Apropos of Ideology

Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies

Edited by
María Calzada Pérez

ST JEROME
PUBLISHING

St. Jerome Publishing
Manchester, UK & Northampton MA

Apropos of Ideology

Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies

Edited by
María Calzada Pérez

ST JEROME
PUBLISHING

St. Jerome Publishing
Manchester, UK & Northampton MA

Published by
St. Jerome Publishing
2 Maple Road West, Brooklands
Manchester, M23 9HH, United Kingdom
Tel +44 161 973 9856
Fax +44 161 905 3498
stjerome@compuserve.com
http://www.stjerome.co.uk

ISBN 1-900650-51-7 (pbk)

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
T. J. International Ltd., Cornwall, UK

Cover design by
Steve Fieldhouse, Oldham, UK (+44 161 620 2263)

Typeset by
Delta Typesetters, Cairo, Egypt
Email: hilali1945@hotmail.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record of this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Apropos of ideology : translation studies on ideology, ideologies in translation studies / edited by María Calzada Pérez.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-900650-51-7 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Translating and interpreting. I. Pérez, María Calzada.
PN241 .A66 2002
418'.02--dc21

2002014787

I FORGET YOUR NAME
I DON'T THINK
I BURY MY HEAD
I BURY YOUR HEAD
I BURY YOU
(Jenny Holzer)

Contents

Acknowledgements

Extracts of Jenny Holzer's *Truisms*, *Inflamatory Essays*, *The Living Series*, *Under a Rock*, and *Laments* displayed at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum for the 1989-1990 exhibition, © Jenny Holzer, VEGAP, 2001.

Introduction

MARÍA CALZADA PÉREZ

1. Why Ideology?

It is a truism that translation is as old as humankind. Ideology, for its part, is hardly a new phenomenon either. Likewise, the combination of cross-cultural encounters and ideological pressures has permeated history. Examples abound. Goldenberg (2000), for instance, points out that – in the Spanish-American War of 1898 – presses played crucial roles in the construction of public opinion regarding their own countries and 'the Other'. Original (ST) and translated (TT) documents contributed to forging ideological stereotypes. These were intentionally sought to raise support for a war that was to change the global order and the hegemonic discourse of the time.

Therefore, the cross-cultural ideological tensions that mark the turn of the millennium are actually nothing new, despite the growing concern they are causing. However, they do contain certain features that make them, in many ways, unusual and unique. Their idiosyncratic nature mainly stems from what is known as globalization: a widely spread neologism that could be seen to designate a form of cultural and economic colonialism.

Whereas, before, tensions were limited by geographical and chronological factors and mainly affected certain social strata directly, now the homogenizing force of globalization is all the greater because it can reach all places and all social levels very fast. To this end, new means of communication (notably the Internet) and media (e.g. satellite and digital television) are being put to use. It is this overwhelming strength of globalization that worries thinkers like Maalouf (1999:152) when he argues:

> I am convinced that globalization is a threat to cultural diversity, especially to diversity of languages and lifestyles; and that this threat is even infinitely greater than in the past [...][1]

Concern about these globalized ideological tensions is resulting in increasing interest on the part of a variety of disciplines ranging from political

[1] All translations into English are my own.

science and anthropology through sociology and cultural studies to linguistics. Linguistics, for example, has developed a relatively new trend of research – critical discourse analysis (CDA) – whose primary aim is to expose the ideological forces that underlie communicative exchanges. This is the common goal of an approach that is far from homogeneous. According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997:262-268), there are at least six main strands within CDA – French discourse analysis (e.g. Pêcheux); the discoursal-historical method (e.g. Wodak); Van Dijk's socio-cognitive school; Fairclough's emphasis on socio-cultural/discursive change; social semiotics (e.g. Kress) and critical linguistics (e.g. Fowler). All of them use slightly different tools and methodologies for their work.

This, of course, does not exhaust the viewpoints from which cross-cultural ideological phenomena may be – and are indeed being – examined. Translation studies (TS) have a great deal to say about these issues. In fact, it has been doing so for over a decade now. TS dig into ideological phenomena for a variety of reasons. All language use is, as CDA contenders claim, ideological. Translation is an operation carried out on language use. This undoubtedly means that translation itself is always a site of ideological encounters (which often turn 'sour'). Fawcett (1998: 107), for instance, provides an eloquent illustration of how

> throughout the centuries, individuals and institutions have applied their particular beliefs to the production of certain effects in translation.

Ranging from the Middle Ages to the present day, Fawcett's chosen cases show that translations have been ideological simply by existing (like Ælfric's transfer of *The Life of the Saints*); by being subjected to various forms of (religious) creeds, which ultimately took translators to be burnt at the stake or to be threatened (and killed) by notorious *fatwas*; or by echoing all sorts of value-related messages such as Marxism:

> As in all good dialectical practice, the thesis (source language) and the antithesis (target language) are resolved in the synthesis of translation. (Fawcett 1998:110)

Furthermore, ideological phenomena may also be legitimately approached from a TS vantage point because, as Emily Apfer (2001) argues, globalization is resulting in an in-built form of (Anglo-American) translatability at which "global artists, video makers and writers consciously or unconsciously" aim. If globalization is unleashing translational mechanisms even within monolingual artefacts, this seems to hint at an ever-increasing need for TS expertise. It is not without reason, then, that Apfer (2001:online) makes a point of stressing TS's important contribution to ideologically-related matters:

> When the problem of a globalizing mass culture and public culture is approached from the perspective of translatability, new and important questions of cultural commodification and thus, ideology, arise.

