Catherine Porter
A Translator’s Statement

Starting from the assumption that translations will increasingly be encountered in the academy as evidence of scholarly activity in the context of personnel decisions, this paper considers possible evaluation procedures for translations and proposes a model for a translator’s statement that can inform and guide evaluators who may or may not have access to the source text.

Lawrence Venuti
The Poet’s Version; or, An Ethics of Translation

The twentieth century witnessed an unprecedented form of poetry translation practiced by poets. Various called a “translation” or “adaptation,” an “imitation” or “version,” the resulting text may have departed so widely from its source as to constitute a wholesale revision or it may have involved a source language of which the poet-translator was ignorant, therefore requiring the use of a close rendering prepared by an academic specialist or a native informant. The poet’s version is a second-order creation that mixes translation and adaptation, and it can be illuminated by drawing on translation theory that assumes a hermeneutic model. A translation never communicates the source text itself or some invariant contained therein, but an interpretation that varies the form, meaning, and effect of that text, constrained by the translating language and culture. The translator inscribes an interpretation by applying interpretants that are formal and thematic, and that are fundamentally intertextual and interdiscursive, recontextualizing the source text by building into the translation a network of relations to the receiving culture. If translation is by definition variation, an interpretive act that submits the source text to degrees of loss and gain, a poet’s version cannot be evaluated simply by comparing it to that text, especially when revision is involved and the source language may be inaccessible to the poet. Attention must rather be given to the impact of the translation or adaptation on the receiving culture, a relation that can be construed as properly ethical. A translation or adaptation is a cultural event that can disclose a lack or a plenitude in the translating language and culture, challenging or confirming institutionalized knowledge.

SESSION A1
Translation in the Context of Psychoanalysis

In many respects translation is of primary importance to psychoanalysis, the latter being concerned in the first place by language, which is at work in the conception of the symptom as a translation of something unknown. The loss which is central to the psychoanalytical cure as it is to the experience of translation; the questions brought about by the translation of psychoanalytical theory and practice from one language to another, even from one continent to another; the problems of interculturality which pervade the whole psychoanalytical experience with regard to its clinical setting, its history, or its conceptual transfers are some of the aspects
our panel wishes to discuss, exploiting to this end various approaches and cultural sources. Throughout the course of its history, psychoanalysis has actively taken part in this experience of translation as a way of remodeling subjectivity. In return, its conceptual tools allow it to reach a comprehensive understanding of the task of translation, which is indeed closely connected to it as a never-ending attempt to unveil meaning and claims of an urtext.

Fethi Benslama
Translation of the Sexual
This paper addresses the translation of the modern concept of “sexuality” in the Arabian world in the 19th century and how it has impacted the very unconscious structure of language by initiating a whole new ethics of the body and its related jouissance. This shift is typical of modern subjectivity in general, as it has witnessed a collapse of traditional mythologies and their related “truths.”

Rainier Lanselle
Shifting Practices as an Effect of Shifting Language: The Case of the Acclimatation of Psychoanalytical Discourse into Chinese
This paper will examine coextensive effects of translation in the source and target languages and practices: 1. The importation/translation of new concepts into non-Western cultures has led to sometimes critical refoundations of the language. 2. The language so refounded has, in its turn, reframed the way people define themselves subjectively, which reveals itself in the way they manifest their symptoms in new idioms. For example, the appearance of “modern” psychic symptoms in China in the 20th century would have been unthinkable had not the Chinese language, in the first place, undergone such a shift, enabling it to sustain these symptoms.

Patricia Cotti: Sexual Trieb
Sexual Instinct, pulsion sexuelle or Sexual Drive? — Origins, Trials and Tribulations of a Psychoanalytical Concept Transmitted across Languages
This paper discusses how the Freudian concept of sexual Trieb emerged from a late nineteenth-century debate concerning the distinction between the older German notion of Trieb and the Darwinian concept of instinct. After examining this debate and its consequences for the Freudian conception of the sexual drive, the paper also investigates how Strachey’s English translation of the Freudian sexual Trieb as “sexual instinct” impacted Anglo-Saxon postwar psychoanalysis.

Yulia Popova
The Language that Could Do without Translation…
This paper will begin with the Khlebnikovian fantasy of a “transmental language” that supposedly was not vulnerable to the loss inherent in the process of translation. It will then discuss the way psychoanalysis alternatively stresses how lack and loss are part and parcel of the speaking and desiring subject. Language is heterogeneous and marked by alterity; these are also characteristics inherent in any process of translation. For these reasons, psychoanalysis has much to tell about the task of the translator.
Elizabeth McAdams: To Translate or to Adapt, That Is the Question: Japanese Shakespeare(s)

Meiji-era Japanese audiences would be acquainted with both *Hamlet* and *The Merchant of Venice* even before the latter was adapted as a Kabuki play by Katsu Genzo in 1885 and the former was translated and performed by Tsubouchi Shoyo’s literary-theatrical experiment in 1907. *Merchant* was a box office smash so much so that its Japanese title, which contained a reference to the cherry blossoms in bloom when the production began, had to be modified to refer to the autumn leaves as the seasons changed. Unlike the Kabuki adaptation, Shoyo’s *Hamlet* was a commercial and critical failure. I look at the myriad causes of the respective success and failure of each both in terms of relation to the original and relevance for its audience. I draw upon scholars of translation theory such as Lawrence Venuti, George Steiner, and Leith Morton to examine each production’s value as a translation. I also use Margaret Kidnie’s recent *Shakespeare and the Problem and Adaptation* to blur the line between translation and adaptation, thus broadening the claims of genre of both productions. *Performing Shakespeare in Japan* (edited by Minami Ryuta, Ian Caruthers, and John Gillies), *Re-Playing Shakespeare in Asia* (edited by Minami Ryuta and Poonam Trivedi), and *Shakespeare East and West* (edited by Minoru Fijita and Leonard Pronko) provide a critical context for Japanese Shakespeare production and text translation.

Philippe Postel
The Scholar and the Beauty: First Translations of Chinese Novels in England and France in the 18th - 20th centuries.

This is a comparative study of translations based on recent research on the Chinese novel, called *caizijiaren xiaoshuo* 才子佳人小説, literally the “scholar and beauty novel,” from China. It deals with the first translations of such novels in England and France. Chinese novels have been introduced in Europe and the US through the *caizijiaren xiaoshuo* genre, which is akin to our sentimental novel, such as Richardson’s or Rousseau’s. Five of these Chinese novels were translated either into English or French, between 1761 and 1925, totalling at least 10 translations and retranslations. First I classify these translations starting from the very first one (*Haoqiu zhuans* 好逑傳) and its translation into English by James Wilkinson and Thomas Percy in 1761, and finishing with its translation into French by George Soulié de Morant in 1925. Then I discuss how an “exotic” literature is transferred into the European classic literary space: why do we translate these novels and not those, for instance the historic novels? My hypotheses take into consideration the Chinese literati’s world—as European translators were dependent on the “genius’ works”/ *caizishu* 才子書 which these literati used to list—and also rely on the reception theory, as translating a *caizijiaren xiaoshuo* similar to our sentimental novel is a way of
minimizing the strangeness of a Chinese novel for European readers. Further, I examine the quality of these translations, as it depends not only on objective reasons, such as the actual knowledge of the language and the tools at translators’ disposal, but also on the pre-conception of the Other. China is a world that can be, at least partly, reduced to our own landmarks, or alternatively, seen as a world, whose differences must be preserved in translation. Additionally, I explore the aesthetic significance of these translations, namely, their meaning in terms of history of European taste in regard to Chinese literature. I distinguish three successive phases: encyclopaedic, sinologic, and exotic. And finally, I take into consideration the contemporary state of translation of classical Chinese novels in Europe.

SESSION A3
Can Translation and Translation Studies Really Transform Other Disciplines? An Exchange

Humanities programs in U.S. universities are currently experiencing the largest and longest crisis in several decades in terms of available jobs for their graduates and their role in the university curriculum. In an attempt to ensure that their programs are relevant, many foreign language departments have initiated translation programs and courses in translation and translation studies, and English departments have begun to discuss the need to include translators in their faculties and to seek more interdisciplinary approaches to the study of literature and culture (See “Literary Scholars Ponder Their Discipline and its Direction,” Chronicle of Higher Education, March 21, 2010). However, scholars in the Humanities have yet to find a way to address the considerable body of scholarship that has accrued in the field of Translation Studies and to draw on this knowledge and “tradition,” to use Antoine Berman’s term, in order to successfully implement the paradigm shift that would allow translation to truly re-energize disciplines in difficulty. Consequently, it is not difficult to feel skeptical about claims for the transformative potential of Translation Studies.

This panel is an exchange about the extent of the impact of Translation Studies in the current academic climate and the institutional, disciplinary, and cultural factors that are both impediments and incentives with respect to its success. The three participants are all members of the Institute of Applied Linguistics at Kent State University, a major U.S. research and training center for translators at Kent State University. Carol Maier is a prize-winning translator of Spanish literature and a scholar who focuses on issues of ethics and pedagogy in translation, as well as reviewing and criticism. Françoise Massardier-Kenney, director of the Institute for Applied Linguistics at KSU, has recently translated Antoine Berman’s Toward a Translation Criticism and is the series editor for the American Translators Association Scholarly Series. Brian Baer, a translation studies scholar who works with Russian, is the founding editor of Translation and Interpreting Studies, the general editor of the Kent State Scholarly Monograph Series in Translation Studies, and a founding member of ATISA (American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association). Françoise Massardier-Kenney will argue that Translation Studies has successfully constituted translation as a proper object of study and is capable of transforming a variety of disciplines, while Carol Maier will present the view that Translation Studies has as yet been unable to change institutional practices and is unlikely to do so in the foreseeable future. Brian Baer will serve as the respondent.
SESSION A4
Political Issues of Translation, Translation Issues of Politics

Lara Maconi: Located in Translation: A Propos of Tibetan Literature in the PRC

In recent years the field of translation studies has encompassed spheres which go beyond the traditional textual dimension of transferring a source text into a target text. Translation today is as much about the translation of cultural, political, and historical contexts and concepts as it is about language. Translation has become a fundamental and dominant metaphor for our time and for the complex multilayered interactions connecting diverse local cultural identities and national political powers in the global setting. In this sense, translation has become a politically and culturally crucial question since it is about the control of language(s) and the power of ‘informing’; the creation of linguistic, cultural, and political territories; the right to be different, to question assimilation and homogenization, to affirm one’s identity, and to create new in-between hybrid identities.

