Cultural Functions of Translation

Edited by
Christina Schäffner and
Helen Kelly-Holmes

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Philadelphia • Adelaide

Cultural Functions of Translation

Edited by
Christina Schäffner and
Helen Kelly-Holmes

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Philadelphia • Adelaide

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Cultural Functions of Translation/Edited by Christina Schäffner and Helen Kelly-Holmes
Also published as Vol. 1, No. 3 of *Current Issues in Language and Society*.
1. Translating and interpreting–Social aspects. 2. Language and culture. 3. Intercultural communication. I. Schäffner, Christina. II. Kelly-Holmes, Helen, 1968-
P306.2.C85 1995
418'.02–dc20 95-42194

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-333-8 (hbk)

Multilingual Matters Ltd

UK: Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon, Avon BS21 7SJ.
USA: 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007, USA.
Australia: P.O. Box 6025, 83 Gilles Street, Adelaide, SA 5000, Australia.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Short Run Press.

Multilingual Matters

About Translation
PETER NEWMARK
Annotated Texts for Translation: French – English
BEVERLY ADAB
Annotated Texts for Translation: English – French
BEVERLY ADAB
Linguistic Auditing
NIGEL REEVES and COLIN WRIGHT
Paragraphs on Translation
PETER NEWMARK
Practical Guide for Translators
GEOFFREY SAMUELSSON-BROWN
The Coming Industry of Teletranslation
MINAKO O'HAGAN
Translation, Power, Subversion
R. ALVAREZ and M.C.-A. VIDAL (eds)

Please contact us for the latest book information:
Multilingual Matters Ltd, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,
Victoria Road, Clevedon, Avon BS21 7SJ, England

CONTENTS

Christina Schäffner: Editorial 1

Lawrence Venuti: Translation and the Formation of Cultural Identities 9

Lawrence Venuti: Preliminary Remarks to the Debate 26

Debate 32

Candace Séguinot: Translation and Advertising: Going Global 55

Debate 72

EDITORIAL

Christina Schäffner

Institute for the Study of Language and Society, Aston University, Aston Triangle, Birmingham B4 7ET

Culture in Translation and Translation Studies

Throughout the centuries, translations have contributed to the processing and exchange of information both within and across cultural boundaries. Translating as an activity is almost as old as mankind, but the more systematic occupation with this phenomenon — dealing with translation as an academic and scholarly endeavour and deriving consequences for translation training — is relatively new. Although there are statements about methods of translating that date from the Middle Ages (for example, Martin Luther's comments on how he translated the Bible, cf. Störig, 1963), they were not based on a particular theory of translation. Attempts to develop a more theoretical account of translation began in the 1950s. The developments of these accounts are a reflection of both the dominant scientific paradigms of the time and the development of linguistics. But even today, translation studies has not become a homogeneous discipline.

Translation has traditionally been described as a comparative linguistic undertaking, whereby translation has been approached primarily from the perspective of the differences in language structures. But this has turned out to be too narrow a view. As Nida (1994: 1) says: 'It is true that in all translating and interpreting the source and target languages must be implicitly or explicitly compared, but all such interlingual communication extends far beyond the mechanics of linguistic similarities and contrasts.' One of the main reasons for this is that 'the meaning of verbal symbols on any and every level depends on the culture of the language community. Language is a part of culture, and in fact, it is the most complex set of habits that any culture exhibits. Language reflects the culture, provides access to the culture, and in many respects constitutes a model of the culture' (Nida, 1994: 1).

Recently, therefore, the need for treating translation from a wide range of perspectives has been recognised (e.g. Snell-Hornby, 1988). Translating and interpreting are essentially communicative processes that produce texts. The important features of sociological settings have been included, and it has been recognised that, apart from linguistics, insights from a number of scientific disciplines, for example psychology, cultural anthropology, and communication theory should be employed to explain the complex phenomenon of translation.

What happens in this complex process? A target text is produced that is based on a source text (Neubert, 1985: 18 speaks of translation as 'source-text-induced target-text-production'). This target-text-production may be initiated in the source or in the target culture. Both source text and target text fulfil a specific function, play a specific role in their respective language communities and cultures. The source text was produced in a source culture, it is a product of this

culture (which is itself heterogeneous), and it functioned in that culture. The target text has to function in a new culture. Apart from the two cultures usually being different, the functions of the texts may be different as well. The function of an instruction manual or a scientific article will usually be the same for the source and the target text, namely instructing and informing, respectively. However, a speech by a politician at an electioneering rally may have a persuasive function in the source culture, but only an informative function when translated for a target culture (that is to say, members of the target culture are not expected to cast their votes for this politician).

Translation and Cultural Identities

The function of a text may also be seen in a wider, social context, that is, how a text effects the structure and functioning of a society. For example, a source text can consolidate or challenge existing power structures in its source culture. Translations, too, may have far-reaching effects in the target culture. Such effects may result from the picture of the source culture that translations present for the target culture. Where does knowledge about cultures usually come from, including knowledge that other cultures may be different? Such knowledge can be acquired by living in the other culture, by watching undubbed films, or by reading texts produced in this culture — but all this obviously requires knowledge of the language of this culture. The other way of gaining knowledge of other cultures is through translations. These translations stand for the original: they replace it. Translation as a 'culture transcending process' (Vermeer, 1992: 40) is thus an important way of forming cultural identities and of positioning cultures.

