

Gentler notes in his introduction to Robinson's *What Is Translation?*, these new critical developments are taking place in the "space between theory and practice, between criticism and creative writing" (xvi). It is therefore not surprising that the points of view expressed in the works discussed below are mostly those of practising translators concerned with sharing their experience and what they have learned from it with others in the field and with creating new pedagogical tools. The knowledge produced by this body of work however reaches beyond what is needed in the training of translators and has deeper epistemological consequences. Translation is, and has always been, an activity which takes place at borders, be they linguistic, cultural, political, theoretical, literary, disciplinary or otherwise, and the field of translation studies has always borrowed methods, concepts and theories from other fields. Perhaps it is time it gave back some of its own.

Translation is caught up in the dynamics of use and abuse because it operates within an interliminal space, to borrow a term favoured by Marilyn Gaddis Rose, where the other is presumed to be translatable, that is, decipherable and comprehensible, and reducible to the same. Because the practice of translation, by definition, ignores the alterity of the other, it takes place at the crux of cultural literacy and acts as a constant reminder that "[f]oreignness does not start at the water's edge but at the skin's" (Geertz 112). A translator is like a cat who, fascinated by the dog next door and fully aware of the danger it poses, nevertheless walks provokingly into its yard. One can imagine many scenarios of what happens next but the point is that the cat is no more able to stay away from the dog than a translator can stop translating. Unlike the cat however, the translator can theorise and thus recognise the other as an inevitable part of his or her world, a desirable part that he or she will learn to know better, no longer perceive as dangerous but respect as irremediably different. Many translators find an intellectual home in Modern Languages departments which are well placed to impart this kind of knowledge since they are coming to understand the need to identify their curriculum as "a reflective involvement in another culture." Russell Berman explains that his use of the term *reflective* has two meanings: "going beyond an enthusiastic fascination with alterity in order to achieve a cultural literacy with intellectual foundations" and the fact that "students learning about another culture reflect on their own" (71). Translation can and should inform such a position. Indeed, the field of translation studies has come a long way since it first moved into the area of cross-cultural communication.

The Uses and Abuses of Translation

ANNE MALENA

We must learn to grasp what we cannot embrace
Clifford Geertz

A pluralist concern with cultural literacy is manifesting itself in the field of translation studies as is evident from the latest wealth of publications¹. As Edwin

1 I borrow the term *foreign cultural literacy* from Russell Berman since my thinking on this topic is influenced by the struggles of departments of Modern Languages to transform their curriculum in order to survive. In my usage however I drop the word "foreign" to stress the reflective nature of the concept. The works treated herein are Mona Baker, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998. Pp. 654. US\$ 165.00); Dirk Delabastita, ed., *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur, 1997. Pp. 296. No price); Peter Fawcett, *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. Pp. 160. No price); Luise von Flotow, *Translation and Gender: Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1997. Pp. 114. No price); Marilyn Gaddis Rose, *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis and the Law*, ATA VIII (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995. Pp. 337. US\$ 75.00); Christiane Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. Pp. 154. No price); Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998. Pp. 220. No price); Douglas Robinson, *What Is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions* (Kent/London: The Kent State UP, 1997. Pp. 219. US\$ 32.00); Douglas Robinson, *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. Pp. 131. No price); Mary Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Rev. ed. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988/1995. Pp. 170. No price); Edwina Taborsky, *The Textual Society* (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1997. Pp. 229. Cloth: US\$ 50.00; paper US\$ 17.95); Jane Taylor, Edith McMorran and Guy Leclercq, eds., *Translation: Here and There, Now and Then* (Exeter: Elm Bank Publications, 1996. Pp. 185. £ 24.99); Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995. Pp. 311. Cloth US\$ 84.00; paper US\$ 27.95). Although not a work on translation, Taborsky is germane to the discussion.

An interdisciplinary

When Mary Snell-Hornby first published *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* in 1988, her stated goal was to link literary translation and linguistics. Very little has been added to the revised edition (1995), other than selective additions to the bibliography, an index of names and key terms and a disappointingly short afterword on future perspectives which goes no further than to confirm the 1988 prognosis. This work has become a classic and was instrumental in bringing linguistics and literature closer together by showing the text to be more than a sample of language and translation more useful than mere language practice. Snell-Hornby had a vision of how translation and translation theory could be used for imparting cross-cultural communication skills to students of foreign languages. In this, she was reacting to the endemic misuse of translation in traditional language departments, partly due to the history of language teaching and the history of translation itself. However, in spite of the elaborate *cline*² she comes up with in order to represent the dynamic nature of an integrated concept of translation studies as a system of relationships, Snell-Hornby's commitment to scientific methods of analysis and clear definitions reveals a certain reluctance to let go of deeply ingrained concepts such as cultural cohesion and authorial intention. To define culture as a simple matter of consensus and the literary text as "a text that presents a systematic alternative to the accepted version of the 'real world'" obscures the diversity inherent to any culture and the ambivalent nature of the relationship between literature and the "real world."³ Furthermore, to assume authorial intention presupposes a textual transparency which should become apparent to the translator as long as he or she adheres to the recommended methodology. While I agree with her that

"translation, like any other kind of specialised activity, will have to be left to the specialists" (132), I also believe that translators need to collaborate with many specialists in other fields if the field of translation studies is ever to make it as an interdisciplinary. For now, students need at least to be made aware of the current theoretical debates in cultural and literary studies. Literary theory has shown that texts are not as systematic as structuralism would have had us believe and that they contain cracks and opacities that may be far more meaningful than the presumed authorial intention. This insight has repercussions beyond the literary field with grave consequences for translators who have to determine what to do with these ambiguities and probably refrain from elucidating them in the target culture. A greater knowledge of the interrelations at work within a culture should help the translators' decision-making processes. For example, polysystem theory has proven itself very useful in shedding some light on the norms governing a target culture.