This focal point, which draws upon cultural studies and postcolonial theories, is paramount when considering Tibetan literature in the PRC and the specificities of the Sino-Tibetan political, cultural, and linguistic cohabitation/confrontation since the 1950s. I argue that Tibetan contemporary literature—that is literature written by Tibetan writers in both Tibetan and Chinese since the 1950s and, more significantly, since the 1980s—is located in translation. This is to say that Tibetan contemporary literature has stemmed from and developed in a complex context of transition and transformation, where intra-national (intra-Tibetan, Tibetophone and Sinophone) and inter-national trans-frontier cultural and linguistic practices are relevant expressions of Tibetan identity issues, of diglossia, cultural dislocation, and dissymmetrical cultural transfer.

Based upon a relevant selection of oral and written sources, this paper describes how translation—considered as a metaphor for a political, social and cultural context; as a literary and editorial practice for mediation, reception and transfer of texts; as the writer’s and the reader’s cultural and psychological state of mind in a diglossic context; and as a political weapon used by both Tibetans and the Chinese establishments—is a pervasive defining feature of Tibetan literature in the PRC today.

Corine Tachtiris
Work in Process: The Opportunistic Circulation of Literature in Translation from the Global East and South

Instead of viewing world literature as a set of texts or products, in this paper I regard it as a process, constantly changing according to local and global shifts in ideology, market forces, politics, and aesthetics. This paper challenges the assumption that “deserving” or “important” texts and authors from each nation or region will automatically reach a global audience in translation. I thus join scholars like Harish Trivedi who criticize David Damrosch’s What Is World Literature? for ignoring the preferential means by which a limited number of texts enter the global literary scene. I argue that the circulation of texts outside of their local culture requires that agents, such as authors, translators, editors, and publishers, capitalize on opportunities not
present at all times or in all places. Furthermore, seizing these opportunities may mean complying with what André Lefevere calls poetic and ideological constraints.

In this presentation, I explore the implications this opportunistic process has for literary translators like me who work on texts from the global East and South which, as Lawrence Venuti has noted, enter the hegemonic Western literary system with more difficulty. As a translator of Haitian literature, I take its circulation in the American literary system as my case study, paying particular attention to new developments since the earthquake in January of this year. I discuss what such an understanding of the process of world literature might contribute to the way translators approach their work and how they assert their agency.

**ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION**

**Keeping the Lights On: From Translation to Editing to Publication.**

This panel will bring together publishers and editors to discuss issues of the whole editorial process of bringing translated books to publication, of what goes into the making of books from finding translators, to the relationship of translators with their editors, the editing process itself, and final publication, promotion, and distribution of books in bookstores and online. The panelists will be asked to address the state of the art in producing translations and the current conditions of the market place for translations produced in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain.

**SESSION B1**

**Translation as a Paradigm in Science**

Michel Prum: Lost in Darwin’s Translation: The Impact of 19th Century Translations on the Reception of Darwinism in France

Since the first translation of Darwin’s *Descent of Man* (1871) in 1872 by the Swiss translator Jean-Jacques Moulinié the French speaking scientific community has known Darwin’s famous anthropology as *La Descendance de l’Homme*—a title which meant just the opposite of what the author meant by “the descent,” as the book was definitely not about Man’s offspring, but about who humankind descended from. This translation, slightly revised by Edmond Barbier in 1881 (without any change to the title), was to be published throughout the 20th century and was the only way for French speakers to know Darwin’s thought on Man. Similarly the first translation of *On the Origin of Species* (from the 3rd, 1861 edition of Darwin’s 1859 epoch-making book) showed an unabashed pro-Lamarckian bias. Moulinié’s translation (1873—from the 5th and 6th English editions) and Barbier’s (1876) are also marred by a number of mistranslations which throw light on the 19th century translators’ ideological preconceptions, e.g. on the position of Man within or superior to the animal kingdom. The aim of this paper will be twofold. First it will underline the main problems in 19th century translations. Then it will present the project of a new translation of Charles Darwin’s *Complete Works* under the scientific supervision of Patrick Tort. The translations of Darwin’s three main monographs—*Descent of Man* [*La Filiation de l’Homme*—1999], *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication* (1868) [*La
Andrei Rodin
**Euclid and Radical Translation**

It is often said that Euclid’s *Elements* for centuries were used as the Bible of mathematics. However when one studies the texts that circulated under the name of Euclid’s *Elements* in different epochs, in different geographical areas, and in different cultural and linguistic environments, one finds a surprisingly diverse literature. Until very recently translators and editors of Euclid’s classics also worked as revisers who tried to produce an improved version of Euclid rather than merely reproduce some older contents with new means. Such a nontrivial character of translations of Euclid’s *Elements* made possible a radical rethinking of foundations of mathematics, which dramatically changed its shape throughout its long history (and also throughout its wide geography) and at the same time allowed for an impressive historical and geographical continuity of mathematical thinking.

Although Quine introduced his concept of radical translation in a very different context, I claim that most important historical translations of Euclid’s *Elements* qualify as radical in Quine’s sense because these translations re-introduce relevant mathematical contents wholly anew rather than describe them as previously given.

In my talk I shall briefly overview the long history of translations of Euclid’s *Elements* and speak more specifically about existing Russian translations of this source. I shall conclude with some general observations concerning the fundamental role of translation in science, mathematics and beyond. I shall argue, in particular, that the continuing radical translation of mathematical and scientific contents is a crucial condition of progress in these fields.

Carl Niekerk
**Translating the Pacific: Georg Forster’s *A Voyage round the World / Reise um die Welt* (1777-1780)**

My paper presents a case study on the English and German versions of Georg Forster’s description of his and his father’s participation in Captain James Cook’s “second” circumnavigation of the world (1772-1775), published in both languages between 1777 and 1780. The primary question I would like to ask is how Forster’s texts depict the practice of “translating” in encounters with the non-Western other, in particular the indigenous populations of Tahiti and Easter Island. Scholarship to date has done very little with the many acts of translation documented by the text. I am interested in the question, how these acts of translation are expressive of a theory of alterity, how the indigenous other is seen as different and yet also
similar, and how this difference according to Forster’s texts can be accessed through the act of translating.

Beyond these encounters, the text contains many other observations on “translation” and, more broadly, the ways in which languages relate to each other. Forster is intrigued by the question whether the different indigenous languages he encountered have a common root. Forster’s text is also surprisingly sensitive toward the effects of “naming” a certain space as part of a voyage of exploration; such an act often also means the taking away of an original, indigenous name.

Finally, it is interesting that Forster himself produced English and German versions of his book, and that other competing projects based on Cook’s second voyage “around the world” were printed before / simultaneously with Forster’s version. To what extent do these texts reflect each other (explicitly or implicitly)? Do they construct diverging versions of the Pacific with their different audiences in mind? I am also interested in the question to what extent the different versions of Foster’s text reflect on their own status as original / translation.

My paper builds forth on earlier work I have done on Lichtenberg’s essay on Cook, his reflections on Forster, and in particular the models of biological and cultural alterity that informed texts of Lichtenberg, Forster, and their contemporaries. While the importance of Rousseau and Bougainville (and Diderot’s essay on Bougainville) for theorizing other cultures in eighteenth-century Europe has been recognized, my view is that in particular the importance of Buffon—the introduction to his *Histoire naturelle*—for Forster has been acknowledged insufficiently.

Furthermore, Cook’s voyages and the way in which the various travel reports based on them reproduced the encounter between Western and non-Western cultures were the basis for one of the major anthropological controversies in the 1990s. I would like to use both eighteenth-century anthropological / ethnological theory and the late-twentieth-century controversy as theoretical frames to understand the specifics of the process of translation as documented in Forster’s texts.

**SESSION B2**
**Translation in the Classroom**

**Patricia Minacori: Translation Assessment: Bridging a French and American Paradigms**

Assessing translation quality is a difficult matter and it is widely recognized that many assessment models exist, depending on the particular criteria they emphasize. This paper asks questions about the fundamental elements of translation assessment while also seeking to investigate whether a link can be created between pedagogical and professional translations.

In earlier research conducted between September 2004 and January 2006, I analyzed 545 English to French translation assignments carried out by University students ranging from the years L2 to M2 (Minacori, 2010). The analysis had two main objectives—to create an “error tree” which would be useful to teachers (evaluators) and to help students to enhance the quality of the translations they produce. Since 2006 I have been testing the assessment model both with my
own students and with other universities in France (Université de Mulhouse, Université de Besançon, ESIT (Ecole Supérieure d’Interprètes et de Traducteurs, Paris) and the Université de Paris VII, Denis Diderot (Paris)). My research has a Eurocentric perspective and time has come to adapt it to an American reality. Since the American Translators Association has defined certification examinations, I analyze the documents to bridge the gap between two paradigms concerning translation assessment: one applied in France and one in the United States. My objective is to propose a new paradigm for translation assessment that can also be applied to US practice.