Hence, both the present interest in today's cross-cultural ideological phenomena and their undoubted relation to the field of translation studies (of which we have only presented a handful of arguments here) explain the reason for a book like *Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*. The main aim of this compilation of articles is, thus, to encourage a debate on ideology in translation studies which contributes to the discussion that is currently taking place at various levels. However, to understand what this aim fully entails I will now consider the concepts of 'ideology' (section 2) and 'translation studies' (section 3). A detailed structure of the volume, with an overview of the articles it contains, follows (section 4).

2. On Ideology

There are so many definitions of ideology that it is impossible to review all of them here.[2] Such a profusion tends to confuse scholars and lay readers alike. For the latter, "An ideology is a belief or a set of ideas, especially the political beliefs on which people, parties, or countries base their actions" (Collins Cobuild s.v.). The common political slant of the term often merges with negative undertones so that, for Van Dijk (1998:2), it is sometimes "taken as a system of wrong, false, distorted or otherwise misguided beliefs". This is, of course, the legacy of a Marxist (and neo-Marxist) tradition which saw ideology as tantamount to political domination, in the form of covert manipulation, and always related to

[2] For a brief outlook of the history of the term and copious bibliography on the topic, see, for instance, Larrain (1979); Thompson (1990); Eagleton (1991); Hawkes (1996); or Van Dijk (1998).

the concepts of power and hegemony (in the Gramscian sense). Along these lines, ideology is imposed surreptitiously. It gradually becomes everyday, common thinking. The more naturalized it is, the more successful it becomes amongst its subjugated citizens. This is precisely why, according to Van Dijk (1998:2),

> few of 'us' (in the West or elsewhere) describe our own belief systems or convictions as 'ideologies'. On the contrary, Ours is the Truth, Theirs is the Ideology.

In this sense, ideology is a pernicious, destructive force that should be opposed, fought, and conquered. However, the political definition of ideology does not need to be tied to these 'negative' (destructive) echoes. Kellner (in *Illuminations. The Critical Theory Website*) explains that, within the Marxian tradition itself, more 'positive' (constructive) approaches, have also developed. These are particularly associated with Lenin, who described Socialist ideology as a force that encourages revolutionary consciousness and fosters progress. Merging the negative/destructive and positive/constructive connotations Kellner (online:3) describes the term as:

> 'Janus-faced', two-sided: it contains errors, mystifications and techniques of manipulation and domination, but it also contains a utopian residue that can be used for social critique and to advance progressive politics.

The political definition of ideology has indeed had a direct influence on today's academia. Some theorists remain 'faithful' to ideology's most political undertones because, as Fairclough (1995:16) for instance explains:

> My view is that the abuses and contradictions of capitalist society which gave rise to critical theory have not been diminished, nor have the characteristics of discursive practices within capitalist society which gave rise to critical discourse analysis.

Sometimes these scholars underline the negative connotations of the term, in which case they link ideologies to the dominant social power and support the following definition (reproduced by Eagleton 1991:30):

> Ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interest of a ruling group or class by distortion or dissimulation.

On other occasions, however, they put an emphasis on ideology's most positive side. Ideology is now viewed as a vehicle to promote or legitimate interests of a particular social group (rather than a means to destroy contenders).

The political definitions of ideology have also had a refracted impact upon other members of the language-related and TS academic community. These scholars realize the importance of the concept as a set of ideas, which organize our lives and help us understand the relationship to our environment. They contend that certain ideologies become naturalized or common, whereas others are pushed aside to the edges of our societies. For them, some ideologies are dominant, they are more useful to succeed in public spheres while others remain chained to more domestic settings. However, they refuse to constrain the term to its purely political meaning. So they open it up to a wider definition. For Verschueren, editor of a compilation on *Language and Ideology:*

> Ideology is interpreted as any constellation of beliefs or ideas, bearing on an aspect of social reality, which are experienced as fundamental or commonsensical and which can be observed to play a normative role. (1999:Preface)

After reviewing various definitions, Van Dijk (1998:48-9) agrees with Verschueren:

> [...] an ideology is the set of factual and evaluative beliefs – that is the knowledge and the opinions – of a group [...] In other words, a bit like the axioms of a formal system, ideologies consist of those general and abstract social beliefs and opinions (attitudes) of a group.

Briefly, the definition of ideology I want to put forward and pursue in this volume is – like Verschueren's or Van Dijk's – not limited to political spheres. Instead, it allows researchers to investigate modes of thinking, forms of evaluating, and codes of behaviour which govern a community by virtue of being regarded as the norm.

There is a final issue that often causes confusion amongst scholars; that is, the distinction between culture and ideology. Whereas the latter, as we have just argued, consists of "the set of ideas, values and beliefs that govern a community by virtue of being regarded as the norm" (Calzada-Pérez 1997:35), culture is commonly taken to be "an integrated

system of learned behavior patterns that are characteristic of the members of any given society" (Khol 1984:17). Both definitions certainly overlap and the difference between them may be so subtle that academics such as Fawcett (1998:106) openly ask: "When is something ideology rather than culture?".

Just answering this question to the full would probably entail a volume on its own and it is not our intention to provide any definite answers to this specific question in this introduction. Suffice it here to say that we have foregrounded 'ideology' rather than 'culture' for two main reasons. Firstly, everyday 'culture' is normally related to what is conventionally known as 'society', in its ethnic sense of "the community of people living in a particular country or region and having shared customs, laws and organizations" (New OED 1998 s.v.). Our definition of ideology aims at enlarging this ethnic framework. Ideology, as is understood here, not only affects 'societies'. It permeates (identity) groups of the most varied nature, which would not always relate to the conventional meaning of 'society'. Disparate communities such as the gay scene or TV interpreters may be the setting of ideological phenomena which would not strictly qualify as cultural.