Gideon Toury's *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* represents the culmination of many years of work devoted to the descriptive branch of translation studies. Toury's work, in particular on the use of translation to enrich Hebrew literature, has greatly contributed to the constitution of translation corpora, to the study of cultural norms and to the knowledge of translation strategies. This book makes a case for "approaching translation empirically as such" in bringing together a "Rationale for descriptive studies in translation" and several case studies. The last part of the book formulates laws drawn from these descriptive studies and opens the way for future study. Because of his concern to establish translation studies as a legitimate discipline with all the respect warranted by a true science, Toury sometimes makes surprising suggestions. For example, guarding against prescriptive tendencies in the field, he insists on the need for translation scholars to distinguish themselves from the practitioners, i.e. translation critics and teachers, and from practising translators. According to him, it is up to practitioners to draw conclusions and not up to scholars (17). The artificiality of these distinctions seems rather difficult to maintain today in a field where many translation scholars and practitioners are also practising translators even if the reverse is not true. Surely, he is not suggesting that, in order to do descriptive studies properly, one would need to dissociate oneself from one's own experience, in short, control one's subconscious, or risk compromising objectivity? What should we make then of Toury's own very deliberate move to posit translations as "facts of a 'target culture'" (23)? He does it in order to establish a much needed target-oriented paradigm in reaction to the source-orientedness prevalent in translation studies but, in doing so, he denies the possibility of intercultural ambiguity: "As long as

2 Snell-Hornby explains that the conception of the *cline* is borrowed from the linguist M.A.K. Halliday and lends itself to representing a spectrum "where sharp divisions have been replaced by the notion of gradual transition" (31).

3 Snell-Hornby borrows her definition of a literary text from Beaugrande and Dressler (70) and her definition of culture from Heinz Götting who adapted it from that of the American ethnologist Ward H. Goodenough. The latter definition reads as follows: "Culture is everything one needs to know, master and feel in order to judge where people's behaviour conforms to or deviates from what is expected of them in their social roles, and in order to make one's behaviour conform to the expectations of the society concerned — unless one is prepared to take the consequences of deviant behaviour" (40).

a (hypothetical) intercultural has not crystallised into an autonomous (target!) systemic entity, e.g., in processes analogous to pidginisation and creolisation, it is necessarily part of an *existing* (target!) system" (28). My own *parti pris*, as the present discussion should make obvious, is that such an intercultural by definition does not crystallise but rather operates in a very fluid way within a culture, disrupting the apparent coherence of the target culture, blurring the boundary separating it from the source culture and creating the motivation and the possibility for translation. In denying this, Toury is relegating foreignness to the water's edge.

Before taking a look at more recent texts on different aspects of translation theories and approaches, I would like momentarily to broaden the perspective and consider the social construction of knowledge within which translation necessarily takes place. Edwina Taborsky, not a translator but an anthropologist, writes in *The Textual Society* that human existence is an organic complexity, combining nature and culture and made up of four realities: individual reality, group reality, biological reality and generative reality or the reality of the gods (xii). The first three have spatial and temporal frames while the fourth, also called generative energy, is a-spatial, a-temporal and infinite. Society is textual because it is formed through the constant dialogical interplay between these forces. For example, literature is a dialogical interaction that permits expression of a group reality but also gives the individual access to generative energy (22). In drawing from the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce, the chronotopic dialogics of Mikhail Bakhtin, quantum physics and biology, Taborsky suggests that, if we are to gain a deeper understanding of ourselves, these disciplines ought not remain isolated from each other (xiii). What interests me here is that the human being, "as an author, reader, and multiple actor" is examined within the text of society, linking together sensual and conceptual experiences. Using Peirce's three categories and operations of thought, namely Firstness, Secondness and Thirdness,⁴ Taborsky shows that the dialogue between individual and group reality creates a path of conceptualisation leading from the sensuous experience of the actor to the conceptual experience of this action (21).

This implies an ongoing process of interpretation of the text of society. She explains: "The textual society and its metaphors are chewed over, interpreted,

reinterpreted; bits are diverted, rejected; new ones are created by beings who experience these textual metaphors in a variety of ways" (163). Even though Taborsky does not consider translation, her terms can be used to explain how the translator's reality is formed through a double dialogue between his or her somatic responses and both source and target realities. As Douglas Robinson has already suggested in *The Translator's Turn*, the translator inhabits and is inhabited by both source and target textual societies. In occupying this somewhat privileged position, the translator is an agent of change on the side of heteroglossia which, according to Taborsky, "permits the entity to vary its conception of reality and thereby adapt its behaviour. Each entity must have this ability to vary its interactions with the external world" (210). In spite of this last statement however, it seems that Taborsky remains committed to the idea of certain cultures "naturally" dominating others. She does not consider how such dominated groups as colonised or ex-colonised people, migrants or other minorities may change the dominating group's reality through their own experience of heteroglossia. When Taborsky determines that it takes three generations for a colonised society to adapt to the imposed cognitive pattern of the coloniser, she does not allow for the possibility that resistant patterns of cognition may eventually disrupt the power structure of the colonising culture. Within the dominant culture resistance takes place in what Clifford Geertz calls "social spaces whose edges are unfixed, irregular, and difficult to locate" (121). Many translators occupy these spaces and translation theory, in attempting to explain them, repeatedly points out, as we will see in the next section, the contingency of knowledge.