Josef Horáček

Translations in the Comparative Literature Classroom: Toward a New Literacy

Translations elicit a wide range of responses among readers, from a naïve trust in their ability to faithfully represent the source text to their categorical dismissal as unreliable and unworthy of a close read. Either stance belies a sense of helplessness on the part of the reader who is unable to directly access the source text. The situation is not much different among literary scholars and instructors. This is a missed opportunity. The comparative literature class is the perfect venue in which to introduce pertinent topics from translation studies. If translation is indeed an autonomous genre of literature and a fact of the target culture, as the current state of debates in translation studies seems to suggest, it deserves to be read as such. In this paper, I will consider what such a reading might entail. I will argue that literary translation requires a new kind of literacy, a set of skills that can be acquired through instruction and refined through practice. The first step toward such literacy is basic familiarity with recent trends in translation theory and practice. For instance, readers might benefit from the knowledge that so-called transparent translations tend toward explication, tend to be less culture-specific, and have a narrower range of vocabulary while at the same time shying away from repetition. Students can be made aware of possible alternatives to transparent translations. In the process, certain texts would receive attention precisely on account of their method of translation. Students can be taught to identify and discuss moments in the text in which translation becomes visible. Reading translations as translations in the comparative literature setting in turn forces us to revisit a number of literary issues which have been deemed closed or have not received much recent attention: the presumed death of the author, the problem of authorial intention, or the question of intended audience, to name a few. Certain hegemonic positions with regard to these topics are bound to come under severe scrutiny when the problem of translation is allowed into the discussion.

Brian James Baer

Re-Thinking Alterity: The Translation of Foreign Words in Modern Russian Literature

The German Frankfurt School philosopher Theodor Adorno (1991) described foreign words “as an expression of alienation itself.” In this paper, I examine the understudied topic in Translation Studies of the treatment of foreign words, that is, words that are foreign to the source text language, in translated texts. To the extent that foreign words, in Rainier Grutman’s (2006) assessment, “lay bare the power imbalance between literatures in different languages and/or from different countries,” the treatment of such words in translation must tell us something about the conception of alterity in the target culture at any given time.
Because of the traditional focus of Translation Studies on the relationship between a single “unified” source language and a single “unified” target language, it is perhaps no surprise that the treatment of foreign words has been largely ignored. The very concept of a language “pair,” one could argue, belongs among the many social “centripetal forces of verbal-ideological life,” described by Mikhail Bakhtin (1984), that determine “the content and power of the category of ‘unitary language’ and work to obscure the phenomenon of linguistic and cultural diversity.” Downplaying the presence of foreign words in translated texts, then, must inevitably alter the reader’s “experience of the foreign” (Berman 1984).

I will examine in this paper the treatment of foreign words in translated texts in the context of imperial Russian literature as central to the ways in which the source and target texts construct—and reconstruct—alterity. Russian literature is an especially rich area for investigation of this kind insofar as Russia has been since the fifteenth century a multi-lingual empire. Moreover, for most of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, French, German, and to a lesser extent English and Italian, were considered prestige languages and were widely spoken among members of Russia’s educated elite.

SESSION B3

From Chinese Body to European Body: Contextualization of French Translations of Chinese Medical Texts

SESSION B4

Translation and New Media

Lauretta Clough: Words in their Mouths: The Translation of Speech in the Press

A large share of our common knowledge is conveyed through translation—and no small part of our common misknowledge. This paper explores the representation of speakers of other languages through quotations in the US press, a little-noticed, yet potent shaper of the ethical and political context in which the academy lives out its purposes. The words put—or left—in the mouths of people speaking to us from other spaces influence the cultural assumptions of a public that either listens to or ignores the humanities, and which the humanities, in turn, either attend to or ignore.

When Daniel Ortega is quoted in The Washington Post as saying, “During 16 years, the people endured the consequences…,” when, on the same page, Hugo Chávez is made to say, “I’ve proposed, and we’re writing the proposal,” readers instantly log two additional slips into their impression of the intellectual capacities of Latin American leaders. When Dominique de Villepin opines that: “One shouldn’t imagine that with the touch of a magic wand, one can render things simple,” we have further confirmation that those stuffy French leaders missed the Revolution/s. Of course “durante” is fine Spanish, Chávez knows his transitive verbs, and it is not elitist to use “on” and “render;” this is simply the French way of … making things simple.
My principal goal is to illustrate how our work in translation studies within the academy can be brought to bear on one important site of translation outside it. After analyzing a set of distancing translational choices (drawn, to show degree of prevalence, from a limited span of publication dates, but a maximum span of source culture), I will start discussion of alternative translation strategies, suggest action, and consider the consequences of a practical turn for the humanities as they continue their textual globalization and their struggle for relevance.

**Xianwei Wu**

*Recreation through Translation: Examining China’s Online Volunteer Translators*

This paper relates the results of an in-depth interview with China’s online volunteer translators of western TV shows. These translators produce subtitles of popular American TV shows and films online for free. Moreover, their translation styles are also quite different from those of traditional translators due to the time and resource constraints of the subtitle groups. While the works of these translators are extremely popular in China, the cultural implications of this activity have not been examined. This paper aims to explore the motivations as well as the cultural and social significance of these translators. The results show that, due to their mediating relationship with both the western discourse and China’s official discourses, this translation activity simultaneously advocates and undermines globalization.

**Miguel A. Jiménez-Crespo**

*Translation, Crowdsourcing and the Dissemination of Knowledge on the Internet: From Quality to Quantity*

For centuries, academic institutions and publishing houses have controlled the quality and the quantity of the translated materials that have circulated around the world. Nevertheless, the Internet revolution has led to a dramatic shift in the ways in which knowledge and information are translated and disseminated globally. The Internet has not only produced changes both in the quality and quantity of translated documents worldwide, but also has allowed dominated cultures and languages to become equally accessible to a global audience. Additionally, the relationship between translation quality and professional translation is being redefined with the introduction of the crowdsourcing model used by an increasing number of websites, such as Wikipedia, Facebook, Microsoft or Google. This paper examines this changing relationship through a theoretical review of this issue, as well as by a corpus based empirical analysis of translated speeches by US Presidents. The methodology consists of using an error based evaluation model in order to assess the quality of different translations for the same speech. The results were then contrasted with the volume of reposting for each translation on the Internet. These two variables, quality and Internet dissemination, were then contrasted in order to observe whether there is a relationship between the quality of translated texts posted on the Internet and their potential dissemination through subsequent reposting on the Internet. This analysis shows that the authoritative translation model might be slowly disappearing, given that Internet content producers randomly use and repost translations regardless of their quality. This study will shed
light on the increasing impact of the Internet revolution on quality, time-pressure, and the growing dissemination of translations produced by non-professionals.

Mairi McLaughlin
News Translation and Linguistic Change: An Interdisciplinary Approach

Mona Baker’s (2009) edited collection of essays in translation studies illustrates the interdisciplinary nature of this field. The collection spans four volumes and sixteen different research areas. In this paper, I argue that all scholarly consideration of translation will benefit from an interdisciplinary perspective. This theoretical position is explored by means of a case study involving the investigation of translation in the news (McLaughlin, forthcoming).

The motivation for this investigation is firmly rooted in the field of linguistics. Since the end of the nineteenth century, commentators have noted the possibility that contact with English could lead to syntactic change in metropolitan French. However, there has been almost no scholarly research into this question, so linguists today remain uncertain about the impact that contact with English will have on the future evolution of French syntax. McLaughlin presents the first in-depth analysis of the question. The main hypothesis tested is whether translation in the press will lead to syntactic change in French. The translation carried out by international news agencies such as Reuters and Agence France Presse is considered a likely channel for the transmission of innovative syntax because it is so widespread and must be carried out at high speed. The question at the heart of the investigation is therefore, whether the translation of news in the global era will lead to an increased circulation not just of knowledge but also of linguistic structures. The potential for translation to lead to syntactic borrowing is explored through an analysis of translated news stories that uses methods developed at the boundary of translation studies and linguistics.

The findings of the investigation are reported here because they illustrate the value of an interdisciplinary approach. Ethnographic fieldwork was used to observe the process of translation in news agencies and to compile a corpus of translated dispatches. A combination of comparative linguistic analysis and methods from corpus-based translation studies was then employed to analyze the corpus in order to determine whether it contains linguistic evidence to suggest that the syntax of the translated dispatches is influenced by the original dispatches. The methods and disciplines involved in this project extend beyond linguistics and translation studies to include anthropology, globalization theory, media and communication studies. The value of this approach is indicated by the results obtained: the type of syntactic influence observed in the corpus differs considerably from the predictions made by previous commentators. In this paper, the study of translation is therefore seen as one of an emerging set of research areas that call for the breakdown of traditional disciplinary boundaries. It is not just the humanities but all disciplines that are affected by this paradigm shift and we are left to question what effect the rise of interdisciplines will have on the traditional disciplines.

SESSION C1
Os Sertões by Euclides da Cunha: Re-Translation and Historical Revision

The opportunity to re-translate this important Brazilian classic for Penguin has invited us to re-examine the impact of the reception of the book by the English language readership and to reflect on how the book shapes our understanding of the emergence of Brazil as a modern nation. Samuel Putnam’s 1944 translation (Rebellion in the Backlands) became required reading for most Latin American and Brazilian studies programs in US universities. Our rendition, with a new title, Backlands: The Canudos Campaign seeks to capture the immediacy and relevancy of this civil war for a contemporary readership and to better understand da Cunha’s purposes in writing the book through his unusual style, described by Putnam as comparable to Walt Whitman's “barbaric yawn.”

The book, originally published in 1902, has been called a novel, but is really a chronicle of a backlands war. It is a painful recounting of the confrontation of the military establishment of the new Brazilian Republic with a band of starving backlands religious fanatics in what is known as the Canudos Campaign (1986-1897). Euclides da Cunha, a military engineer and a journalist, challenged his countrymen to re-examine their own claim to modernity and accused the fledgling Brazilian republic of “crimes against humanity.”

The book is the work of a polymath: it examines environmental, social and political conditions that give rise to fanaticism (a precursor to modern terrorism) and it is also a treatise on psychiatry. Da Cunha, embedded with an army battalion in the last month of the war, saw his role as not just a passive observer, but as a commentator and conscientious objector to the events and their bloody aftermath. As Ilan Stavans, in his introduction to the new Penguin translation, observed: “A good journalist is always in the right place at the right time, but an influential journalist has the vision to see the long-lasting impact of those coordinates. In a stroke of luck, Euclides da Cunha became a reporter of the debacle, and in the process, wrote the ultimate chronicle of the Brazilian psyche.”