And secondly, in the same way that ideology has been traditionally associated with negative – political – connotations, culture is normally tied to positive – 'philanthropic' – features. Looking into the former seems to encourage greater 'critical thinking'. Cultures are often regarded as traditions, pasts, roots or knowledge; in short, heritages. Being 'critical' with our own cultures can be seen by some as 'risky' and 'inappropriate' as it is 'politically incorrect' to criticize other cultures openly. By foregrounding 'ideology' rather than culture we want to encourage (self)-criticism from various standpoints within translation studies.

3. On Translation Studies

Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies has a twofold aim, represented by its two running titles. On the one hand, it is a compilation on ideology, in the sense we have already specified in the previous section. On the other, it is a book clearly conceived within TS. It revolves also, therefore, around 'Ideologies in TS'. This section tackles the latter.

Holmes' (1988) mapping of our discipline has arguably become a standard amongst TS (theoretical and practical) communities. However, this

does not mean that TS is either unified or homogeneous. On the contrary, it is a conglomerate of dissimilar approaches or trends to which Snell-Hornby *et al.* (1994), for example, has referred as an 'interdiscipline'. Each of these approaches or trends favours its own set of ideas and beliefs about the translating task and about the world that surrounds it, and each has its own mechanisms to perpetuate itself amongst (would-be) followers. Ultimately, translation scholars become ideological channels that (re)produce and (re)create translational behaviour to its most minute detail. Translators *qua* translators build their identities upon the (artificial) 'certainties' that they grasp in these different ideological 'niches'. Robinson (online) makes critical remarks about the ideological certainties of both our discipline and practice:

> Translators know certain things: how to regulate the degree of 'fidelity' with the source text, how to tell what degree and type of fidelity is appropriate in specific use contexts, how to receive and deliver translations, how to charge them, how to find help with terminology, how to talk and generally act as a professional, and so on. Translators are those people who know these things, and who let their knowledge govern their behavior. And that knowledge is ideological. It is controlled by ideological norms [...]. If you want to become a translator you must submit to the translator's submissive role, submit to being 'possessed' by what ideological norms inform you [...]

In sum, translators translate according to the ideological settings in which they learn and perform their tasks. These settings are varied and have resulted in a rich 'concoction' of ideologies. Feminists, functionalists, descriptive and polysystemic scholars, sociolinguistic researchers, postcolonial exegetes, corpus studies propounders, critical linguistic theorists, gay and lesbian academics, semioticians, contrastive linguists embody some of the very many 'ideologies' that make up TS. Nevertheless, throughout history, the varied range of TS has often been reduced to series of polar opposites. Studies in our discipline have been presented as in favour of either literal or free strategies; scholars have been classified into literary or non-literary traditions; approaches have been segregated as theoretical or practical; and so on and so forth. TS's ideological complexity has also been jeopardized by the latest of these academic simplifications: strands are either located within cultural studies or 'pure' linguistics. It is already well known that, in its most extreme version, this

dichotomy would claim that linguistically-orientated approaches to translational phenomena are mainly descriptive studies focusing on textual form and failing to address wider, ideological issues. Cultural studies, for its part, targets these issues but would have no systematic formal framework of analysis.

Furthermore, these two sides – as Baker (1996) shows – have been depicted as isolated contenders that can neither communicate nor work together; that constantly attack and exclude each other, disregarding the numerous instances of research in which they do indeed come together. However, more and more voices are currently being raised to contest the dichotomy. Amongst them, Maria Tymoczko (1999:140) has always worked to propound that "seemingly divergent or antithetical translation traditions can function in complementary and symbiotic ways". For example, both in Tymoczko (1999) and (2000) she uses descriptive tools to uncover explanatory, ideological material via the analysis of textual and paratextual data.

This compilation of papers on ideology is born out of both centripetal and centrifugal forces. On the one hand, because of centripetal forces, we want to claim that TS is much richer than the binomial opposites mentioned above would suggest. With Ulrych and Bollettieri Bosinelli (1999:238), we believe that:

> [...] there now exists a variegated and consolidated core of translation scholars working within a variety of approaches and with a variety of methodologies but all focusing on the ultimate aim of furthering their knowledge and understanding of translation as a phenomenon per se.

On the other hand, centrifugal pressures lead us to argue that all these different ideological trends need to approach each other in order to foster dialogue and fusion. The merging of dissimilar issues and approaches around the notion of ideology is one of the main contributions of this book. In effect, whereas it focuses on ideological phenomena of various kinds and from various TS perspectives, it nevertheless, gathers material that up until now would probably be found in separate volumes. We admit the inspiration of three previous volumes: Dingwaney and Maier (1995); Bowker *et al.* (1998); and Simms (1997).

Dingwaney and Maier's work is an exciting project owing especially to its multidisciplinary nature. Amongst its varied range of contributors are poets and writers, social and community workers, sculptors and lecturers in diverse fields: literature, anthropology, law, applied linguistics, cultural studies and religion. It is precisely this multidisciplinarity which has served as a model for *Apropos of Ideology*. As mentioned above, the work seeks to merge different traditions in order to give a richer, more dynamic view of ideological matters in translation. At the same time, we propose to draw on the interdisciplinarity of TS itself, rather than to resort to external disciplines.

In turn, Bowker *et al.* (1998) is really a book on the various ideologies within TS and it inspires our theoretical/ideological scope. It approaches a wide variety of topics (e.g. feminism, bilingualism, nationalism, subtitling, machine translation, etc.) from dissimilar ideological viewpoints. Cultural studies, descriptive translation studies, computer-aided translation, and interpreting are represented in this compilation. Our contributions, for their part, seek to maintain TS ideological variety. However, they focus on ideologically related matters only.