Problems and Challenges

Let's pull back and look at some individual thoughts on translation. The volume *Translation: Here and There, Now and Then*, long delayed, is a welcome contribution to the field and the product of a meeting of practising translators under the auspices of *Translation Research in Oxford* at la Maison Française in 1992. Organised in four parts, the essays show how much fun earnest translators can have in perfecting, performing, playing with and persisting with words. In a more serious vein however, the authors are also concerned to reveal that the process of translation inevitably marks the target text: for example, Freudian concepts are different in English, French and German because the conceptual paths they have taken were influenced by the process of translation. The inclusion of many essays on the translation of theatre in this volume underlines this mediating role of translation, or, as one author puts it, its function as a

4 Peirce's phenomenological categories correspond to a three-fold interrelated process of apprehending the universe; firstness is the monadic category of being as a quality; secondness, the category of existence, is dyadic because it introduces differentiation; thirdness is the triadic category of reality and involves conceptualisation.

surrogate mother. Whether one believes in retaining traces of an old text in the modern adaptation (Jean-Paul Débax on translating and directing Henry Medwall) or accept to "fly" as much as the author (Martin Sorrell on translating Obaldia), taking informed licence with poetry (Ranjit Bolt on translating Molière) or finding the balance between sound and words (Michael Irwin on translating opera), what all these essays illustrate one after the other is the fundamental historicity of translation and of the translator. As Jean-Michel Déprats, the much acclaimed Shakespeare's translator and director, stresses, translation is not performed by completely free agents but by readers immersed in the history and sensitivity of a particular era. To him "une traduction, comme une mise en scène, est un moment très contingent, très éphémère, de l'approche qu'on peut avoir d'une œuvre" (118). The rest of the essays, more focussed on the particular problems encountered in translating Dickens, Lewis Carroll, or Astérix, all make for very interesting reading and reinforce the idea that translation facilitates cultural literacy. One of them, "Traduction, Puns, Clichés, Plagiat" by Walter Redfern, tackles the translation of wordplay which has long been considered the last frontier of cultural (un)translatability.

Redfern's essay is reprinted in the volume edited by Dirk Delabastita and inspires its title. The old rhetoric term of *traductio* denotes the pun. Redfern plays on this and points out that the *Traduttore traditore* "pun was inevitable, built into the whole idea of translating. A pun is a translation within a language, shuttling between two or more meanings of a word or phrase" (265). These essays on Punning and Translation show that puns, like translation, have a history made up of a complex and "variable constellation of factors having to do with text producers and receivers, with verbal and situational contexts, with genres, text-types and pragmatic situations of discourse, with psychological and cognitive mechanisms, with ideologies, with the ways in which different language systems set up and regulate relationships between signifieds and signifiers, and so on" (8). The effort of this book to deal with as many of these factors as possible reveals a welcome plurality of approaches ranging from Toury's empiricism to Redfern's playful look from the inside. The editor has to be commended for bringing together and contrasting such disparate approaches and concerns as deconstruction, feminism, Bible Studies, cognitive linguistics, contrastive linguistics, the author as reader, subtitling, Shakespeare in French, subjectivity and descriptive analysis.

The translation of wordplay pushes the uses of translation to the limit and challenges practitioners and theorists to rethink accepted views and concepts, in particular the widely accepted untranslatability of wordplay. In a provoking article Kathleen Davis shows the importance of wordplay for post-structuralism

and clarifies Derrida's position on Benjamin's notion of translatability which has been wrongly understood by some to allow for "abusive" translation — or for "deliberately preventing a fluent reading in the target language" (24, 41). By treating wordplay as a *signature* apposed to language, because it is both referential and metalinguistic, Davis enters into a nuanced discussion about the inevitable dialogic relationship shown by Derrida to exist between a translation and its original because "the translation countersigns and thus affirms the identity of the original" (39). In a different vein, Luise von Flotow's discussion of the failed German translation of Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* brings into question the possibility of maintaining a "supranational Network" of women because, as liberating as wordplay was for English and French speaking women—reading respectively Daly, Cixous or Brossard — the didactic aims of the German movement did not allow for such freedom. The remainder of the essays amply show that wordplay is indeed translatable but none more brilliantly than Douglas Hofstadter's. As the author of *Gödel, Escher, Bach*, he found himself confronted with the very idea he was trying to convey in the book, namely that of the elusive nature of reference, when he collaborated on the French translation.

It is worth giving here some of the details of this author's entertaining perspective on his own punning efforts and coinages of multi-level acrostics because it provides a deep insight into the search for the "essence" of a text. The article first explains the structure of an acrostic, "Contracrostipunctus," which is also one of the dialogues in the book. The discussion then focuses on the process of the French translation of this acrostic. The first-level acrostic Douglas Hofstadter arrived at in the dialogue was "Hofstadter's Contracrostipunctus Acrostically Backwards Spells 'J.S. BACH'" (188). At a second level this acrostic forms a melody inscribed on a goblet once owned by J.S. Bach. Other levels of signification complicate Hofstadter's language game even further but what interests us here is that the process of translation—and the dialogue that took place between the author and the French translators—revealed that the author's intentions were far from being clear, even to himself. The translation process led through a series of versions and their rejection to an adaptation of the acrostic in question: "Je Soussigné Ecris Bien Baroquement des Acrostiches Cachés. Hofstadter" where the name J.S. Bach becomes J. Seb. Bach (196). This experience has given Hofstadter valuable insight into what he calls "the ladder of intentionality" (198) according to which translation takes place along a continuum depending how much the translator can infer about the intentions of the author. He concludes that, by having to play with and try on different versions of the French translation, he got closer and closer to discovering what

really mattered to him in the original acrostic or its essence. In this case, however, the essence was preserved thanks to a set of ideal conditions: a close collaboration between author and translators, the nature of the text (a skillfully constructed dialogue within precise formal constraints) and the author's own interpretation of the entire process, from composition to translation, as a form of ultimate reading. Other testimonies from the field however speak to the fact that ideal conditions such as these are rarely encountered and that indeterminacy of language is the norm, even in fields where one would least expect it such as Law.