Joe Love offers an overview of the Canudos war in the context of the history of Brazil, and comments on the significance of the event for the new Brazilian republican government.

Linda Lewin describes how Os sertões exerted a pivotal impact on the mentalities of coastal elites throughout the Northeast by legitimizing key elements of a regional culture that prior to 1902 were either ignored, misunderstood, or reviled. Three elements received intense, but conflicting, intellectual examination by regional literati: popular religion, the iconic figure of the sertanejo-jagunço, and, implicitly, violence, most saliently manifest in “cangaceirismo.” All three elements were interconnected and mediated by Euclides’ notion of the “mestiço race in the backlands,” one rendered highly ambivalent by his “irritating parenthesis.”

Ilan Stavans comments on how this book has become the "greatest chronicle of war ever written."

Elizabeth Lowe gives a history of the translation and reception of the book, and compares and contrasts her rendition with the original Putnam translation. She suggests that the new translation offers a different perspective on this important moment in Brazilian history, as well as on the intentions of the author in composing the epic-like account of the war.
SESSION C2
Translation as a Paradigm for Changing Art Theory and Practice

Allison Weiss


The life of Julián Aguirre (b. October 12, 1868; d. August 13, 1924) coincided almost perfectly with the gradual rise of a project, sponsored by upper class intellectuals and politicians, to strengthen cultural institutions and consolidate Argentina’s cultural identity in the face of economic, demographic, and political change. Best known for his piano and orchestral works, his innovation of a “uniquely-Argentine” musical idiom was also recognized in the genre of song.

In this paper, I explore how Action Theory used in translation studies can help describe the principal work of Aguirre as composer: the innovation of strategies to “trans-create” source texts (i.e., musical genres, structures, emotional symbols, visual images) into target texts (i.e., Argentine art songs for voice and piano) that could be understood by concert-going audiences; in other words, to mediate culture via a communicative act, which sometimes served the nation. Four lullabies—“Berceuse,” “Duérmete niño,” “Evocaciones yndias,” and “Ea” illustrate the shifting skopos (purpose) of target text producers and receivers, which, I argue, to varying degrees was influenced by a discourse of originality (dissimilar comparisons relative to a perceived cultural center) and a discourse of contemporaneity (analogous comparisons relative to a perceived cultural center).

I end the paper by discussing how translation theory helped me to specify and describe cultural shifts taking place in early 20th-century Buenos Aires in a more elegant and precise manner than any other critical or cultural theory that I had yet encountered. I also describe some of the potential pitfalls of using translation theory as metaphor for cultural processes.

Sasha Hedges Steinberg

“Illumination”: The Theory and Practice of Experimental Translation

Traditionally, translation has been understood as a linear action—the transformation of an original text into an equivalent iteration in a different language. Starting in the 20th century, however (and specifically following Walter Benjamin’s 1923 essay “The Task of the Translator”), theoretical accounts of this practice began to question the validity of an assumption of linearity. To what extent, theorists from Benjamin to Homi Bhabha began to ask, does translation ultimately alter a text? To what extent are these alterations violent and deceptive? Productive and transparent? Today, “translation” refers not only to the linear process of linguistic rendering, but also to the ambivalent and ubiquitous domain of intercultural dialogue in which concerns about preserving the “original” have been replaced by experiments with “alternative” transformation and interaction. But how has this discursive shift affected literary practice? It seems that an ideal literary translation today should no longer look like the outdated works Benjamin was debunking in the 1920s. Literary translation, too, should be a place where
different languages can meet with and transform each other. Unfortunately, this has not happened. Literary translations have remained, in practice, as monolithic and conservative as they were before Benjamin’s critique.

In the first section of my proposed paper, I will argue that the word “translation”—rife with conservative etymological implications—is itself partly at fault. Trans suggests a completed, directional action (from an original to a destination, a copy) and Lation suggests neutral carrying, support. Instead, I propose a practice I call “illumination,” which strives (as its etymology suggests) to “bring to light” the spaces of contradiction, imperfection, and ambiguity.

In the second section, I will present the result of my first practical experiment with this theory—the almost 400-page illumination of Vladimir Sorokin’s [Russia] 1999 novel Goluboye Salo. This illuminated manuscript—alive with many voices, possibilities, problems, and experiments—is much more than a translation. It is my experience of analytical reading—full of holes and gaps, differed glances, contradictions, mistakes, and insights—distilled for the page.

SESSION C3
Translation, Gender and Power

Daniela Raducanu
From Science to Public Debate: Carmen de Burgos and the Gendering of the “Subversive Scribe”

Scholars studying Spanish literature may find it strange that Carmen de Burgos, one of the early twentieth century’s most radical Spanish feminists, decided to translate one of the most misogynistic scientific works of that time. But the contradiction holds only if we assume that the translator’s task is to “invisibly” render the text of the original as accurately as possible. In open rejection of this notion, Carmen de Burgos translated Paul Julius Moebius’s “Ueber den Physiologischen Schwachsinn des Weibes” or “The Intellectual Inferiority of Women” by adding notes to the original text in which she comments on and questions Moebius’s misogynistic claims. She expands the idea of translation to a new level, using it not only as cultural exchange, but also as a dialogue with the original text. At the same time, de Burgos also challenges traditional translation theories by questioning the idea of “invisibility” of the translator and his presence also as a reader and writer within the translation process. She transforms the concept of translator for her contemporary Spanish readers into that of, as Suzanne Jill Levine describes it, a “subversive scribe.” She transforms the translation performance into a political act. My paper explores rhetorical strategies for transforming a nineteenth century medical text by means of translation into a discourse serving not only the translator’s feminist approach, but also a more contemporary and modern understanding of the translated text as fluid, exposed to different interpretations, and independent from the original.

Florence Binard
Translating Feminisms: Non-Sexist Neutralization or Feminization?
A succinct comparison of official guidelines (issued by governments, local authorities, universities, etc.) based on feminist recommendations regarding language use in English- and French-speaking countries shows a marked difference in approach caused by grammatical differences in the English and French languages. Broadly speaking, in English, the norm in producing a non-sexist discourse involves a neutralisation of the grammatical genders where they exist. This means that the gender of a person remains unknown unless it is meaningful to the speaker in which case it is specified (a female lawyer). In French, on the contrary, on account of the absence of a neutral gender and because of the generic nature of the masculine, the feminist strategy entails a feminization of nouns, which results in an accentuation of the gender bi-categorization.

Although the aim of these strategies, to curb sexism in language, is identical, the end results are worlds apart, and even though our perceptions of the sex differences are obviously not exclusively based on linguistic factors, these factors nonetheless play an important role in our mental representations, as the debate in France over the use and translation of “gender studies” illustrates.

The aim of this presentation is twofold. It will first aim to study how feminist theories, including post-modern theories, such as transgender and queer theories, have transformed both French and English languages. Secondly it will discuss translation strategies from French into English and from English into French.

Barbara Pausch
Women Translators in Romantic Germany—Transmitters of New Ideas

The Romantic Age in Germany (late 18th-early 19th century) was dominated by several leading ideas and motives, among them the Romantic notion of Bildung. Bildung, the process of education and self-formation, implies the exploration of the self and the foreign. The Romantic Age was characterized by an interest in understanding and getting to know “the other.” Thus, the German Romantics looked for ways to approach that which was not “their own.” A strong interest in translations clearly was one option to deal with the foreign, starting with “what is one’s own, the same […] in order to go towards the foreign, the other” (Berman 46). The mediating force of translation and its power to form a language, an individual, a literary canon, etc., made it a central activity of the German Romantic Age.

With the Romantic curiosity for “the foreign” came love for traveling, fascination with one’s own roots in the Middle Ages (Lüthi 17), a strong interest in sensitivity and raw emotions (Lüthi 26), and of course the tentative yet decided emancipation of “the other sex,” namely women. This interest in the more emancipated roles of women laid the foundations for women translators in Romantic Germany. For some women, such as Dorothea Schlegel, translation stood next to some original works which they could proclaim as their own work (at least in parts). Other women translators, such as Dorothea Tieck, never produced any original works and were never credited for their numerous translations although they contributed a lot to women’s translation achievements. “Dorothea Tieck wrote no original works, but her translations of Shakespeare’s
plays in the celebrated “Schlegel-Tieck” version are one of the most distinguished contributions by a woman to German literature in any age” (Purver 87).

This paper analyzes the roles that women translators played in Romantic Germany. To this end, I will portray two women translators, namely Dorothea Schlegel and Dorothea Tieck. Furthermore, I will address general questions such as the following. What texts were translated? What were the goals of the translations? What was the style of the translations? What ideas and concepts were brought into German culture through the translation work done by women? How independent and confident could the women translators be about their translation works? And, more generally, what was the role of women in the Romantic Age? What were the social, political, and cultural obstacles that they had to cope with when translating?

Patricia M. Phillips-Batoma
Translating Medieval Texts into Modern Languages: The Example of Jean de Meun’s Roman de la Rose

Le Roman de la rose, a thirteenth-century text composed in Old French, is both an allegorical love poem and a compendium of scholarly discourse on the subject of love in the postlapsarian world. The first 4,058 lines of the text were written by Guillaume de Lorris around 1230 AD. The poem was completed some 55 years after Guillaume’s untimely death by Jean de Meun, a scribe associated with the University of Paris. Much ink has been spilled about Jean’s misogyny, and indeed one of his main characters, la Vieille, is often held up as one of the best examples of medieval anti-feminist and anti-marriage literature. After all, how else could one read such a character, a former prostitute who in her old age is working as a procuress? The key to rethinking the traditional reading of la Vieille’s speech lies in its translation into modern languages. In this paper I first examine the dominant translations of la Vieille’s speech into modern French and English, with a view to showing just how much of the subtlety of the Old French is lost when translators attempt to render an enjoyable prose translation or, in other cases, try to recreate a verse translation. These losses then deprive the text, and the reader, of the ambiguity inherent in the words of Jean de Meun’s character. Next, I show that a more literal, line by line translation of the text provides the reader with a better sense of just what Jean was trying to do. In this portion of the text, word order and lexical content really do matter. Finally, I will suggest that translations that are more literal and well annotated are necessary to preserve the nuances and richness of medieval texts. For in the case of this text, an accurate, literal translation could show Jean de Meun to be both a misogynist and a feminist.

