierre Menard." More specifically, a thorough reading of "Funes" will shine a light into the kind of ambivalent treatment the French translator receives from the story's narrator and, thus, also into Borges's complex views on the translator's visibility subtly suggested in "The Translators of *The One Thousand and One Nights*."

Chapter Five, "Texts as Private Retreats," also an expansion of previously published material (Arrojo 2002), focuses on three remarkable pieces: Kafka's "The Burrow" (Kafka 1971, trans. Muir); Borges's "Death and the Compass" (Borges 1998c, trans. Hurley); and "Gallus," a chapter from

Introduction

Kosztolányi's *Kornél Esti* (Kosztolányi 2011, trans. Adams). These narratives work quite well together particularly as I read them alongside Nietzsche's concept of the "will to power" and its deconstruction of the essentialist basis of any "natural," hierarchical distinction between the writing and the interpretation of texts. In my readings of Kafka's and Borges's stories, besides taking a closer look at the profile of their bizarre authorial figures, I examine the metaphor of text, or the writing of a text, as the construction of an ever-changing labyrinth that should protect its constructor from the invasion of unwelcome intruders. The labyrinth maker in Kafka's story is presumably a burrowing animal, obsessed with the possibility of creating a flawless structure that could be definitive, perfectly closed and, hence, shielded from difference and the interference of others. The reflection I construct around Kafka's story is supplemented by a reading of Borges's "Death and the Compass," in which the unconventional author figure is Red Scharlach, an assassin who weaves a textual labyrinth to trap his arch-enemy Erik Lönnrot, the reader/detective who is determined to outsmart and arrest Scharlach. This textual labyrinth finds a fitting representation in *Triste-le-Roy*, the abandoned villa located in the outskirts of the city where Scharlach finally catches Lönnrot. While Kafka's and Borges's stories can be read to illustrate and even expand on some views associated with Nietzsche's concept of the will to power and its implications for writing and interpretation, it is in Kosztolányi's piece that an actual translator figure is brought to the scene. From the perspective of the Hungarian author's narrator, who introduces himself as a respected writer, Gallus, the translator, was a promising, talented young man with exceptional language skills. However, as a chronic kleptomaniac, he could not stop himself and ended up "stealing" an odd assortment of objects from a second-rate English thriller he was commissioned to translate, and which he transformed into an elegant piece of Hungarian prose. The characterization of the translator as an incurable thief provides a comical, but eloquent portrayal of the difficulty of establishing a clear-cut distinction between the author's and the translator's roles in the production of translated texts, a difficulty that is also behind the often complicated relationship authors and translators tend to establish with one another.

In Chapter Six, "Authorship as the Affirmation of Masculinity," I revisit similar versions of these distinctions, but, this time, they are anchored to the most fundamental dichotomy of all, that is, the one that reduces gender to an opposition that values males over females and is traditionally viewed as self-evident and unquestionable. The chapter proposes a reflection on gender-related stereotypes often found at the core of clichéd assumptions about authorship and translation and is organized around two pieces – José Saramago's *History of the Siege of Lisbon* (Saramago 1997, trans. Pontiero) and Isaac Babel's "Guy de Maupassant" (Babel 2002, trans. Constantine). Particularly when read comparatively, these very different texts can bring to the fore the intimate relationship often established between mainstream