As is evident from *Translation and the Law*, a volume published by the American Translators Association in their Scholarly Monograph Series, legal translators and interpreters are caught in a paradox: they must do justice to both texts that are deemed authorless and to persons scrutinised by the court. According to John Joseph (19), the myth that "the human author is only a vessel" is inherited from the tradition of holy scripture and precludes the translator from commenting on either the source text or the target text. In debunking this myth, the outstanding articles included in this volume call for a greater degree of cultural literacy in the field of law and for the training and recognition of legal translators and interpreters as professional experts. As it stands now, the general lack of training provided for court interpreters and the prevailing view that translators are mere "foreign language scribes" (234) lead to abusive situations for individuals appearing in front of the court as well as for interpreters and translators. In pointing out the complexities of legal translation and court interpreting, these studies subvert the authorless notion of legal texts and advocate inscribing within the texts the results of the hermeneutic inquiries undertaken by the translators through the use of commentaries and annotations (73). Neither translation nor interpreting can be done automatically if attention is to be paid to implicit messages as well as to surface meanings (37, 48, 273). In dealing with intercultural, national and international issues, the rich diversity of essays presented in *Translation and the Law* emphasises the need for professional translators to function as information brokers (Obenaus) or cultural consultants (Hammond). Furthermore, problems such as the treatment of Aboriginal people in Australian courts (Cooke) or of Hmong people in Minnesota (Dunnigan and Browning) make it clear that *all* legal professionals, not only court interpreters and translators, need better training in order to be prepared for the bilingual courtroom and the cultural, communicative and legal issues it entails (107). It follows from this, and the book makes it quite clear, that the onus for this improved training and preparedness no longer rests solely on the shoulders of the lowly translator but should be shared equally by translation schools, the legal

profession and the courts. I would recommend this book to anyone interested in gaining a better grasp of the complexity of human relations as they are translated into national and international laws. A subject index and a useful guide to legal resources on the Internet (Obenaus) also make it a great reference tool for translation and the law.

Translation Theories Explained

This new series, edited by Anthony Pym and published by St. Jerome, is addressed to translation students, teachers and scholars but, in light of the preceding discussion, the clarity of the language and the conciseness of the explanations which characterise these short texts make them perfectly accessible to specialists from other disciplines with an interest in translation. In responding to "the profound plurality of contemporary translation studies," this series raises the profile, and the stakes, of the field of translation by juxtaposing several approaches and thereby highlighting the connections and ruptures between them. Since other fields have influenced the development of these approaches, connections are also being made back to the future, as it were, when the cultural literacy afforded by translation will be sought after in many fields. For example, the first book in the series, entitled *Translation as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*, might very well provide the first steps in training the legal profession.

Functional approaches have been criticised for relying too heavily on concepts of intentionality and purpose and for being too prescriptive. The reader can gain some insight about this internal debate in translation studies by examining these issues in a chapter of the book where Christiane Nord takes them up one by one and responds to them. In the cultural perspective I am adopting here, I do want to address a question that, in my view, Nord does not answer satisfactorily, namely the usefulness of regarding translation as a purposeful activity for the training of future translators. Nord and a small group of other European scholars from the "German school" of functionalist translation theory which is primarily based on *Skopos* theory and the theory of translational action. For a functionalist, language is used for communicative purposes and translation, a type of human action, fits within the category of human interaction which is viewed "as an intentional change of a state of affairs affecting two or more people or agents" (16). In this large framework all texts are considered to have a purpose and functionalist approaches help the translator in determining the target text functions which may differ from those of the source text. Future translators are taught therefore to prepare briefs providing essential

decisions" (107). Reviewing in this way Russian, Canadian and American translation techniques, concepts of equivalence, generative grammar, register, textual cohesion and coherence, text functions, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and psycholinguistics, Fawcett determines in each case the usefulness of these theories for the practice of translation. At the same time, he establishes the limits of linguistics. In most cases, linguistics will explain what is going on without necessarily proposing appropriate solutions which may depend on other factors "such as world knowledge, reader expectation, information loading, text type, desired effect, and even the politics of translation" (29). In recuperating many useful aspects of linguistics, this study provides the reader with a clear sense of areas where linguistics might help the translator to deal with the "messy reality of language in use" and with a constant reminder that linguistic theory is one discourse among many the translator needs in order to gain a better understanding of translation as a "site of tension and conflict, an activity swept along, in the dark and without a reliable compass, on the currents of culture, ideology and history" (144).