Finally, Simms (1997) is, in many ways, a similar product to the present compilation. It includes articles on ideology from different TS traditions. Nevertheless, while it concentrates on linguistic descriptions of legal, religious, political,... products, it excludes other forms of research, such as – for example – poststructuralist criticism. *Apropos of Ideology* sets off with the intention of providing an eclectic, though clearly not exhaustive, picture of the topic.

4. About this book

Apropos of Ideology follows a specific to general approach regarding the notion of ideology. It starts off with the definition of this concept as political thinking, but gradually incorporates other sites of ideological engagement like gender, sexual identity, religion, secularity, technology and translation studies self-criticism.

The political focus is provided by **Christina Schäffner** who, in **'Third Ways and New Centres – Ideological Unity or Difference?'**, examines a joint manifesto produced by the British Labour Party and the German Social Democratic Party in 1999. Schäffner moves from establishing the political background through analyzing ideological features of text production to probing the ideological considerations reflected by the text itself.

As far as the political background is concerned, she briefly introduces the British and German *status quo* and then reviews the process of co-writing (as the result of either parallel work or 'traditional' translation).

When examining text production, the author discusses the extratextual factors which surround the document under scrutiny and which make up this 'peculiar' form of translational event combining parallel writing and translation. The agents of this mixed process are not individual conventional translators, but a team of (unknown) writers who, though politically minded, are not normally connected to translating tasks. Both the British and German versions were ultimately supervised by the then-influential Peter Mandelson and Bobo Hombach and were designed to behave as equifunctional texts, theoretically aiming at comparable addressees with comparable needs and expectations. In effect, the texts ended up fulfilling different functions in what were indeed very different social (and linguistic) contexts. These contextual dissimilarities are clearly portrayed by textural features of the manifestos. Straightforward concepts such as 'social justice', 'state', 'community', 'partnership' have different (semantic) histories in Britain and Germany and this has clear effects on final translations.

Schäffner's paper may, consequently, be seen as the classical top-down approach to ideological phenomena. There are certain elements that make the text innovative. Firstly, while focusing her definition of ideology on politics, she broadens the most traditional descriptions of translation, in order to incorporate cross-cultural practices, such as parallel writing, that some voices (within TS) would leave outside its scope. Admittedly, this is not an entirely new stand, since other TS scholars – notably Bassnett and Lefevere – have supported this theoretical 'enlargement' for some time now. Schäffner shows that linguistic-oriented voices actively contribute to this enlargement. Secondly, like the other contributors to this volume, Schäffner implicitly argues against the pure and neat categorization of TS schools when she borrows, for her study, tools from critical discourse analysis (the textual/contextual link, for example), descriptive translation studies (translational events), German functionalism (emphasis on TT clients and reception; Nord's extra- and intra-textual components) and cognitive and text linguistics (frames, schemata, metaphors,...).

Finally, if linguistically-oriented research on translation has been accused of being detached from the real world, Schäffner proves this criticism wrong when she presents a linguistically-oriented article full of names that were certainly internationally recognized at the time when the manifesto was produced (i.e. Mandelson, Hombach, Lafontaine). As Vidal Claramonte (1998:8) suggests, the author shows that translation studies 'is in this world'.

TS's active involvement in the world remains a constant in this book and is clearly endorsed by **Keith Harvey**'s **"'Events' and 'Horizons': Reading Ideology in the 'Bindings' of Translations"**. Here, after reviewing the apparently antithetical concepts of individual agency and social determinism, the author synthesizes them by drawing on the works of Fairclough and Berman in his discussion of the translations of three American gay novels: John Rechy's *Rushes*; Larry Kramer's *Faggots* and Andrew Holleran's *Dancer from the Dance*. Harvey concentrates on their translated titles, cover photos, and blurbs (his 'binding' or 'peripherals') to examine the repercussions in the receiving environment of what he calls "agency of the translation as event" (versus the responsibility of individual translators).

While complementing Schäffner's definition of ideology with issues related to gay identity, the author fully coincides with the latter in the use of eclectic sources to enrich the scope of translation studies.

Harvey's contribution is, in fact, a fitting illustration of how TS scholars can promote a multifaceted (methodological and formal) alternative agenda from a relatively 'traditional' point of departure. In other words, when the author initially takes up the theoretical challenge of reconciling agency and determinism, events and systems, human behaviour and history, he is hardly taking on a new task. However, in the actual analysis of his corpus he implements an 'interactional/interventionist' working protocol, which sets his 'alternative agenda' in motion.

Harvey's agenda is alternative firstly because his actual methodology is alternative. He favours the exploration of what Tymoczko (2000:26) would call 'the perlocutionary dimension' of target texts; that is their effects amongst the target readership. While today's TS on ideology is basically dominated by – much needed – causal studies of translations (see Schäffner in this volume, for example), he chooses to do otherwise. In other words, Harvey not only isolates plausible reasons for his textural material. He also identifies (potential) repercussions on the readership. Furthermore, he manages to avoid essentialist divisions between causations and repercussions (systems and agency) (cf. Chesterman and Arrojo 2000). In this sense, Harvey shows that translation agency – his focus of study – is a complex concept which has systemic causes and, at the same time, leaves a constitutive imprint on the target site.

Harvey's agenda is alternative secondly because his subject of analysis – translating American gay fiction into French – differs from other, more 'conservative' topics. Consequently, he shows an interest in

'minoritized' translational realities while again escaping essentialist thinking. He underlines the fact that majorities and minorities are not clear-cut, monolithic categories, but that they change with time and appear intermingled: minorities within majorities and vice versa. The topic chosen by the scholar brings to the fore his academic affiliation with gay/queer studies and increases the already high level of multidisciplinarity his research usually displays.