Introduction

notions of authorship and the recurrent hierarchy that opposes literary creativity, commonly identified as a masculine attribute, to feminine or less than masculine, “reproductive” textual practices such as reading or translation (for the theoretical basis informing my commentary, I am indebted to Gilbert and Gubar 1984 and Chamberlain 2000). This opposition is emblematically illustrated in the trajectory of Raimundo Silva, Saramago’s protagonist in *The History of the Siege of Lisbon*, a lonely, almost asexual proofreader in his fifties who has settled for a profession he despises until he finds the courage to change a key sentence in the history book he is proofreading about the reconquest of Lisbon in the twelfth century. As the plot associates the emergence of Raimundo’s authorial voice to the reawakening of his masculinity and, thus, to the possibility of a fulfilling relationship with a loving female, it also suggests the outline of a simplistic, gender-based opposition between authorship and proofreading, according to which females (or less than aggressive males) seem to have no desire or adequate skills to create texts of their own and are, thus, meant to proofread the texts of others. A similar dynamic is suggested in Babel’s “Guy de Maupassant,” whose plot allows me to expand on the discussion outlined above with a focus this time on the process of translation and the figure of the translator. The story takes us to 1916 Saint Petersburg, Russia, where we get acquainted with three translator figures: Aleksei Kazantsev, a gentle male teacher and translator who has no ambition to do anything else; Raisa Bendersky, a wealthy, married woman whose hobby is to translate stories by her beloved Maupassant, but who has no talent for literature; and the oversexed young narrator who is adamant about becoming a writer and resorts to literary translation in order to pursue his dream. When the narrator is hired to revise Raisa’s translations, the opportunity provides him not only with the writing exercise supplied by translation and some means to support himself, but also with the sexual initiation Raisa is willing to offer. Indeed, as the narrator manipulates and rewrites Maupassant’s stories in Russian, translation allows him to temporarily take the author’s place and seduce Raisa in her domestic context. If, as Saramago’s and Babel’s storylines seem to suggest, proofreading and translation are viewed as devalued practices pursued either by those who lack appropriate authorial skills, or those who view such practices mostly as a writing exercise that might lead to the composition of their own texts, they basically deny the actual possibility of translation and proofreading as legitimate professional activities that deserve to be taken seriously for their own sake.

Chapter Seven, on “The Gendering of Texts,” based on a previously published essay (Arrojo 2005), proposes readings of Moacyr Scliar’s “Notas ao pé da página” (“Footnotes”) (Scliar 1995) and Italo Calvino’s *If on a Winter’s Night a Traveler* (Calvino 1981, trans. Weaver). These pieces have allowed me to continue probing the interface between gender and general conceptions of textual practices with a focus this time on representations of women and texts as highly prized property, and, therefore, as the objects of

Introduction

desire and contention that divide author and translator figures. As in the storylines examined in the previous chapter, the roles attributed to women in Calvino's and Scliar's plots revolve around simplistic, sexist stereotypes, which suggest, among other things, that texts, like women, are not to be trusted and can only be somewhat stabilized or temporarily tamed under the sway of a steady male authority figure. Scliar's story, like Walsh's, commented on above, resorts to footnotes as a persuasive representation of the translator's marginal position not simply in the process of translation, but in the very text he produces, where he may be allowed to be visible only at the bottom of the page. From the narrator/translator's five footnotes, one at the bottom of each blank page, we learn that they refer to the translation of a poet's memoir, the same poet whose work this translator/narrator had also translated, and the same poet whose mistress the translator ends up marrying. As a valuable asset that changes hands, the poet's mistress, as a sort of "belle infidèle," can be interpreted as a metaphor for the text that cannot stay the same or stand still and is thus unable to remain truly faithful to the author, or anybody else, for that matter. This trope of the woman as text, or the text as woman, can be explored in greater detail in Calvino's acclaimed novel, in which a male Reader, an impotent author figure, and a deceitful, powerful translator character, are all pursuing the attractive Ludmilla. As the female reader character, who has had an affair with the translator and has no interest in being intimate with the elderly author, but ends up married to the Reader, Ludmilla represents not only a close association between woman and text, but, also, the usual conception of reading as a "feminine," passive activity that is expected to revere the allegedly unconditional authority of the (male) author.

Considering that Calvino's and Scliar's gender-focused plots bring out weak male author figures who cannot get or keep the girl, so to speak, in sheer contrast with highly visible, empowered translator characters, it is fair to argue that they both recognize the productive nature of the translator's practice and, consequently, also the difficulty of clearly separating what belongs to the author from what belongs to the translator in the process of translation. In fact, up to a certain point, Calvino's and Scliar's pieces could be read as humorous, albeit sexist, representations of post-Nietzschean conceptions of text and authorship, with an emphasis on the "death of the author" arguments proposed by French poststructuralists. However, a closer look at Calvino's and Scliar's ambivalent treatment of the translator's visibility will also reveal a different picture. In both pieces, there is an obvious contrast between the theoretical or ideological positions implicitly represented in their plots and what they actually seem to value on a more subtle, subterranean level, as revealed, for instance, by the characterization of their translator figures as grossly unethical individuals. Such a characterization implies, of course, that in these storylines the translator's visibility is not seriously treated as the logical outcome of the fact that translators do have to make choices and reveal themselves in the translations

Introduction

they compose, but, rather, as a symptom of their abusive personalities or sheer lack of scruples and, hence, as something that could (and should) be potentially corrected or neutralized.