Another such discourse is literary criticism and Marilyn Gaddis Rose, in a short essay, muses on the ways the reading of literature is enriched by the relationship between translation and literary criticism. Drawing from her erudition in translation studies as well as literary criticism, Rose investigates the dialogical space created by translation which, after Stephen David Ross, she calls "an interliminal space of sound, allusion and meaning where readers must collaborate, criticise and rewrite, thereby enriching their experience of literature" (2). For her, literary translation constitutes a form of literary criticism and she demonstrates this through the critical reading of Baudelaire, as poet and Poe's translator, the analysis of the interliminal space existing between Baudelaire's poetry and the translations by Stefan George and Walter Benjamin as well as the examination of three prose examples, Moncrieff's translation of Stendhal's *La Chartreuse de Parme*, Baldick's translation of Flaubert's *L'Education sentimentale* and Swoffer-Penna's translation of Baudelaire's *La Fanfarlo*. These analyses are masterful illustrations of the kind of reading Rose advocates and which she calls "a stereoscopic reading, i.e. a reading that moves back and forth among source texts and one or more target texts" in order to uncover "the interliminal richness" and point out "the harmony or disjunction among the texts" (54). Rose's aim is clearly didactic and an interesting appendix on pedagogy, entitled "The *Ennui* Factor," gives practical tips on how stereoscopic reading can be used across the curriculum. The workshops and the study groups that she describes, and the fact that her own students "come from the departments of art history, comparative literature, English and creative writing, and philosophy" (80), strike

information about "the intended target-text function(s), the target-text addressee(s), the medium over which it will be transmitted, the prospective place and time and, if necessary, motive for production or reception of the text" (137). In spite of the obvious merits of this approach, Nord's uncritical adoption of Goodenough's definition of culture and her ensuing lack of consideration of power relations seem to restrict the use of her method to the simplest of communicative situations. To consider, as she does in a literary situation, the source text sender and producer as one and the same and to find in the target text merely "split responsibilities" between the sender providing the intention and the translator trying "to verbalise that intention" (85) is to oversimplify the conditions of production of the target text. At the very least, the points of view and the interests of the publishers and the editors who work for them need to be considered: their criteria for success may differ greatly from those of the author or the translator. The problem that every translator will immediately recognise is that he or she is rarely accepted as an expert on market acceptability or readership expectations and may never be invited to enter into a dialogue with the editors about these matters. Functional approaches therefore may provide future translators with worthwhile argumentation to defend their translation but a lot remains to be done to convince publishers and other clients that such a level of expertise is either warranted or welcome. As we saw above in regards to Law, translators will be consulted as experts when the professions relying on their expertise are also trained to recognise their usefulness. This ideal situation entails purposeful interdisciplinary networking at the grassroots level, both in universities where translators are being trained and among professionals.

At the same time as the field of translation studies is called upon to foster new relationships it may be necessary for it to revise old ones. Peter Fawcett does just that when he takes on the "love-hate relationship" that translation theory has always had with linguistics. In pleasant prose, *Translation and Language* covers this troubled relationship from Saussure to pragmatics. What is most remarkable about this book is the fact that Fawcett never loses sight of the practice of translation and that, at every analytical level, the relevance of linguistics for the development of translation strategies is examined. He thus reproaches both Snell-Hornby and Katharina Reiss, Nord's mentor, for not providing links between theory and practice. In the first case, Snell-Hornby's textual analysis does not offer any more help with the translation "than a good old-fashioned look at the context and the target readership" (99) while, in the second case, identifying the text function "does not mean that we are led inexorably to any logical or 'translation-scientific' imperative to take this function as the overriding parameter to which we subordinate our translation

me as promising examples of interdisciplinary and collaborative use of translation in order to promote cultural literacy. A glossary and an annotated bibliography complete this essay but are regrettably marred by several avoidable inaccuracies such as misspelled names and wrong titles.

In the afterward to her essay, Rose acknowledges that she mentioned "unequal power relations of gender" only in passing because such was not her focus and that another monograph in the series is devoted to this issue (75). Luise von Flotow indeed provides us with the historical background and an excellent contextualisation of gender issues in *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism."* Over the last thirty years or so gender has proved to be a powerful analytical category that has informed the practice and theory of translation in asserting, recovering and promoting women's voices. Translators have adopted interventionist strategies, such as correcting, feminising or rewriting texts, and theorised on their activist praxis in prefaces, notes and critical essays. It was during this wonderfully creative and productive period that feminist inquiry revealed, for example, how abusive the 1952 American translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième sexe* was: more than ten per cent of the source text was deleted, the names of 78 prominent and professional women were eliminated and many arguments cut out with the unfortunate result that Beauvoir often "comes across as a confused, incoherent thinker" (50). In addition to discussing many examples of feminist revisionist work, von Flotow includes a review of the criticisms formulated outside as well as within feminism. One of the most potent of these, and highly pertinent to the issue of cultural literacy, comes from Gayatri Spivak who attacks the claim on the part of privileged western feminists "to truly 'give voice to' or otherwise represent the women they deem oppressed in third world societies" (85). The debate has been productive and, in the wake of the "era of feminism," translation scholarship draws from the teachings of both gender and cultural studies in order to avoid perpetrating neo-colonial abuse on third world source languages.

Much remains to be learned about minority cultural histories and about the role played by translation in their colonisation although postcolonial translation theory has already produced an impressive body of work. Douglas Robinson's *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained* is a very valuable contribution to this series. With remarkable clarity and cogency the author outlines the history of imperialism from the perspective of translation studies and the divergent postcolonial theories applied to this history. This book should be recommended reading for any student interested in pursuing studies in postcolonial criticism because the issues that it takes up are at the heart of the field of cultural studies. By bringing into the discussion of imperialism both

theoretical contributions from outside the field of translation studies, mostly from anthropology, and the history of translation, Robinson provides the stepping stones needed to facilitate an interdisciplinary dialogue on postcolonial theories that is both informed by and informs translation studies. The chapter on translation history traces how, in different eras and traditions, in Nietzsche's words "translation was a form of conquest" (62). The subsequent reviews of postcolonial works on translation then illustrate this history and show how translation can be perceived as either a channel of empire or a channel of resistance to empire.