SESSION C4
Translating Innovative Fiction: New Paradigms

Translating innovative contemporary American fiction raises specific difficulties, especially when fiction relies on innovative structures and involves various languages or cultures, or areas of expertise beyond the merely literary dimension. What are the consequences for translation processes (and for the translator’s task) when a work of fiction explicitly taps the conceptual resources of contemporary thinking, and sometimes uses literary language and structures to shift
the boundaries of concepts, ideas, disciplines? One might have in mind here the names of American novelists such as, among others, Joseph McElroy, Richard Powers, Thomas Pynchon, David Foster Wallace, whose works include such in-depth reflection about key areas of contemporary thinking (cybernetics, genetics, communication networks, to name a few) that it challenges the literary paradigm altogether, destabilizing genres and styles of representation in such a way that it requires some presence of “inner translation” as a form of reading. One might wonder therefore whether a new paradigm for translation is to be found within the textuality of some contemporary literary works themselves. And further, whether a new translation paradigm is not required for translating such works.

The proposed panel will therefore focus on translation as a paradigm within some contemporary American novels, as well as on the implication this paradigm may have for the act of translation itself. We intend to discuss translation as a nexus of practice and theory that helps redefine modes of representation. We would like to suggest an integrative approach to translation, in which literary and non literary cultures fertilize each other in dialogue rather than oppose each another in sterile confrontation. Ultimately, we will try to show that, as much as translating innovative fiction requires a true change of paradigm, innovative literature requires a true change of paradigm for translation.

Roger Allen
The Happy Traitor: Tales of Translation

This presentation gives an overview of the state of translation industry from Arabic into English based on the presenter’s personal experience. It consists of three parts conceptually following the movement of the source text, to the interstitial state of translation in process and on to the translated version in the hellish clutches of the book market. The paper stipulates that the current situation of choosing a text for a translation from Arabic into English is an ad hoc process supporting orientalist tendencies and that this process also has major impact upon the quality of translations themselves. It then focuses on some issues related to foreignizing and domesticating strategies in different translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s novels and broadens the picture to general domesticating/foreignizing attitudes towards texts translated from Arabic into English.

SESSION D1
Translation Issues in Post-Colonial Studies

Jessica Hutchins
Reading Translation as Art in a Caribbean Context

In *La Migration des cœurs*, the Francophone novelist Maryse Condé rewrites Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* in a new language and a new cultural context. While maintaining the core of the romance plot between Catherine and Heathcliff (renamed Cathy and Razýé in *La Migration des cœurs*), Condé changes the time, place, and narrative structure of Brontë’s novel. While we
might read *La Migration des cœurs* as an adaptation, it is also crucial to understand it as a translation of Brontë’s source text from Victorian English into a Caribbean variety of French that is inflected by multiple languages and creolized culture. Condé’s novel is frequently lauded for engaging in a process of textual regeneration with its source text, a process in which the two novels mutually illuminate one another and generate an intertextual, multilingual dialogue. Whereas we might read *La Migration des cœurs*, on the one hand, as a translation of Brontë’s novel, and, on the other hand, as a unique work of art in its own right, the latter description represents a status that is rarely extended to the majority of translations. And while Condé’s novel seems enriched by its translation of the Catherine/Heathcliff story into a uniquely Caribbean form of French, readers and critics have been hesitant to extend the same status of novel-in-its-own-right to *Windward Heights*, Richard Philcox’s English translation of *La Migration des cœurs*. Because Condé and Philcox, as translators, receive different reactions to the liberties they take with their respective source texts, they represent an ideal test case for the dynamics and politics of reading a translation as a unique work of art, and highlight the limits of this type of reading within the context of Caribbean and postcolonial literature.

**Jeanne Garane**

*Translation, “Francophonie,” Littérature-monde*

This paper returns to an in-depth examination of “the language question” in Francophone literary studies and the ways in which conventional notions of translation as secondary and derived are often linked to the ways in which “francophone” African writing is read. Indeed, the very term “francophone” implies a secondary, derived, or indeed, “amateur” relationship to French when it is used to categorize certain “writers of French expression” as “non-French.” Similarly, as Lawrence Venuti writes in *Rethinking Translation*, the contemporary translator is often viewed as “a paradoxical hybrid, at once dilettante and artisan” (*Rethinking* 1), an amateur writer and scholar who works within a relationship of lack. In maintaining a center-periphery binary, the “language question” is informed by the same oppositions that divide the conventional view of translation between author and original text on one hand, and translator and derived text on the other. The paper briefly revisits a number of interventions on this issue from Sartre’s *Orphée noir* (Black Orpheus) to L.S. Senghor’s “Comme les lamentins vont boire à la source” and concludes with an examination of the manifesto, “Pour une littérature-monde en français” (“For a World-Literature in French”) and the call to eliminate the terms “francophone” and “francophonie.” I then propose that a reconfigured notion of translation as both a means of and a figure for transnational exchange enables us to (re)read francophone African writing as simultaneously transnational, cosmopolitan, and local. In other words, by existing in French and yet refusing to “be” French or even “francophone,” such texts appear paradoxical in that they seem to contradict themselves. And yet, this contradictory nature is also a refusal of essentializing gestures whereby the writer is cast as a “representative” of a nation or particular ethnic group.

**Laurence Jay-Rayon**
How Foreign Is this Style? The Experience of Orality in African and French Surrealist Literature through Translation

Institutions at large influence the way we categorize literary works and set expectations in terms of translation. No one, for instance, will dispute the fact that Shakespeare’s *tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury* deserves to be translated with a poetic mindset. By contrast, contemporary African literature is less likely to be associated with poetic writing. Two hypotheses can be put forward to explain this discrepancy. First, the notion of genre, i.e. the rigid distinction between prose and poetry, is well established in Western institutions although not necessarily relevant when it comes to African literature. Second, African writings are approached as bearing a strong sociopolitical message. As a consequence, aesthetic features fall into the category of those unavoidable translation losses. On the other hand, a number of African literary critics and writers have urged for a sustained attention to the role of oral art in modern African literature, an attitude that gets labeled as essentialist by other critics. In this complex environment, the translator’s project can be compared to a dangerous walk on a balance beam between universalism and essentialism. Based on a case study of the English translation of Adiaffi’s novel *La carte d’identité*, with a focus on oral/aural poetic markers, this paper intends to address the question of essentialism and Berman’s concept of the Foreign. To this end, I will draw on a recent thesis by Kouadio (2005) that brings together post-Negritude Ivory Coast poets—among others Adiaffi—and French Surrealist poets and shows the same tendency to put forward sonorous materiality, all the while underlining profoundly dissimilar motivations. I will show that this sonorous materiality has been received as an integrative part of surrealist writing and translated as such, whereas—and although more motivated—it has not been systematically recreated in Adiaffi’s translation.

SESSION D2

Borges in and on Translation

This panel focuses on the relevance of Borges’s writings for a reflection on translation. In “Borges and Nietzsche on Language and Translation,” Rosemary Arrojo explores some consequences of the close affinity she finds between Nietzsche’s reflection on language and Borges’s conception of translation. This affinity becomes particularly clear in “Funes el memorioso,” which often echoes and elaborates on Nietzsche’s “On Truth and Lies in Their Nonmoral Sense,” and can also be associated with Nietzsche’s *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. The outline of this encounter between Borges and Nietzsche allows Arrojo to reflect on issues of language, subjectivity, and power, which seem to be at the core of Borges’s conception of translation.

In “The ‘I’ of ‘Borges and I’,” Ben Van Wyke addresses translation pedagogy and ethics by drawing from a comparative study of six translations of “Borges and I.” This text’s plot undermines many notions upon which much of the ethics of translation has been founded, especially the authority of authorial intentions. By reading Borges’s piece and analyzing its versions, translation students can witness the interpretative role they play in the (re)creation of
both text and author and the complex ethical dilemmas they must constantly confront and work through when doing so.

In “Borgesian Theories of Mis-Translation,” Sergio Waisman starts with “The Translators of The 1001 Nights” as a way to explore the role of “creative infidelities” in literary traditions. Relevant arguments from “The Argentine Writer and Tradition” are brought in, as is a reading of “The Immortal.” The presentation incorporates a comparison of Freud’s essay on the Unheimlich and Borges’s theories of mis-translation. This leads to the idea that mis-translation in the periphery opens fields of potentiality where writers and translators may innovate while challenging the center, creating a new cartography of difference, influence, and originality.

Rosemary Arrojo
Borges and Nietzsche on Language and Translation

This presentation aims to explore some consequences of what I see as a close affinity between Nietzsche’s reflection on language, as presented in his early essay “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense,” and Borges’s “radical” conceptions of translation, which have called a great deal of attention in recent years. Borges’s affinity with Nietzsche’s philosophy becomes particularly clear in “Funes el memorioso,” which often echoes (and also comments on) Nietzsche’s essay. Furthermore, considering, for example, that Borges’s narrator introduces Funes as “a precursor of the race of supermen – ‘a maverick and vernacular Zarathustra’” (Hurley’s version, 131), I will also pursue some of the associations that can be made between “Funes el memorioso” and some sections of Nietzsche’s Thus Spoke Zarathustra.