Harvey's agenda is alternative finally because of the specific corpus chosen for analysis. With the aid of semiotics (amongst other tools), he dissects the 'peripherals' of covers (i.e. title and photo) and blurbs to "a degree of detail and systematicity that I am suggesting is new within translation studies". Furthermore, in his subversive attempt to overturn 'normal' practices, he describes this material as paradoxically the "obvious place to begin an analysis of the translation as interface" (Harvey in this volume), when such research does not abound.

The normalization of marginalized (women's) ideologies and the advocacy of alternative, subversive aims are also the main topic of **María del Carmen África Vidal Claramonte**'s **'(Mis)translating Degree Zero Translation and Conceptual Art'**.

Vidal Claramonte complements the political view of ideology with (postmodern) philosophical matters, which, she claims, are also a subject of analysis for translation studies. In this way, she presents living as constant translating; she highlights the ideological dangers of language (hence translation) and calls for a debate about our practitioners' ethical responsibility towards society. She applies her theoretical thinking to the potential rendering of a postmodern mode of expression – conceptual art – which, like Harvey's 'bindings', can also be described as alternative translational matter. Vidal Claramonte refers to Barbara Kruger, Glenn Ligon, Sue Williams, Shirin Neshat, but she particularly concentrates on works by Nancy Spero and Jenny Holzer. She discusses the radical nature of their artistic proposals, which aim at exposing and opposing patriarchal ideologies through popular – deconstructive – formats such as posters, stickers on phone booths, t-shirts, or electronic signs. She then wonders about the options that are open for translators in dealing with this radical input (that depends entirely on language) and even considers financial matters, since conceptual art – for example Weiner's phrases on walls – has been sold at astronomical prices: "Can anybody imagine translating a word", asks Vidal Claramonte in this volume, "that has cost somebody 10,000 dollars?". This contribution leaves us with a large series of questions – rather than

certainties – that bring the author back to the philosophical tone with which the paper starts.

The material Vidal Claramonte looks into, as has been said already, is as 'marginalized' and 'subversive' as Harvey's. However, there is a major difference between the two scholars. While the latter focuses on the ideological causes and repercussions of translated material, the former prefers to investigate the ideological potential of the original artefacts. The rest of her paper comprises hypotheses about translations that, as far as we are concerned, do not yet exist. For what the Spanish theorist may be advocating here is the need for a translational ethos that precedes the translating task itself. This reminds us of the fact that translation studies is currently devoted to the most varied range of interests that legitimately fall within its scope. In the same way translators explore the repercussions of their work amongst the audience, they also decide about their own ethical stance. In the same way they analyze the representation of politics, they debate the politics of representation.

Vidal Claramonte is as multivocal as previous contributors, though this time she brings into our discipline her preferred inspirational sources, which are connected to postmodernism, poststructuralism, and deconstruction. She also puts into question the cultural studies vs. linguistics dichotomy. When she expresses the need to overcome the view of translating as a solely linguistic practice, she quotes (linguistic-oriented) Schäffner to support her arguments. Whereas cultural studies proponents have often been attacked for their mainly theoretical standpoints (versus the more empirical or pedagogical tones of certain linguists), she is careful to explain that the paper's philosophical and ethical questions respond to her concerns as a practising translator. She has to decide on ethics with the same urgency that she faces many other aspects of her profession.

So far, the definition of ideology as political thinking has been complemented by Harvey's and Vidal Claramonte's different – yet symbiotic – approaches to gay and gender issues. With the next two papers, by Christiane Nord and Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar respectively, other sites of ideological engagement are visited through the consideration of religious and secularizing forces.

Christiane Nord, one of the main defenders of the increasingly influential ideology of German functionalism within TS, explains, in **'Function and loyalty in Bible translation'**, how she faced the conveyance of biblical and apocryphal early Christian texts. In order to do so, she formed part of a two- person translating team, which worked on the

basis of 'split competence'. While she took care of the cross-linguistic aspects of the joint venture, her male colleague was in charge of the theological and linguistic understanding of the original source. Hence, like Schäffner or Harvey, Nord distances herself from a (canonical?) description of translation as a one-person's task. She argues that co-translating is a common practice that deserves our theoretical attention.

As a convinced functionalist, Nord begins by revealing the three-fold purpose that underlies her article. Firstly, she intends to consolidate functionalism in TS academia. Secondly, she wishes to investigate 'sensitive' texts. Now that *Skopostheorie* has been acclaimed with regard to technical and literary genres, religious documents are further material to test her theoretical framework. Thirdly, she sets out to unveil the way in which both her colleague and she have been affected by their theological and functional stances.

Nord continues with a brief definition of *Skopstheorie*'s main concepts – 'function plus loyalty' and 'skopos' – in order to inform an account of the joint experience of translating sacred texts. From that moment on, the scholar resorts to Fillmore's semantic scenes-and-frames model to illustrate nodes of ideological conflict, the team's preferred solutions and a comparison with other (canonical) versions of the same texts. This paper culminates in a series of theological and feminist debates that are clearly ideological.

Nord's proposal offers translation studies a clear-cut, organized framework, which is not only applicable to pedagogical settings, but which is also relevant to the study of ideological mechanisms and goals. As has been seen, this framework takes the scholar from definitions, through statements of intentions, to the analysis of the actual process/product of translation. Furthermore, it illustrates how traditional concepts in (cognitive) linguistics (such as Fillmore's model) may be used to reach ideological conclusions. The combination of Fillmore's familiar and unfamiliar frames and scenes with reference to source and target texts results in a highly structured identification and explanation of ideological shifts that guide the translators' own decisions.