What appears to be a contradiction between the underlying motivations of Calvino's and Scliar's narratives and the notions of text, authorship, and translation identifiable in their storylines is actually one of the most valuable characteristics of the fictional pieces analyzed in this book. Because of their multiple perspectives and the different viewpoints represented, these pieces allow us not only to learn from the theoretical constructs that seem to inform their plots, but also to peek into the kind of emotional response that such constructs tend to elicit, particularly from author/narrator figures who are highly invested in shaping the textual practices that make it possible for their work to circulate. From this perspective, Calvino's and Scliar's texts, like most of the storylines examined in this book, can also be discussed in light of an argument introduced by Freud in "Creative Writers and Daydreaming," which relates the writing of fiction to its author's desire to be invulnerable (Freud 1983: 25, trans. Strachey). According to Freud, while the creative writer "creates a world of fantasy which he takes very seriously – that is, which he invests with large amounts of emotion," his ultimate goal is "to rearrange the things of his world in a new way which pleases him" (ibid.). As a consequence, this kind of fiction will always feature a "hero who is the center of interest" and whom the author "seems to place under the protection of a special Providence" (Freud 1983: 26). In Calvino's and Scliar's texts, as in most of the storylines analyzed, even though such a hero can be associated with an author or narrator figure, the very fact that his antagonist is a daring translator or reader seems to suggest that, besides being recognized, the creative power of translation or interpretation is feared as a major threat, particularly on a more personal level that could even be traced to the actual author. From this stance, it seems fair to speculate that while the translator's alleged invisibility does not reflect the actual practice that allows for texts to live on and travel across cultures and languages, its implicit idealization in fiction may be a forceful projection of the (male) author's desire to reign invulnerable within the imagined limits of his text, even after it has been rewritten by someone else in a different language and context.

Chapter Eight, "Translation as Transference," a revised version of an article that first appeared in *Diacritics* (Arrojo 2004), addresses the question of the translator's visibility from a different angle. Its main goal is to pursue some associations between Borges's own biography and his "Pierre Menard," with special emphasis on his early translation practice and the launching of his career as a poet after he falls in love with Walt Whitman's poetry. My starting point is a close look at the peculiar bond that Menard seems to have developed not only with the *Quixote*, but, more significantly, with Cervantes himself, a bond that, as I claim, can be plausibly understood in the light of the concept of transference in Lacanian psychoanalysis

Introduction

anchored in “the formula of the subject presumed to know” (“Le Séminaire,” Lacan 1975: 64, trans. and qtd. by Felman 1987: 86). From this viewpoint, it would be feasible to consider Cervantes as “the subject presumed to know” for the French translator, who actually desires to *be* the Spanish master and do and write exactly what he did. From this perspective, it can be argued that Menard uses translation as a convenient response to transference, a response that allows him to imagine that he could (and even should) indeed take Cervantes’s place and rewrite his masterpiece. Through readings of pivotal texts such as Borges’s “An Autobiographical Essay” (Borges 1987), I establish some significant links between his early years as an aspiring poet and translator and the story of Pierre Menard: just as Cervantes seemed to function as “the subject presumed to know” who stimulated Menard to compose fragments from the *Quixote*, it was Borges’s love for Whitman and his poetry that inspired him to publish, in 1919, “Himno del mar” (“Hymn to the Sea”) (Borges 1997), his first poem, which reads like a clumsy imitation of the American poet’s work. Borges’s interest in Whitman also produced *Hojas de hierba* (Whitman 1969), his translation of *Leaves of Grass*, whose publication, first announced in 1927, did not take place until 1969. As I speculate, this forty-year gap between the announcement and the actual publication of *Hojas de hierba*, in addition to some of Borges’s puzzling choices, could be ultimately associated with the Argentinian author’s need to deal with his infatuation with the American poet and, perhaps, to feel reassured that he could indeed become a major literary figure and would not end up simply repeating Pierre Menard, the translator who never managed to overcome his obsession with one of the greatest authors of all time and left no legacy of his own. While, in previous chapters, Borges’s stories are shown to destabilize the conventional distinction between fiction and theory, in Chapter Eight it is the distinction between fiction and autobiography that is found to be blurred.