Ben Van Wyke
The “I” in “Borges and I”

The traditional notions of the ethical translator, as one who should remain invisible while reproducing the intentions of the author are still commonplace in translation workshops. Although these notions have been radically called into question in postructuralist theory, this type of theory often remains precisely there, “in theory,” and does not “translate” to the actual practice students see before them. This essay draws from a comparative study I use with my students involving different English versions of Jorge Luis Borges’s 1960 text “Borges y yo” to indirectly expose them to poststructuralist notions of translation, reading, and authorship that will help them confront the limitations of the traditional conception of translation and assist them in developing the critical capacity to responsibly work through the complexities involved in the task of rewriting someone else’s text in another language. In my experience, this activity—with its combination of close readings of the various translations together with an analysis of the text’s plot in the context of the contemporary notion of the “death of the author”—helps students discover that they cannot escape complex ethical decisions related to their agency both as readers of an original and as authors of their translations, even when, as is the case with the translation by Norman Thomas di Giovanni, the author works in close collaboration with the translator.

SESSION D3
Translation and Ethnography

Elizabeth Spreng
Translating Happiness: Ethnography cum Translation of “The Story of Ferdinand”

In eastern Germany bilingual Sorbs often devalorize spoken, performed, and written stories, because these stories fail to recirculate a mixing of registers, an emotionally charged dynamic of erasing and erecting borders between Sorbian/German resources. This paper offers an innovative approach, an ethnography cum translation of “The Story of Ferdinand,” the story of a bull who would rather smell the flowers than fight. My analysis of Sorbian versions of “Ferdinand” highlights the inner stories and emotional dialogues behind Sorbian interpretations. In translations, Sorbs narrate their linguistic perspectives and express wishes to use their endangered language as they deem appropriate. Resonating with Ferdinand’s struggle to live his life in peace, Sorbs find themselves facing language loss and threats to their Slavic culture. Sorbs encountered notions of happiness not only because the phrase “being happy” is part of the text, but also because they experienced an emotional lift by overcoming linguistic differences and cultural misunderstandings. The attributes associated with Sorbian resources—written/spoken modes, urban-rural scenes, and temporal (modern-authentic) referents—transfer notions of language use to passionate views of Sorbian standards. Another aspect of translation involves loyalty to the spoken vernacular and the literary standard. Surprisingly, Sorbs reconstructed linguistic and cultural borders in mixing registers. When Sorbs drew on their village register, they valorized their translations as spoken vernacular, learned as a child, located in the village, and untouched by standardization. In contrast, when Sorbs infused translations with an urban genre, which mobilizes discourses of a written standard, post-secondary education, and purity from German, they capitalized on their cosmopolitan expertise. By mixing registers, Sorbs simultaneously closed intertextual gaps between registers and gained a sense of satisfaction with their translation. The ways that Sorbs mix registers reveal the emotional dynamics of endangerment at the heart of bilingual praxis and how translation can inform an ethnographic approach.

Sean Reynolds
Approaches to the Translation of Verbal Charms

The verbal charm confronts the contemporary Western translator with a unique set of difficulties. Foremost among them is the charm’s latent or explicit claim to incantational efficacy, vouchsafed by the authority of a specific “word formula,” which the purely semantic translation will necessarily threaten to incapacitate. If we adopt Bronislaw Malinowski’s argument that the meaning of a verbal charm will in every case be the “effective change” it intends, we must recognize that, even when direct semantic equivalents for charm language may be found, its meaning may, nevertheless, be lost. The current failure of most English translators to take seriously incantational efficacy has led to overly “domesticated” (Venuti) renderings, often indifferent to the sonic formulas and non-referential content of the original. Moreover, we find that both the practical and theoretical concerns of charm translation have remained largely unexamined. In both ethnographic and literary collections of verbal charms, the demands of their translation are seldom differentiated from those of accompanying chants, song-poems, or
mythologies. In order for charms to be taken up into discussions of translation theory, however, what is first needed is a sympathetic and rigorous theorization of the “place” of charms within language and speech act.

This paper ensues from my own difficulties in finding a translation strategy for Anglo-Saxon metrical charms, including the so-called “gibberish charms.” I evaluate the strategies adopted by past translators of Anglo-Saxon charms, as well as those of Ancient Greek magic, comparing them to those taken up by Malinowski in his “Ethnographic Theory of the Magic Word.” I then turn to the more linguistically innovative attempts made in the field of ethnopoetics (in *Technicians of the Sacred* and *Alcheringa*) and question the possibilities for maintaining magical efficacy present in Jerome Rothenberg’s theory of “total translation.” Before directly addressing the question of translation, I first argue for the non-referential and even “phatic” character of the charm, employing Roman Jakobson’s schematization of the speech event and J. L. Austin’s illocutionary act. I conclude by arguing for the primacy of what Malinowski calls “coefficient of weirdness” in charm language and the necessity of maintaining (if not heightening) this coefficient within a “foreignizing” (Venuti) translation strategy.

José Ignacio Hualde

Translation and Retranslation in the Anonymous *Refranes y Sentencias of 1596*

*Refranes y Sentencias* (*RS*) is an anonymous compilation of Basque proverbs, published in 1596, with translations into Spanish and numbers over corresponding words in the two languages “in order that both languages may be understood.”

A debated issue has been the direction of the translation. Urquijo (1911) suspected that most of the proverbs had actually been taken from a compendium of Spanish proverbs by Hernán Núñez (1555), so that what are purported to be original Basque proverbs translated into Spanish would actually be Basque translations of Spanish proverbs made by the author. Notice that, under this hypothesis, the texts of *RS* would not be Basque proverbs all, since they would lack the currency “among the folk” that can be taken as an essential part of the definition of a proverb (Taylor 1985:3). Instead, they would only be Basque translations of Spanish proverbs.

Although there are compelling reasons for questioning Urquijo’s hypothesis (Lakarra 1996), the fact remains that many of the Basque proverbs in *RS* have similar Spanish versions. This suggests that there was indeed transmission and translation of many of the proverbs from Spanish into Basque, even if the translation was not performed in a book, but, rather, in the oral tradition.

I will compare the Basque proverbs in *RS* both with the Spanish translations in the same book and with the meaning-equivalent sources that one finds in contemporary repositories of Spanish proverbs, focusing on the alteration that linguistic structures and imagery have undergone in passing (orally) from Spanish into Basque and then again into Spanish (in writing), and commenting on the difference between traditional oral transmission of proverbs across languages.
and translation of a text. I will also comment on the anonymous writer’s unusual strategy of placing numbers on top of each word.

SESSION D4
De-Centering Culture

Reine Meylaerts
Translations and the Shaping of the Literary Field: What Do We Learn from Multilingual Cultures?

During the last two decades the fundamental role of translations in the constitution of intellectual fields has gained attention from international scholars. Following Bourdieu’s reflections (Bourdieu 1990; for a critical appraisal see Meylaerts 2005) on the social conditions of the international circulation of ideas, quantitative analyses of book translations in all societal fields worldwide have been initiated (e.g., Heilbron 1999 & 2008; Sapiro 2008). They show how massive import through translation is characteristic of so-called peripheral cultures. However, quantitative analyses of translation flows suffer from a weak conceptualization of geopolitical and geocultural parameters. Equating languages and cultures with nations in a simplistic, anachronistic way (for a critical appraisal see Pym & Chrupal 2004; Pym 2006), they neglect the complex ways in which languages and cultures are articulated and institutionalized in relation with territories and/or societal and political constellations. They thus tend to disregard multilingual cultures and nations like Belgium (for a critical appraisal see Meylaerts 2009). As a result, little to nothing is known about the decisive but complex role of translation in the constitution and evolution of intellectual fields in multilingual societies like Belgium, Canada, Switzerland, South-Africa, etc.

A nuanced understanding of the role of translations in the shaping of multilingual societies and cultures asks for insight in the complex relationships between languages, literatures, cultures and socio-political and socio-cultural institutions. The present paper will analyze the quantitative dynamics of literary Dutch-French translations between 1830 and 2000, taking into account the complex and varying institutional context (Flanders, Holland, Belgium, France...) in which these translations functioned. It will also devote special attention to these translations’ hitherto unknown role in intra-national relations, i.e. between Dutch-Belgian and Francophone-Belgian literatures and to the translations’ role and function in the construction of literary identity and literary hierarchies.

Anastasia Lakhtikova
Literary Tradition, Back-Translation, and Reconstruction of Intertext in Nabokov’s Translation of Pushkin’s Eugene Onegin

To an average Russian reader not versed in French language and literature of the 18th and 19th centuries, Alexander Pushkin’s Eugene Onegin is eternally a major national masterpiece, the famed “encyclopedia of Russian life.” Trilingual Nabokov, on the other hand, never made a
secret of the fact that this “national epic” is the poet’s twist on the writing of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries from France, England, and Germany to the point of verbatim translation into Russian of settings, characters, modes of expression, and colloquial patterns. Consequently, Nabokov’s translation of *Onegin* into English (through French equivalents discussed in the voluminous *Commentary*) can be viewed as back-translation aimed to unearth the sources of Russian literary vernacular attributed to Pushkin and to restore his historical situation among the great Western European writers. As laudable as this endeavor may seem, Nabokov’s translation is notoriously unpopular and “unreadable.” It is too unsettling a method of doing things to a culturally revered text and a blow to the superficial understanding of the poet’s ingenuity. But Nabokov’s method, however inconvenient, sheds light on the genesis of creative texts, on the one hand, and on the creative processes of “artistic” translation or adaptation, on the other. Politically and ethically, it aims to restore historical continuity between Russian and European literatures and their vernaculars, the continuity that was deliberately and methodically broken by the communist anti-western politics. The “back-translation,” in fact, brings *Onegin* back not into the contemporary English but into the English of the late 18th – early 19th centuries, where each word is treated like a term invested with the specific meaning of the literary vernacular of the period. Moreover, each thus identified term is further woven into the web of Western literary canon by quotation from a specific English or French text (both literary and not). Much like in contemporary search for field-specific terminological equivalents, the meaning of such a “term,” often outdated to the contemporary reader, becomes fixed in a context, which ensures equivalence and comprehension. As a result, a dense web of intertextual connections within the body of the late 18th–early 19th century European literature becomes visible to the reader, and *Onegin* emerges from it as its rightful and brilliant heir, rather obnoxious in its playful irony. This presentation will explore the intricate mechanisms of Nabokov’s radical approach to literary translation that elbows the way for its original into the Western literary canon not only *post factum*, but also across the language barriers, as though they have never really existed for the author of the original.