The main works analysed by Robinson are *The Poetics of Imperialism* by Eric Cheyfitz, *Sitting Translation* by Tejaswini Niranjana and *Contracting Colonialism* by Vicente L. Rafael. These theorists first show how, in the Americas, India and the Philippines, translation was used to instruct the colonised (Cheyfitz), to create a market in the colonies under the guise of education and civilisation (Niranjana) and to "codify native culture" (Rafael). At the end of this discussion it is clear that postcolonial theorists are divided in two camps depending whether they view the cultural hybridity caused by colonialism as a "fallen state" or as a given "that generates enormous diversity and creativity" (84). Although no explicit reference to Fanon is made in this section, the first position is linked to how the Martinican writer defined the nativist phase of the process of decolonisation while the second one, formulated more recently, is concerned with the agency of the colonised. Robinson clearly favours the second option, arguing that to idealise the precolonial state of the "natives," as Cheyfitz does, leads to the demonisation of translation. It will also lead to what he calls "the inevitable terminus" of Cheyfitz's argument, namely that all the western critic has left to do is "to assimilate himself into a non-Western culture with no design ever to 'translate' it" (108). Robinson admits that Cheyfitz does not raise this possibility in his book probably because it is far too frightening a prospect but I wonder whether it also has to do with the implicit recognition that no culture in today's world is absolutely free of western influence and therefore such an assimilation is impossible. Ultimately, this "going native" position has colonial overtones because it assumes that a culture other than one's own can be embraced and its differences erased.

The book concludes with a review of the ongoing debate in translation studies concerning the ethics of foreignising versus domesticating a text. Robinson is not convinced that the impact of these strategies on the target reader is as salutary or harmful as the proponents of either approach would have it. According to him, the distinction is "based on naive linguistics" (111). Typically, he is looking for a middle ground between the elitist tendencies of "foreignism"

and the assimilative effects of "naturalising" a text by reminding us that what seems familiar or unfamiliar are not intrinsic properties of language but always related to the situation of language in use. Implicitly then, this overview of translation, imperialism and postcolonial theories echoes debates in cultural theory about agency and oppression and represents an important first step in the dialogue that needs to take place within cultural studies about the uses and abuses of translation in colonial history. In order to keep the debates from becoming too abstract however, more methodological tools are needed, particularly when it comes to investigating the history of translation from a postcolonial perspective.

What Is Translation?

Anthony Pym provides translation scholars with such a tool by focussing on the practical and theoretical aspects of doing research in *Method in Translation History*. By positing that the object of this history should be the translator he also suggests concrete ways to arrive at the middle ground that Robinson is searching for. Indeed, as a person, the translator is subjectively involved in one or more social systems, is called upon to negotiate the cultural transfer between source and target systems, physically moves from one system to the other and can thus be considered both producer and product of history. Underlining this study, there is the exciting vision that work in translation and in translation history will inform the field of "intercultural studies" in an important way. A solid methodology, such as is proposed here, can only pave the way to productive interdisciplinary collaboration, overcoming institutional inertia and providing students, scholars and various professionals with a better understanding of the cultural content of international relations.

The study is based on four general principles: 1) attention to social causation; 2) a focus on the human translator; 3) a hypothesis projecting intercultural belonging; 4) the priority of the present (xi). Pym makes clear that much has been learned from the descriptive side of translation studies, as exemplified by the work of Gideon Toury, but that translation history is needed to explain intercultural dynamics and to inform the formulation of future language policies. He then devotes the main part of the book to the two basic approaches he advocates, quantitative and incremental. In regards to the first, the reductive method which moves from large overviews to small areas of importance, he discusses the shortcomings of bibliographies, the constitution of corpora and the working out of frequency curves. In regards to the second, the tracing of networks from the bottom up, he discusses the mapping of networks,

the relevance of norms and systems and the relative advantages of regime theory for translation history. Both discussions clearly stem from the four principles listed above and are explicitly situated in relation to the already existing body of work in translation theory. In this perspective, Pym provides the scholar interested in undertaking a historical study with practical tips and arguments to defend the theoretical position adopted. Regime theory, which is used in the study of international politics, is Pym's own contribution to translation studies and attempts to bridge the gap between postcolonial theory and the practice of translation. As he notes, postcolonial theorists "have remarkably little to say about what translators should actually do with any power they might have in their hands; regime theory can at least posit the goal of establishing cooperation across power differentials" (126). While I am convinced that regime theory may well be one of the concepts needed by translation studies to widen its focus and contribute in a significant way to the study of international relations, I remain concerned that positing a telos of "cooperation across power differentials" is insufficient in dealing critically with the issue of power. It might even play into the hands of the dominant economic power for the sake of maintaining free trade, financial investments, business ventures, etc. At the same time this risk confirms the need for translation studies to develop and adopt more research tools such as the ones described by Anthony Pym since it is through carefully researched knowledge that the field will be able to articulate the theoretical and ethical issues emerging out of increased globalisation.

In this perspective the arrival of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, six years in the making, is most welcome. The collaborative work of over 90 contributors from more than 30 countries, this very useful first reference book provides scholars, teachers and students with a clear picture of the synchronic and diachronic dimensions of the field of translation studies. In the words of its editor, Mona Baker, its aim is "to offer a balanced, non-partisan view of the discipline" while implicitly recognising what Diderot was the first to acknowledge, namely that an encyclopedia is inevitably out of date, given the state of flux of its object of study and the illusive boundaries of knowledge itself (xiii). The work is divided into two parts, the first dealing with a conceptual framework of the discipline, the second, with its diverse history from the standpoint of its various traditions. The total number of entries is relatively modest (a little over 100) which means that one must rely on cross-references in order to gain a good understanding of a chosen topic.