Readers will probably note that the blurring of the long-established oppositions that have defined the relationship between the writing of originals and their representations, either in translations or interpretations, is indeed one of the most recurrent topics in my commentary. As my readings intend to suggest, what supposedly separates originals from their translations, texts from their readings, authors from translators and/or readers, fiction from theory, or writers from their writings can be productively rethought, particularly when examined through the creative, enriching filter provided by literature. Hence, the recognition and the exploration of what such a rethinking entails will expand and deepen our understanding not only of processes of interpretation, but also the scope and the function of literary fiction. At the same time, as the following chapters will hopefully convey, the perspective that has inspired my approach does not have to lead us to nihilism or to the chaos of a world in which anything goes. In fact, coming to terms with the provisionality and the contextualization of all allegedly clear-cut distinctions can sharpen our awareness of the fundamental roles

Introduction

we play – whether as authors, readers, or translators – in the construction of the meanings that matter to us. Consequently, it is likely to encourage us to confront the responsibilities involved in being true agents, rather than mere spectators, in the communities whose language practices shape us and are also shaped by our interventions. As a diligent interpreter of the fictional pieces chosen for this book, I can only hope that readers will recognize how seriously I have taken not only the authors and the texts I have chosen to write about, but, also, my role as the commentator who must interpret and, thus, rewrite their unforgettable plots.

Bibliography

- Arrojo, R. (1984) “Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*’ – esboço de uma poética da tradução via Borges,” *Tradução e Comunicação: Revista Brasileira de Tradutores* 5: 75–90.
- (1986) *Oficina de Tradução – A Teoria na Prática*, São Paulo: Ática.
- (1993) *Tradução, Desconstrução e Psicanálise*, Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- (2002) “Writing, Interpreting, and the Power Struggle for the Control of Meaning: Scenes from Kafka, Borges, and Kosztolányi,” in E. Gentzler and M. Tymoczko (eds.) *Translation and Power*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 63–79.
- (2003) “The Power of Originals and the Scandal of Translation: A Reading of Edgar Allan Poe’s ‘The Oval Portrait,’” in M. C. Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 165–180.
- (2004) “Translation, Transference, and the Attraction to Otherness – Borges, Menard, Whitman,” *Diacritics* 34(3): 31–52.
- (2005) “The Gendering of Translation in Fiction: Translators, Authors, and Women/Texts in Scliar and Calvino,” in J. Santaemilia (ed.) *Gender, Sex and Translation – The Manipulation of Identities*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 80–95.
- (2010) “Fictional Texts as Pedagogical Tools,” in C. Maier and F. Massardier-Kenney (eds.) *Literature in Translation – Teaching Issues and Reading Practices*, Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 53–68.
- (2014) “The Power of Fiction as Theory: Some Exemplary Lessons on Translation from Borges’s Stories,” in K. Kaindl and K. Spitzl (eds.) *Transfiction – Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 247–251.
- (2016) “A Portrait of the Translator as Laborer: A Reflection on Rodolfo Walsh’s ‘Nota al pie,’” in F. Massardier-Kenney, B. J. Baer, and M. Tymoczko (eds.) *Translators Writing, Writing Translators*, Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 39–53.
- Babel, I. (2002) “Guy de Maupassant,” P. Constantine (trans.), in N. Babel (ed.) *The Complete Works of Isaac Babel*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 679–686.
- Baer, B. J. (2005) “Translating the Transition: The Translator-Detective in Post-Soviet Fiction,” in D. Delabastita and R. Grutman (eds.), “Fictionalizing Translation and Multilingualism,” *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 4: 243–254.
- Beebe, T. O. (1994) “The Fiction of Translation: Abdelkebir Khatibi’s *Love in Two Languages*,” *SubStance* 23(1): 73: 63–78.