**SESSION E2**

**Education, Translation, Transformation**

Both translation and teaching are plagued by the same apparent dilemma. Is the aim of translation to closely approximate the original text, or is translation a creative process resulting in a new work? Educators confront the same tension. In the traditional view, education is a mimetic process in which skills and knowledge transfer from teacher to pupil. Constructivists counter that learning involves making one’s own meanings from the material. In both domains, we find the same tension between mimesis and construction. This, we maintain, is a false choice. By bringing teaching and translation into dialogue we seek to highlight how these processes resist assimilation to both the model of the accurate reproduction and that of the free creation. Instead, we propose to analyze both translation and teaching as acts of communication. The aim of each is to fully and faithfully communicate the meanings of the text to be translated or taught to another. The teacher must make the curricular text speak in this time and place, to her students and their new generation; the translator must make the translated text speak in this new language to its new audience. In the process, the material itself is transformed. A
communicative process is a two-way street. Try conveying with fullness and accuracy a complex experience to another, John Dewey once remarked, and you will find your own understanding of the experience altered. Thus, teaching and translation exhibit a deep isomorphism, together pointing beyond the binary logics that have plagued each: understanding/misunderstanding; reproduction/production; mother tongue/foreign language; conservation/innovation. Translation and teaching, we argue, are dialectical processes in which: understanding proceeds through a series of productive “misunderstandings;” the meanings of one’s home culture and language become clear only when one journeys to “foreign” shores; the import of tradition emerges only after we have tried to renovate it.

Joyce Tolliver
Teaching in the Canal: Transforming the “Original”
The Puerto Rican writer Rosario Ferré compares her self-translation between Spanish and English to shuttling incessantly between two shores, coming to rest, finally, not on one shore or the other, but in the waters of the canal that flows between those shores. The privileged status of the “original” text is undermined; neither of the two “shores” provides a stable resting place. Rather, the linguistic subject is fluid, in constant movement, like the water between the two shores. Likewise, reading and teaching a “foreign-language” text inevitably situates that text between two seemingly stable places—the “shore” on which the text was produced, and the “shore” from which it is read and studied. This is true not just of translated texts, but even of “original-language” texts. The cultural re-situation of the “original” text that occurs when it is taught from another “shore” thus ironically reveals the fallacy of the notion of the “original” in translation.

Chris Higgins
Performing Tradition: The Temporal Dimension of Teaching and Translation
Teaching is often thought of as transmission, as a “sending across” of content from teacher to student. Like the “carrying across” of translation, the metaphor is spatial. This metaphor frames their common epistemology problematic: did the genuine article arrive in its entirety? When we attend to the temporal dimension of both processes, the picture changes. Following Hans-Georg Gadamer, we may view teachers and translators alike as interpreters of tradition. For Gadamer, interpretation is not a willful, subjective projection onto a text but an act of mediation. He models interpretation on the performing arts in which a score or script is brought to life by the work of conductors and directors, musicians and actors. This model helps us rescue both teacher and translator from the untenable choice between creation and reproduction. The text (to be translated or taught) is not an “original” which may only be preserved or distorted. It is already a reply in an ongoing conversation, and it must be interpreted to come into its own. Cultural formations are built to be handed down and taken up, elaborated and amended. Teachers and translators are mediators between past and present, participants in the unfolding of tradition.

Nicholas C. Burbules
Understanding, Misunderstanding, and Understanding Differently
A simpleminded view of translation is that equivalent words and syntax are identified in the
target language that carry “the same meaning” as is expressed in the original language. No one at
this conference needs to have it explained that this view is inadequate. And yet we often fall into
that way of thinking when we talk about understanding another person—whether in a translated
language or even in our own. We say things like, “I understand exactly what you mean,” or in
the opposite case, “You haven’t understood me at all.” In fact it is never possible to understand
something exactly—nor is it possible to misunderstand something completely. Understanding
and misunderstanding always happen together, in different measures and to different degrees.
Our efforts at understanding a person, or a text, are pragmatic achievements: something is always
gained and something is always missed. But there is also a third case—of understanding
differently. This might be termed a “productive misunderstanding.” At times this might be
intentional, at other times inadvertent. Something more or less is understood than might have
been intended, and in this creative reinterpretation the possibility of new knowledge, and new
insights, occurs—for both the reader/listener and the original speaker or text. This raises the
question of “productive mistranslations” as well. Sometimes translation involves going beyond
literal translation to say more or less than might be in the original text—it is a creative and risky
process involving interpretation and judgment, not just signal processing. Teaching, too, is not
just a matter of transmitting a specific meaning, but of fostering associations that are meaningful
within the frame of reference of the learner; the frame that must necessarily be different from
that of the teacher. This raises the same dynamic of understanding, misunderstanding, and
understanding differently as well.

SESSION E3:
Translation Theory Reconsidered

Salah Basalamah
The Paradigm of Translation Philosophy

Translation Studies has since long been dreaming of a general theory, but has resigned itself to
abandon its strive for it rather early (Holmes 1972). Approaches to translation had to be partial
and followed the paradigm that defined it. In fact, after the different turns TS has achieved,
including the linguistic turn almost fifty years ago, the most recent one seems to be agreed upon
as the “sociological turn” (Pym, Wolf, Snell-Hornby, etc.). We have seen translation as an object
of study turn from being a transfer ‘process’ to a final ‘product’, sometimes to be described next
to its original and sometimes compared to other (re)translations.

However, in parallel to these developments in TS, there have been several instances in other
disciplines where translation as a metaphor was used to represent genetic decoding (molecular
biology), transfer and exchange of knowledge (medical research), change of internet protocol
address (networking), TV or radio retransmission (broadcasting), property transfer (law), etc.
Even in the daily talks, translation is used as a figure of speech to express the change of an idea
into something concrete. But has TS ever integrated these translation definitions as part of its
theoretical preoccupations? Obviously not. In fact it didn’t have to and it doesn’t need to co-opt
any translation occurrence beyond its discipline. Nevertheless, I do believe that TS should be in
the best position to hold translation not only as an object of study, but more importantly as a paradigm in itself (Ricoeur 1992 and 2004).

If this approach to translation initially stems from hermeneutics, how can it be conceptualized within the framework of TS as its new field of predilection? Furthermore, how can TS theory expand to encompass this kind of task or does it need to be overcome by a sub-discipline that takes on the responsibility for a more radical investigation of translation as an epistemological paradigm? After social and political philosophies, as well as philosophies of language, law and education, what about a “philosophy of translation” that could deepen the understanding of translation as a heuristic tool in the wider framework of the humanities and social sciences, as a beginning?

Zuzana Jettmarová and Jana Králová
Translation as Access to Knowledge: A Theory for Scholars, Critics, and Translators

Back in the 1980s, Holmes regretted that knowledge produced in Slavic countries was inaccessible for linguistic reasons; since then there have been claims for an English version of Levy’s seminal work The Art of Translation. Its German version contributed (often implicitly) to the establishment of prominent TS schools in the 1970s, but the theory as a whole has remained unknown and unexploited outside the country of its origin where it serves as the fundament of research, training, and criticism. Furthermore, Levy’s internationally circulated image and partial interpretations of his theory are often distorted due to limited access to his work. Western paradigmatic turns in the 1990s, together with the revision of positivism, have brought in quests for a theory and methodology accommodating current concerns. New as they may seem, many issues on our agenda have been discussed before, but we are not aware of them.

In his theory based on extensive research exploring several centuries of translation practice and thought, Levy addressed such issues as ideology, sociology, hybridity, foreignness, theory for practice, world literature, human agency, varieties of translation functions and impacts including universalization (globalization), translation as a means of mass communication, etc. He also introduced some higher-level abstractions so far unknown in western TS (e.g. noetic compatibility or translativity), preferring explanation to description and proposing an open and elaborated theory. It is a theory of literary translation but its framework is general and based on valid methodology (Prague structuralism was different from Russian formalism, positivism or French post/structuralism), on Levy’s experience as a teacher, his gift for abstraction and methodological rigor, and his goal to build an interdisciplinary.

The translation project of The Art of Translation for J. Benjamins was launched in 2008, following the publication of Levy’s extensive study The Creation and Reception of a Literary Work of Art (in Králová and Jettmarová 2008). Levy wrote his book for two purposes—to provide a theoretical and methodological foundation for the discipline (and perhaps the first integral ‘descriptivist’ theory built on genuine interdisciplinarity), as well as to supply a pedagogical basis for translators offering them a tool for self-reflection on their agency, potentials, limitations, and cultural after-effects of their work. This is a design of a theory for practice and ‘cultivated’ on practice, a theory empowering translators, spanning the levels of
communication and cultural systems, incorporating agencies and axiology; a dynamic, open and dialectal theory. With no counterpart in Western humanities (theory- and methodology-wise) the translation of the book involves more than conceptual and methodological incommensurabilities and lacunae as it has to tackle agentive differences in knowledge and mindsets.

This presentation will give a brief outline of Levý’s theory and methodology from the point of currently discussed basic issues, demonstrate its validity exemplified by results from a longitudinal study on market ‘colonization’ after 1990, and discuss systemic and agentive constraints in delivering The Art of Translation in English.