My test case was *culture* and, although there are no specific entries under that title in Part I, the index suggested eight points of entry which in turn led me to "Didactics of Translation," "Dubbing," "Literal Translation," "Ideology and

Translation," "Linguistic Approaches," "Translation Studies" and "Metaphor of Translation". Each entry suggested others of course as well as further readings. The last one, written by Ruth Evans, is a remarkable piece on "the value of current metaphorical uses of translation, especially as they concern relations of power, by drawing on the very structure of metaphor itself" (150). By going over some of the same material discussed above by Robinson (Rafael, Niranjana, Bhabha and Cheyfitz), Evans shows how these postcolonial theorists have been inspired by Walter Benjamin to use translation as metaphor in order to underline the political dimension of translation. She explains that the very structure of metaphor, the transfer of a term from a familiar or proper usage to a foreign or figurative one, lends itself to the use of translation as a metaphor for the "difficult politics of cultural transfer" (151). Drawing from this insight Bhabha thus speaks of translation as "the possibility of cultural interarticulation in radically different terms from liberal traditions of multiculturalism" while Niranjana calls it "a form of disturbance or displacement," the postcolonial subject being a subject "in translation" (152). By following the thread of related entries given by Evans — "Gender metaphors in translation," "Multilingualism and translation, Pure language, Strategies of translation" — the reader may also come to notice that boundaries within the discipline are being blurred by the use of translation "as a metaphor for intercultural relations" (152). For example, a descriptive theorist like Clem Robyns has become interested in translation as a form of "discursive interference" while Wolfgang Iser has developed "a systems theory model of intercultural understanding" (153).

Part II of the *Encyclopedia* provides the reader with information about specific cultural and historical contexts. An overview of national traditions points to differences and similarities among those traditions such as the status of translators and interpreters in various cultures or the varying incentives for translation activity in different parts of the world. Concerning the latter, an interesting point is made in the introduction about the fact that translation no longer seems to be motivated by "religious movements or interest in the classics" but by official policies. More research is called for in the area of official policies, particularly as the concept of "national traditions" is being questioned from different directions as, for example, international relations are being strengthened in the European Union and recently colonised countries such as Ukraine are looking to re-establish their own interrupted traditions. It is indeed a drawback that this second part is organised according to national traditions since such a perspective tends to exclude other translation activities and movements within the said tradition or at times repressed by it. Therefore, it is to be hoped that future encyclopaedic research of this sort will attempt to represent the contexts

of heteroglossia that many translators find themselves working in. Anthony Pym, author of the article on Spain, has written some interesting pages in *Method in Translation History* (see above) about his own questioning of the reality of a Spanish Tradition. The point of contention was mainly the title which he felt did not represent the historic reality of hegemonic Castilian and should have been "Translation in the Iberian peninsula" in order to include Basque, Catalan and Galician practices. A compromise was reached and Pym acknowledges that it will take time for researchers themselves to recognise the intercultural dimension of translation and to transcend their own thinking in terms of national, or regional, traditions (32-34).

In spite of these failings however, the merit of this encyclopaedia is to help us comprehend a field of study that, because of its concern with the other, reveals itself to be an important locus of negotiation between theory and practice and among multiple disciplines all searching "to grasp what we cannot embrace". The fact that translation studies has lately produced what Douglas Robinson calls "centrifugal theories" is no accident and Robinson's review of these theories functions as a metacritical word of caution: in attempting to define translation and in the ethical demands that we put on translation theory, let us not lose sight of the practising translator.

In *What Is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions* Robinson reviews works on rhetoric and grammar, system theories and foreignism. Although the book deals with varied and seemingly disparate approaches, the entire discussion is underlined by Robinson's desire to advance the critical inroads initiated by the works he criticises in order to deal with what he considers the "monstrously problematic" ethical choices facing the ideologically aware translator: do you abuse the text, foreignise it, and risk alienating part of your target-language audience or do you abuse your own integrity and naturalise the text, producing an easily assimilated target text (77)? In discussing works by Frederick Renner, Rita Copeland,⁵ Eric Cheyfitz, André Lefevere, Anthony Pym, Suzanne Jill Levine, Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz, Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti and Philip Lewis, Robinson never loses sight of the fact that "[t]ranslation is steeped in power relations, between men and women, between colonisers and the colonised, between academics and professionals" (3). The writings that he enters in dialogue with prompt him to consider the tensions between hegemonic and counter hegemonic theories being formulated within the field of translation studies and to suggest that the new translation studies, as represented by these

5 These last two have been reviewed in the pages of this journal (see Lang).

authors, do not free themselves from the cycle of abuse that has always marked the field.

Translation is abusive because it invades another territory and pretends to transport back its very essence, unchanged and clearly defined. On the other hand, translation is itself abused when unreasonable demands are made upon it in order to either counteract its potential as an abuser or cover it up. Douglas Robinson sets up an allegory at the end of *What Is Translation?* that illustrates this double bind perfectly. Throughout the book he has been concerned with questioning the validity of *foreignising* translation in order to right the colonial wrong historically perpetrated by the use of translation. By discussing his own *foreignising* translation of a Finnish play about domestic abuse he suggests that "all translation is abusive — or at least caught up in a web of abuse" which is part and parcel of the larger dynamics of social interaction: translators, like abusers and their victims, have been conditioned by an abusive society to submissive fidelity; they become abusers themselves when they resist the control of the source text and find ways of subtly "correcting" it, thus "converting fidelity into a manipulative codependency" (163).