Equally noteworthy is Nord's overt sincerity when it comes to acknowledging her academic and translating intentions. Her open attitude may be compared to that of other (cultural studies) researchers who set their own (often radical) agendas, revealing their intentions from their very first moves. Finally, the paper challenges the rigid dichotomy of canonical vs. non-canonical translational phenomena. Whereas *Skopostheorie* is gradu-

ally occupying the centre of translation studies (and is indeed setting many a teaching curriculum within training institutions) the transfer choices Nord justifies in this paper are still seen to be competing against a well-established (Bible Studies) tradition that makes it unadvisable to talk lightly about 'canonical' behaviour.

While Nord's paper revolves around the Christian religion, **Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar's 'The Translation Bureau Revisited: translation as symbol'** deals with secularizing forces in Islamic Turkey. From 1839 onwards, Western literature has been imported by this country, via translation, with a view to promoting secular European Humanism and Renaissance thinking. This translating activity was part of some form of culture planning that has had institutional support, gained ground in national conferences, and depended on governmental bodies like the Translation Bureau. The Bureau was founded in 1940 and prolonged its work until 1966. Tahir-Gürçağlar describes the periods that preceded, coincided with, and followed its production. She examines historical events such as the replacement, in Turkey, of the Arabic alphabet by Latin characters in 1928; the celebration of the First Turkish Publishing Congress; the creation and disappearance of the Bureau; the change of government in 1946, etc. At present, after some decades of descriptive research, Turkey's academia is still intrigued by this translational experience, which is an appealing topic for further research. Tahir-Gürçağlar herself points to the Bureau's norms of transfer as the next potential stage of analysis.

In an increasingly anglicized academic environment, Tahir-Gürçağlar opens a window to 'other' traditions. She claims, not without reason, that TS scholars from all over the world can learn from the Turkish experience, not just about translation, but also about nationhood, culture planning, shifting ideologies and ideological symbolism. She exposes the fact that translation participates in a wider process that is made up of micro-level agents (e.g. translators, authors, critics, publishers, editors, individual politicians, ...) and macro-level agents (institutions). A critical analysis of this complex process reveals that it is hardly innocent. On the contrary, it actively contributes to the creation and perpetuation of artificial ideologies that are absorbed as natural. Approaching Harvey's conception of agency, Tahir-Gürçağlar implicitly argues that both micro and macro-level agents are responsible for ideological repercussions.

These investigations, according to the author, may benefit from the research tools developed by descriptive translation studies (DTS), another centre of our translation polysystem. In contrast with previous (or

following) papers that examine actual translated material of a more or less conventional type (e.g. traditional texts, conceptual art, 'bindings',...), Tahir-Gürçağlar reviews the extratextual matter that surrounds ideologically inspired translations. Furthermore, contrary to synchronic approaches to translations, the author opts for a diachronic gaze (historical DTS) that is especially helpful in pinning down ideological change. By doing so, she again reminds us that translation may be studied in many different ways, from many different viewpoints and upon a large range of data.

In our globalized, consumer-oriented societies, 'old' religious/secularizing concerns intermingle with 'new' communicative situations created by the emergence (and widespread use) of audiovisual media. The next two contributions by David Katan and Francesco Straniero Sergio, on the one hand, and Peter Fawcett, on the other, discuss the constraints imposed on linguistic/cultural mediators handling television or cinema products.

With **'Submerged Ideologies in Media Interpreting', David Katan** and **Francesco Straniero Sergio** produce a joint paper about the underlying ideologies influencing TV interpreting, a relatively unexplored issue by T(I)S scholars. The scope of translation (and interpretation!) studies widens yet again.

The article proposes a model of intercultural communication based upon a very broad, multidisciplinary and hybrid literature with references from (Marxist) philosophy and sociology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, interpreting research, media studies and cultural studies. According to this model, the interpreting process may be compared to a system of relations established at three levels. The most hidden of these planes encompasses the values and desires of our societies. For Katan and Straniero Sergio our dominant value system takes the form of 'consumer capitalism'. As for our desires, the authors expound on the concepts of 'popular culture', 'comfort factor', and 'environmental bubble'.

The second plane of the method proposed by Katan and Straniero Sergio is that of the interpreters' identity – their roles in the labour market and the skills they need to survive the selection process which would result in their return to their interpreting jobs. Obviously, values and desires have an important influence upon the creation of identity in the same way ideologies and identities are openly realized in Katan and Straniero Sergio's third plane of visible – linguistic and paralinguistic –

features. This tripartite model, consequently, envisages tied links between ideologies, identities and performance. Like Harvey and Tahir-Gürçağlar, the authors foresee agency as a potential 'detonator' of change and submerged ideologies as only influencing (never determining) factors for co-communicants' conduct.

Their framework allows the scholars to compare the behaviour of (new) TV interpreters with other (traditional) forms of consecutive, simultaneous or dialogue interpreters. This is achieved through tangible units (e.g. voices, lexicon, register, turn-taking, or *décalage*) as the departing point of study. Among other things, Katan and Straniero Sergio conclude that TV interpreters are currently more 'visible' than their predecessors. Whether translators will experience a similar – desirable – 'coming out' in the future is, at present, only a matter of speculation.

Katan and Straniero Sergio enrich our already varied images of translation and ideology. They produce a joint piece of research that, as has already been mentioned, benefits from a high degree of multidisciplinarity. Methodologically speaking they remind us of the existence (and relevance) of quantitative trends as part of our studies. They adopt an implicitly militant tone, through which they demand further space for interpreters. These are constantly isolated by commissioners, colleagues, and clients who regard them as 'passive and slavish' (Vuorinen 1997:169, cited in Katan and Straniero Sergio in this volume) imitators. Yet, they are often equally underestimated by TS academia who even drop the 'interpreting' component from our official label.