Jennifer Croft
Syntax and Szymborska

In his recent book, Benjamin’s –abilities, Samuel Weber promotes what he calls the “practical applications” of Walter Benjamin’s famous—and famously elusive—essay on translation, “The Task of the Translator.” Weber deals first with his overarching topic, showing how Benjamin’s focus on traditionally secondary, even parasitic potentialities or –abilities like translatability, reproducibility, and criticizability “as quasi-transcendental, structuring possibilities” shifts “the emphasis away from the ostensibly self-contained work to a relational dynamic that is precisely not self-identical but perpetually in the process of alteration, transformation, becoming-other” (59). The inherent openness of the text, then, and the accompanying flux, are the first things the working translator needs to keep in mind. And yet it isn’t the text Benjamin is ultimately concerned with, but rather the relationships between languages themselves: “Translatability defines language as the medium of singularly dividual events, rather than of universally meaningful works” (69). It is an inherently open and fluctuating event, then, that the translator has to reckon with. How can a transfer of the singular dividuality of the event be executed?

Weber argues that it is the Art des Meinens, the “way of meaning,” that must be ferried over from one language to another. The way of meaning, that is, the syntax. It is the order of things, to borrow from Foucault’s own translation into English of Les mots et les choses, that must stay the same in the target language.

I propose in this paper an analysis of syntactical fidelity in practice: comparing an assortment of translations of Polish poet Wisława Szymborska’s “Terrorysta, on patrzy,” translated by Clare Cavanagh as “The Terrorist, He Watches,” I will examine the venues in which the ways of meaning matter and discuss the ramifications for language of orderliness in translation.

SESSION E4:
Translation in South Asia: Challenges and Choices

The panel brings together four papers, which address diverse issues of translation in the context of South Asia. Though empirically grounded, the discussion in these papers significantly contributes to the understanding of these issues in the larger/universal context of the phenomenon of translation. The first paper, “In Search of Agency: Translating the Voice of
the ‘Other’,” questions the agency/primacy of the “original” and provides evidence from Spivak’s translation of Mahashweta Devi’s story “Stanadayini” to show that the representation of the original (and not the original) serves as the primary source of the understanding of the subaltern theory. The second paper, “Teaching Bollywood, Translating Culture: Lessons from a Midwestern Classroom,” addresses a complex pedagogical issue in teaching cultural text of Bollywood (Indian) movies in a “global/mixed classroom.” In particular, it examines the role of the English subtitles in translating the cultural text of the movies, and argues that students’ preconceived attitudes toward India and Bollywood override the interpretation of the cultural narrative presented in the subtitles. The third paper, “Hindi Literature in English: The Political Dimension of Translation” addresses the question what determines the translators’ choice of the text(s) for translation and, based on the evidence from the English translations of Hindi texts, argues that sociopolitical and ideological considerations influence the choice of the texts. The fourth paper, “One Text, Many Voices: Why Do Translations Differ?” examines the issue of significant differences in translations of the same text (the Bhagavadgita), and thereby underscores the major issue of defining Translation. It a) points out that these translations validate different definitions of Translation, b) discusses the factors which are responsible for the differences, c) provides definitions of translation in the Indian tradition, and d) argues for the need for the theory/definition of Translation, which is comprehensive enough to allow variation and yet provides the criteria to determine what qualifies or does not qualify as translation.

Reshmi Mukherji

In Search of an Agency: Translating the Voice of the “Other.”

Keeping in tune with the conference title, “Shifting Paradigms: How Translation Transforms the Humanities,” my paper will study the impact of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s translation of Mahasweta Devi’s “Stanadayini” and its reception in the Anglo-American academy. My paper will focus on two important aspects; first, how the translation rather than the original story has become a primary source for the understanding subaltern theory as propagated by Spivak, and second, if the representation of Jasodha and Draupadi’s characters from Mahasweta’s stories have led to the silencing of the original text.

Rini Bhattacharya Mehta

Teaching Bollywood, Translating Culture: Lessons from a Midwestern Classroom

Drawing from the speaker’s experience of teaching an undergraduate course on Indian Cinema at the University of Illinois, this paper will cover the pedagogical complexities related to teaching a body of mainstream cultural texts in a literally global classroom. Indian Popular Cinema has gained a global audience in the past 10 years and considerable amount of secondary material is now available in the United States. The combination of the two factors makes the prospect of teaching a 100-level course on Indian Cinema to the general student body a tenable and exciting venture. In a university that has a global mix of undergraduates, the task entails juggling not only different skill-levels in writing and critical thinking, but also widely varying sets of consumer-attitudes towards popular culture. Subtitles convey the lowest common denominator of linguistic exchange. Serious problems arise when different sections of the class make assumptions regarding the narrative not on the basis of what has just been conveyed by the
subtitles, but on the basis of what they think they know about Bollywood and India.

Mithilesh Mishra

Hindi Literature in English: The Political Dimension of Translation

The paper will document the texts and authors of Hindi translated into English in the last sixty years and analyze distinctive patterns and thrusts of those translations. The paper will also discuss why a default expectation regarding over-the-board translations of important Hindi texts and authors into English is clearly belied, even when English has been a co-official language of multilingual India since 1950. Finally, the paper will show that there seems to be a tacit agreement among translators regarding the choice of a Hindi text or an author (to be translated into English) and their choice is almost always sensitive to political and ideological considerations.

Rajeshwari V. Pandharipande

One Text, Many Voices: Why Do Translations Differ?

The paper addresses two major questions: why do translations of the same text differ from each other? and the related question, how do we define Translation? “Translation” has been variously defined as ‘transfer/transmission of meaning’, ‘communication’, ‘meaning equivalence, interpretation, representation, etc. The paper examines four translations of the same text, the Bhagawadgita (one of the important Hindu scriptures). It points out that these translations significantly differ from each other, that they validate different and, at times, mutually exclusive definitions of Translation, and yet are all accepted as legitimate translations. The paper a) discusses the factors which explain differences among these translations, b) provides definitions of translation in the Indian tradition, and c) finally argues for the need for the theory/definition of translation which is comprehensive enough to allow variation and yet provides criteria to determine what qualifies or does not qualify as translation.

SESSION F2

Translation in Popular Culture and Film

Alexander Burak: The Trend of “Ozhivilazh” (Jazzing Things Up) in Russian Film Translations: A Case for Comparative Translation Variance Studies

I will examine the current trend to liven up original English texts in Russian film translations (“ozhivilazh”) by comparing the dominant – what I will call – “majoritizing” approach to translating films into Russian (exemplified by the officially licensed and released films) with the marginal, “minoritizing” (Venuti’s term) approach exemplified by the currently extremely popular voiceover translations by Goblin (the pseudonym of Dmitry Yurievich Puchkov).
I will use two translations (the NTV Channel’s and Goblin’s) of a short excerpt from “The Sopranos” TV series to demonstrate how Goblin’s pragmatics of translation caters to the expectations of certain cultural constituencies by challenging the officially approved, general-audience version that caters to a hypothetical, supposedly culturally superior, “median” audience that generally expects film translations to meet standards of public decency.

I will assess the level of the translators’ professionalism manifested in the two translations and also address the question of whether one catchall, across-the-board translation of a mass-appeal cultural product is sufficient to span a theory or do we concurrently need more than one translation of a popular-culture work?

I will argue that the situation in Russian film translation proves the viability of multiple concurrent translation variants of the same popular film and that such translations generally fall under three broad categories: one for “whole-family viewing,” one for the “broad-minded” part of the general audience, including some culturally marginalized contingents, and one for the minority of exacting translation professionals, with the three types conceivably conflating in one smoothed-over, “domesticated” version that cuts across cultural divisions and hierarchies. Consequently, I will argue that establishing comparative translation variance studies as a separate, legitimate humanities subject, academic discipline, and branch of research to study such phenomena has been long overdue.

Justine Huet

Dubbing The Flintstones: How Do You Say “Yabadabadoo” in French?

*The Flintstones*, one of the first animated TV series to be popular throughout the world, constitutes a rich multimodal text whose complex humor relies on intertextuality, situation comedy, and anachronisms. The dubbing of the show, aimed at children and adults, resorts to various translational techniques playing on different channels of communication that range from subtitling, to voice-over, to dubbing. I consider the dubbed show a heteroglossic product—plurality of voices, interplay between verbal and non-verbal dimensions, intertextuality, and presence of both subtitles and voice-over. The dubbed work represents a heteroglossic hybrid (Ludwig and Poulet 2007: 22) in which the American “body” (the visual) and the Québécois one (the verbal) meet and create points of tension and disjuncture, at times clashing and other times converging. The use of *joual*—a vernacular language coming from the working class living in the suburbs of Montréal and mixing English and French words—in the Québécois dubbing especially emphasizes the hybridity of the different levels of the existing French languages: *joual*, Québécois, and international French. Through translation, perceived as a site of power struggle, exchanges occur between the Québécois/French voices and the American visual on film, where different cultural references coexist, drawing upon French, Québécois and American cultures. A new type of entity emerges from the site of dubbing, a hybrid at the crossroads between nationalistic and homogeneous tendencies and a rhizomatic entity (Deleuze and Guattari 1980). Dubbing questions both the concept of norms defined in *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Toury 1995) and in *Le français ordinaire* (Gadet 1997) and also the language politics in Québec. The show acts as a mirror of Québec, a province at the crossroads between France, English Canada, and the United States.
Marilyn Booth
The Muslim Woman as Celebrity Author and the Politics of Translating Arabic: *Girls of Riyadh Goes on the Road*

This essay considers the recent production of texts in English that construct and rely on repeated and homogenized images of Muslim women; it focuses on a translated text but argues for its contextualization within the market of popular memoir. Taking the recent translation of Rajaa Alsanea’s *Banat al-Riyadh* into English as a case study, I argue that revisions made by press and author to my translation assimilated it to chick-lit generic conventions in the Anglophone marketplace, muting the gender politics and situatedness of multiple kinds of Arabic that acted, in the Arabic novel, as a critique of the Saudi system. Paratextual framing of the marketed book (such as reviews) and translational choices emphasized the fiction as a writing of “experience,” bringing it closer to the memoir genre and linking it to a tradition of what the author calls Orientalist ethnographicism. These effects produce a work and author-figure both exotic and familiar.