Robinson is at his best when he questions his own line of thought and invites the reader to accompany him along a new inductive path of inquiry. This happens in the last chapter when he links translation with anxiety, something he has already done with varying results in *The Translator's Turn* and *Translation and Taboo*. As I have suggested in the introduction, this state of anxiety is linked to the difficulty one has in dealing with the other, the realisation that the "Other is already within" (Lang 250). Robinson contends that once the abuse is recognised and one's complicity with it acknowledged, it is time to engage into a process of healing which may develop along the four following steps: 1) the discovery of abuse; 2) the exploration of that abuse; 3) the working through of the conflicting emotions emerging through the process; 4) the ability to be choosy about translation jobs and methods (176). The political implications of this conclusion are worth considering. By confronting the abuse and attempting to work through it, rather than correcting it in the name of a good cause, we are more likely to understand it and combat it. The presupposition of course is that abuse is here to stay and the ethical choice has to do with recognising it in ourselves, in our own backyard, in our own culture.

Clifford Geertz shows how difficult it is to do that by quoting the example of the drunken Indian who, after having gained access to a scarce artificial kidney machine, refuses to quit drinking in spite of strict dietary discipline required of the patients who queue up for the use of the machine. According to Geertz, this was "a hard case and it ended in a hard way" because the "whole thing took place

in the dark": the doctors could not take the Indian off the machine and he stayed on it for years until, "quite unapologetic, he died" (116-117). The point is that the opposition this case sets up is a false one since both sides—carried along by a history of abuse — constitute now what Geertz calls "an enormous collage" where social spaces, as mentioned above, no longer have "definite edges to them" and "seriously disparate approaches to life are becoming scrambled together" (121). In order to live in this collage, and to translate in it, we need to sort out the power relations governing it, their history and what our role as scholars, practising translators and, most importantly, human beings "without at the same time blurring one's own sense of one's own location and one's own identity within it" (Geertz, 122).

At the conclusion of this survey of the latest publications in the field of translation studies, one retains the sense that "historical freedom and cultural survival exist in the midst of antagonism" (Bhabha 39). The act of translating sometimes takes place at the heart of the battle and the merit of all the works discussed above is that, from different and at times conflicting points of view, they all show how translators are intricately involved with the practical, epistemological and ideological difficulties inherent in the passage of one culture to the other. In learning how to grasp what they cannot embrace, translators also discover how to focus on what Bhabha calls "the dangerous tryst with the 'untranslatable'" (1994, 227) and to recognise the foreign element present in all cultures as the very motivating factor of translation. This insight is further enhanced by the linguistic, historical and cultural analytical tools developed by scholars. Consequently, the collective discourse formulated by theorists and practitioners sharpens their own critical awareness of the uses and abuses of translation and contributes in a significant way to increased cultural literacy and to the knowledge of the moral and ethical issues at stake in a world faced with the messy reality of globalisation.

University of Alberta

Works Cited

- Berman, Russell A. "Reform and Continuity: Graduate Education toward a Foreign Cultural Literacy," *Profession* 1997: 61-74.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "On the Irremovable Strangeness of Being Different," *PMLA* 113.1 (1998): 34-39.
- . *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from the Tempest to Tarzan*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Geertz, Clifford. "The Uses of Diversity," *Michigan Quarterly Review* 25 (1986): 105-123.
- Lang, George. "La Belle Altiérité: Towards a Dialogical Paradigm in Translation Theory?" *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* (1992): 237-251.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1992.
- Rafael, Vicente L. *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society Under Early Spanish Rule*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1988/1993.

"Come Writers and Critics. . . ."

IMRE SALUSINSZKY

I approach these five books from the perspective of one of the more peculiar and eccentric by-ways of contemporary criticism – Dylan Studies. Although he is arguably the most popular poet of the 20th century, and unarguably the only one to have been nominated both for a Nobel Prize and a Grammy, the critical understanding of Bob Dylan's work has lagged far behind his achievement, in a way still summed up best in his own famous challenge to a querulous music critic: "Something is happening, but you don't know what it is, do you, Mr Jones?" It was with general curiosity, but also a more particular interest in trying to understand what Dylan scholarship is doing, is not doing, and should be doing, that I turned to these new studies on the theory and aesthetics of popular music.

A problem for critics interested in a serious study of Bob Dylan is that he seems to cross so many traditional boundaries. Is he poet or songwriter? Are his key influences musical or literary ones? Does he belong to popular culture, high culture, or neither? Is he a modernist mask-wearer, a postmodern multimedia phenom, or simply an old-fashioned romantic seer? Innovator, or fierce traditionalist? And is the copy-text of "Like a Rolling Stone," say, the printed lyric, the album version, or one or more of the thousands of variants that Dylan has performed live? Instead of anyone's really having been able, thus far, to take Dylan's achievement whole, we have had a kind of shuttlecock between the literary interpreters – critics like Aidan Day, Stephen Scobie, and Christopher Ricks – who have focussed on a close-reading of the lyrics (whether in New Critical or deconstructive timbre), and the performance-oriented writers – music critics like Clinton Heylin, Paul Williams, and Robert Shelton – whose efforts have tended to be more descriptive/impressionistic than analytical. And while these are all worthy questers after understanding, almost drowning them out these days is the Internet, where, predictably, Dylan "sites" of varying levels of hysteria proliferate like toadstools.