Introduction

- Ben-Ari, N. (2010) "Representations of Translators in Popular Culture," *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 5(2): 220–242.
- Borges, J. L. (1987) "An Autobiographical Essay," in J. Alazraki (ed.) *Critical Essays on Jorge Luis Borges*, Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 21–55.
- (1997) "Himno del mar," in *Textos recobrados, 1919–1929*, Buenos Aires: Emecé, 24–26.
- (1998a) "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*," A. Hurley (trans.) *Collected Fictions*, New York: Penguin, 88–95.
- (1998b) "Funes, His Memory," A. Hurley (trans.) *Collected Fictions*, New York: Penguin, 131–137.
- (1998c) "Death and the Compass," A. Hurley (trans.) *Collected Fictions*, New York: Penguin, 147–156.
- (1999a) "The Homeric Versions," E. Weinberger (trans. and ed.) *Selected Non-Fictions*, New York: Penguin, 69–74.
- (1999b) "The Translators of *The One Thousand and One Nights*," E. Allen (trans.), E. Weinberger (ed.) *Selected Non-Fictions*, New York: Penguin, 92–109.
- Calvino, I. (1981) *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler*, W. Weaver (trans.), New York: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Caputo, J. D. (1997) *Deconstruction in a Nutshell – A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Chamberlain, L. (2000) "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation," in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 314–329.
- Cortázar, J. (1985) "Letter to a Young Lady in Paris," P. Blackburn (trans.) *Blow-Up and Other Stories*, New York: Pantheon, 39–50.
- Cronin, M. (2009) *Translation Goes to the Movies*, London: Routledge.
- Delabastita, D. and R. Grutman, (eds.) (2005) "Fictionalizing Translation and Multilingualism," *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 4.
- Felman, S. (1987) *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight: Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Freud, S. (1983) "Creative Writers and Daydreaming," J. Strachey (trans.), in E. Kurzweil and W. Phillips (eds.) *Literature and Psychoanalysis*, New York: Columbia University Press, 24–28.
- Gentzler, E. (2008) *Translation and Identity in the Americas – New Directions in Translation Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Gilbert, S. M. and S. Gubar (1984) *The Madwoman in the Attic – The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Goldbout, P. (2014) "Fictional Translators in Quebec Novels," in K. Kaindl and K. Spitzl (eds.) *Transfiction – Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 177–187.
- Kafka, F. (1971) "The Burrow," W. and E. Muir (trans.), in N. N. Glatzer (ed.) *Franz Kafka – The Complete Stories*, New York: Schocken, 325–359.
- Kaindl, K. (2014) "Going Fictional? Translators and Interpreters in Literature and Film: An Introduction," in K. Kaindl and K. Spitzl (eds.) *Transfiction – Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–26.
- Kaindl, K. and K. Spitzl (eds.) (2014) *Transfiction – Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kosztolányi, D. (2011) *Kornél Esti – A Novel*, B. Adams (trans.), New York: New Directions.

Introduction

- Lacan, J. (1975) *Le Seminaire*, livre XX, Paris: Seuil.
- Nietzsche, F. (2006) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra – A Book for All and None*, A. Del Caro (trans.), A. Del Caro and R. Pippin (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pagano, A. S. (2002) “Translation as Testimony: On Official Histories and Subversive Pedagogies in Cortázar,” in M. Tymoczko and E. Gentzler (eds.) *Translation and Power*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 80–98.
- Plato (1991) “Book X,” B. Jowett (trans.) *The Republic*, New York: Vintage, 360–397.
- Poe, E. A. (1983) “Life in Death [The Oval Portrait],” in *The Unabridged Edgar Allan Poe*, Philadelphia, PA: Running Press Book Publishers, 734–738.
- Saramago, J. (1997) *The History of the Siege of Lisbon*, G. Pontiero (trans.), Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Scliar, M. (1995) “Notas ao pé da página,” in *Contos Reunidos*, São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 371–375.
- Steiner, G. (1975) *After Babel – Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strümper-Krobb, S. (2003) “The Translator in Fiction,” *Language and Intercultural Communication* 3(3): 115–121.
- Vieira, E. R. P. (1995) “(In)visibilidades na Tradução: Troca de Olhares Teóricos e Ficcionalis,” *ComTextos* 6: 50–68.
- Wakabayashi, J. (2005) “Representations of Translators and Translation in Japanese Fiction,” in D. Delabastita and R. Grutman (eds.), “Fictionalizing Translation and Multilingualism,” *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 4: 156–169.
- Walsh, R. (2008) “Nota al pie,” in *Un Kilo de Oro*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor, 69–96.
- Whitman, W. (1969) *Hojas de hierba*, J. L. Borges (trans.), Buenos Aires: Juárez Editor.
- Wilde, O. (2014) *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Brooklyn, NY: Millennium Publications.
- Wilson, R. (2007) “The Fiction of the Translator,” *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28(4): 381–395.
- Wozniak, M. (2014) “Future Imperfect: Translation and Translators in Science-Fiction Novels and Films,” in K. Kaindl and K. Spitzl (eds.) *Transfiction – Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 345–361.