Finally, this discussion underlines the hybridization of all communicative exchanges, amongst which TV interpreting is just one example. In the same way that TV interpreting is merging with other (media) genres, so it may be concluded that hybrid texts (original and translations) are definitely the norm rather than the exotic exception.

Peter Fawcett proposes an article entitled **'The Manipulation of Language and Culture in Film Translation'**, whose main topic is the shifting ideology of subtitling. This ideology regulates the level of work translators expect from their audiences; the moral, political and legal concerns that dominate our field; subtitlers' perception of their task; and the central discourses that surround this task. All of these constitute a constellation of ideas (i.e. ideology), which are implemented everyday by practitioners and handed down to younger generations through training, instruction, national culture, company culture and general translation culture.

According to Fawcett, film subtitling is exposed to at least three main forces – technical constraints, cultural and ideological issues, and the features and skills of each individual translator. The encounter of all three may result in randomness. However, it may also have, as Fawcett shows, systematic effects on the handling of language in general and the specific treatment of metaphors, cultural allusions, register and bad language. Nevertheless, by the end of the paper, Fawcett highlights the importance of translators' individual agency. He also critically assesses the genuine nature of two important 'technical' constraints: maximum number of characters allowed and synchronization of oral dialogue and written titles. Fawcett identifies a normalizing/domesticating trend in the translated data examined and ends his paper on a critical note, when he argues that English subtitlers have no option but to normalize. The final remark – "But film translation can hardly offer a site for resistance" – is a challenge bound to ignite academic debate.

Again, Fawcett's paper widens our perspective of translation with its focus on film subtitling. His ample gamut of examples illustrates the critical implementation of dissimilar theories by Vinay and Darbelnet, Shveitser, Newmark and Venuti. At any rate, Fawcett warns readers about the fact that isolated data can only offer tentative conclusions regarding ideological shifts.

It is Fawcett's bitterly critical tone that makes his paper particularly enjoyable. The author is critical of British society and its (censored) media. He is critical of technical constraints that are really customary conventions. He is especially (self-)critical of TS scholars, amongst whom he finds normalizers and foreignizers who are equally prescriptive. And it is this criticism that connects him with the final contributions by Rosemary Arrojo and Maria Tymoczko.

Apropos of Ideology encourages self-reflexivity in TS. As practising translators or scholars, it is vital for us to 'deconstruct' and expose the ideologies of 'others'. However, it is of equal importance that we turn to the field of TS with a critical – and constructive – mind. It is only in this way that we will achieve real progress.

'The Power of Originals and the Scandal of Translation – A Reading of Edgar Allan Poe's *The Oval Portrait*', by **Rosemary Arrojo**, contains an exercise of self-criticism, which erodes the essentialist system of representations (or ideology) lying at the foundation of our studies. This system spreads in various ways. One such way is through the naturalization of those metaphors that inform our view of translation at all levels

(from theory to practice, from teaching to learning). According to Arrojo, it is also within the scope of the (postmodern) translator to dismantle these metaphors, to defamiliarize their workings and to unveil their effects. Since literature has traditionally catered for these metaphoric images, Arrojo turns her eyes – and her poststructuralist toolkit – to Edgar Allan Poe's famous short-story 'The Oval Portrait'. This is basically about a narrator who arrives at a chateau, where he finds out about the tale of a painter who, while producing an excellent portrait of his wife, has been punished with her death for violating the clear-cut hierarchy of original/translation, real life/imitation.

The paper becomes a series of chained 'translations' (in the hermeneutic sense of 'interpretations'), reminiscent of Chinese boxes or Russian dolls. Arrojo recounts / 'translates' the tale of a narrator who is, in turn, conveying / 'translating' the story behind a picture of a beautiful lady, 'rendered' / 'translated' by a painter from a real life model, his wife. A complex network of relationships is established between all these mediators / 'translators'. The chain is potentially endless as Arrojo shows by providing multidisciplinary interpretations / 'translations' by Kennedy, Freud and Poe himself.

In the end, Poe's story seems to suggest that painters/translators are never to pursue a creative role or else they will be penalized. Yet, why is the narrator allowed to praise the painter/translator so vigorously throughout the story? Initially Arrojo provides a (purposely) essentialist answer, which she later challenges and which provokes thought in readers.

Arrojo warns us about the fact that metaphors of this kind (translation is painting) abound in TS. They forge the image of our task as servile imitation, secondary reproduction, or defective exploitation of the ST's innumerable treasures. Arrojo urges us to challenge this long-established essentialist ideology, that is by now common ground (protected by Western voices like Freud and Poe). Arrojo's paper expands both our understanding of ideology and our treatment of translation. With regard to ideology, she complements Marxist theory with complex concepts such as Freud's 'subject-formation' and Althusser's elaborate system of ideological practices. Concerning translation, she strengthens our discipline with its critical message and 'other' research procedures. She carries out a study that complements 'other' theoretical and practical works, with the varied help of different TS scholars – such as Hermans, Mounin or Venuti. She abandons observational or empirical approaches in favour of a rather more introspective examination. Arrojo disregards translated texts or

extratextual evidence and bases her work directly upon the system of representations that informs TS.

If Arrojo challenges essentialist thinking in TS, **Maria Tymoczko** turns the critical screw in **'Ideology and the Position of the Translator – In what Sense is a Translator "In Between"'**. She does so by assessing the metaphor of 'translator between' which, in turn, comes from anti-essentialist quarters. With her carefully woven logic, this scholar is, therefore, advocating that all ideological messages are subject to deconstruction and that TS would benefit from a constantly skeptical attitude towards (its own) pre-established ideologies. Avoiding – indeed despising – essentialist arguments, Tymoczko firstly examines general mechanisms of causality, in order to provide a truly scholarly answer to the question in the title. She reviews phylogenetic, physical, ontogenetic and functional reasons for the acceptance of the 'in between' discourse, but accompanies each of them with a warning of caution. Then, she refutes them with the help of a very varied multidisciplinary theoretical framework that draws on literary criticism, linguistics, politics, philosophy, systems theory, mathematics, anthropology, ethnography and descriptive translation studies. Finally, she sheds light upon the potential implications of this supposedly 'progressive' metaphor which, however, grows out of Western capitalist paradigms and perpetuates romantic, platonic constructs.

Tymoczko's informed article is a fitting conclusion to our discussion in *Apropos of Ideology*. It sums up much of what has been defended throughout the book. Its clear, careful argumentation is based on a hybrid theoretical ground that has been a key element of the rest of the contributions. Multidisciplinarity encourages merging and fusion and abandons fruitless oppositions that impoverish research. Tymoczko's gaze runs freely over 'other' non-Western traditions, which are still greatly unknown in dominant TS circles and which will undoubtedly be the most productive theoretical sources in the future. She also investigates different points in the historical spectrum, boosting an increasingly influential historical academic paradigm. Above all, she practises a constantly self-critical attitude, which avoids blindfolded (albeit possibly trendy) militancy. As always, Tymoczko's logic deconstructs simplistic notions and methodologies in order to depict a complex reality that needs to be appraised.

By revisiting various sites of ideological engagement (related to politics, gender, sexuality, religion, secularity, technology) or by taking a long hard look at TS itself, the contributors have all added to a debate that is

neither exhaustive nor complete. It simply aims to provide a common forum in which we talk to each other. Surely the conversation will continue beyond the pages of this volume. Hopefully the volume will inspire many other conversations.

In concluding this introduction, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following:

- The contributors to this volume, for patiently and meticulously dedicating their time and effort to sharing with us their own ideologies; for participating in a forum which is by no means exhaustive but which is an attempt to talk to each other; for engaging themselves in a project that foregrounds the importance of our ideological roots and agendas.
- All TS researchers who have helped me with the editing of the book, for generously offering me their knowledge and experience; for their constant encouragement and support. Apart from contributors, special thanks are here due to Prof. I. Mason, Prof. Dirk Delabastita, Prof. Kirsten Malmkjær, Prof. Anthony Pym, Prof. Douglas Robinson; Prof. Juan Sager.
- All TS researchers who have directly influenced my own ideology on TS (and the world in general). Naming all of them here would obviously be impossible. I will always owe special gratitude to Prof. Arthur Terry, Prof. Ian Mason, Prof. Mona Baker and Prof. África Vidal.
- Ms Marie Gleason, Mr. Stephen Jennings and Ms Mirta Fernández for their help with the proofreading of the whole collection.
- The Salomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, New York, for permission to reprint Jenny Holzer's work in this volume as well as for providing prints to include Ms Holzer's work.
- The Guggenheim Bilbao Museoa / Museo Guggenheim de Bilbao for their very quick and helpful response to all my requests. A genuinely felt *eskarrikasko / gracias* to Ms Nerea Abajo.
- VEGAP for helping me find copyrights and prints of Ms Holzer's work. Maria Teixidor, *Graciès de veritat per la teva eficiència i simpatia.*
- Presses de la Renaissance in general and Mrs Frederique Polet in particular, for information concerning cover copyrights of the French translations of John Rechy's *Rushes*; Larry Kramer's *Faggots* and Andrew Holleran's *Dancer from the Dance*.

- Dr Daniel Sabbagh for his tireless and generous mediating role with Presses de la Renaissance and for succeeding in the almost impossible task of finding the actual French copies of *Rushes*; *Faggots* and *Dancer from the Dance. Merci, merci bien, Daniel.*
- St. Jerome Publishing for engaging themselves in an ideological project that is by no means complete or definite.
- My parents and brother, without whom this book would not have been possible; for their love, help and support at moments of stress when, from all ideological viewpoints, I was clearly unbearable.

It goes without saying that I alone am responsible for any shortcomings which remain.

Third Ways and New Centres
Ideological Unity or Difference?

CHRISTINA SCHÄFFNER

This chapter illustrates extratextual and intratextual aspects of ideology as related to translation with a case study, a policy document by Tony Blair and Gerhard Schröder, jointly published in English and German in June 1999. Textual features of the two language versions are compared and linked to the social contexts. Concepts and methods of critical discourse analysis and of descriptive and functionalist approaches to translation are applied for this purpose. In particular, reactions to the German text in Germany are explained with reference to the socio-political and ideological conditions of the text production, which was a case of parallel text production combined with translation. It is illustrated that decisions at the linguistic micro-level have had effects for a political party, reflected for example in the German Social Democratic Party debating its identity due to the textual treatment of ideological keywords. The subtle differences revealed in a comparative analysis of the two texts indicate the text producers' awareness of ideological phenomena in the respective cultures. Both texts thus serve as windows onto ideologies and political power relations in the contemporary world.

1. Introduction

The relationship between ideology and translation is multifarious. In a sense, it can be said that any translation is ideological since the choice of a source text and the use to which the subsequent target text is put is determined by the interests, aims, and objectives of social agents. But ideological aspects can also be determined within a text itself, both at the lexical level (reflected, for example, in the deliberate choice or avoidance of a particular word) and the grammatical level (for example, use of passive structures to avoid an expression of agency, cf. Hodge and Kress 1993). Ideological aspects can be more or less obvious in texts, depending on the topic of a text, its genre and communicative purpose. In political texts, ideological aspects are, of course, particularly prominent.

Research into political discourse has been conducted within several disciplines, with scholars pursuing different aims, focusing on different