These aspects are the topics of this issue of *Current Issues in Language and Society*. It is based on papers given by two scholars from the United States of America and Canada in the winter of 1994/95. Lawrence Venuti discusses the role of translation for the formation of cultural identities, and Candace Séguinot focuses on the effects of globalisation for translating advertising.

The effects which translated texts have in the target culture are determined by the choice to translate a text and publish it, and also by the way in which these texts are read, comprehended, reviewed, and made use of in social, cultural, and institutional settings. All of these factors play an important role in the formation of cultural identities, the topic of Lawrence Venuti's paper. His main aim is to show that translation wields enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures. Translation can create stereotypes for foreign countries that reflect domestic cultural and political values and they can be instrumental in shaping domestic attitudes towards foreign countries.

Venuti discusses conservative or transgressive effects of a translation. By examining several translation projects from different periods he shows 'how translation forms particular cultural identities and maintains them with a relative degree of coherence and homogeneity'. His examples fall into the broad category of literary texts — novels, philosophical and religious texts. Venuti argues that American publishers established an ethnocentric canon of Japanese fiction in

English that was based on a well-defined stereotype, a representation that reflected a domestic nostalgia for an exotic pre-war Japan.

The example for a philosophical text is Jones's existentialist-informed translation of Aristotle's 'Poetics' which displaced the dominant academic reading and acquired an institutional authority. The controversies surrounding the translation of the Bible in the early Christian Church, for example Jerome's project of translating the Old Testament, show that translations may bring about social change by revising ideological qualifications and thereby modifying institutional roles or functions.

Venuti also considers how translation creates possibilities for cultural resistance, innovation, and change. He argues in his preliminary comments that 'any agenda of cultural resistance for translation must take specifically cultural forms, must choose foreign texts and translation methods that deviate from the canonical or dominant ones.' Translation should, where appropriate, reveal and accentuate difference.

The identity-forming power of translation is also evident in non-literary texts. Candace Séguinot discusses the specific case of advertising, which is an all-invasive aspect of our daily lives. Advertisements may promote a product (usually with a view to immediate purchase) or a service, and usually the visual element — which can be in an iconic, symbolic or indexical relationship with the product — is of key importance. Ads invest the products with a very special significance for the consumer. When the products are foreign, the advertising and marketing campaign must establish this significance of the product. Sometimes products are closely identified with their culture of origin, they may indeed reinforce stereotypical images of this culture. But they can also lead to a revision of that stereotype and an establishment of a culture-independent, or supra-national identity associated with a product.

Translators are expected to take responsibility for the final form of an ad, and Séguinot argues that 'the marketing of goods and services across cultural boundaries involves an understanding of culture and semiotics that goes well beyond both language and design.' Her examples illustrate how cultural differences affect marketing. In translating ads, an almost literal translation is inadequate in creating an appeal to a different target audience. Conceptual transfer from source culture to different target cultures can also be full of pitfalls, because of differences in national perceptions and preferences.

In discussing advertising, another important factor is introduced, namely that through translations, new international or supranational cultures may emerge. This is termed 'globalisation', and various aspects would come under this heading. Globalisation of the translation business sometimes means also providing full marketing services in addition to translation and interpretation. It may also involve devising different local campaigns or developing one common, international or supranational marketing and advertising campaign. And in a world of global communication, some groups, for example adolescents and business travellers the world over, form a common market across cultures.

Translation Strategies

Both papers make it absolutely clear that translation is not a matter of words only, but that it is a matter of making intelligible a whole culture. One of the key concepts in both papers is the idea of translation strategies.

Since translation studies is not a homogeneous discipline, as said above, it is only logical that some terms are used differently, or even controversially. One of the most controversial terms is the term *equivalence*. Other key concepts that are differently used are *strategy* and *function*, and this divergence also becomes obvious in the debates.

Venuti differentiates between foreignising and domesticating as his two main strategies. These two strategies can be found especially in the translation of literary texts. Domesticating means bringing the foreign culture closer to the reader in the target culture, making the text recognisable and familiar. Foreignising, on the other hand, means taking the reader over to the foreign culture, making him or her see the (cultural and linguistic) differences. Venuti (1994) argues that in domesticating foreign texts, translators were in fact maintaining the literary standards of the social elite while constructing cultural identities for their nations on the basis of (archaic) foreign cultures. A foreignising strategy seeks to evoke a sense of the foreign. This strategy necessarily answers to a domestic situation, where it may be designed to serve a cultural and political agenda. Macura (1990), for example, has shown that 19th century Czech culture virtually 'cloned' itself on the German model, and that translation thus actually 'constituted' a culture.

Of course, the culture to which the translator belongs is also important. Venuti's discussion usually assumes the translator to be a member of the target culture: only in these circumstances is the distinction between foreignising and domesticating translation strategies clearly understandable. That is, the translator is a member of the domestic society for which the source culture is foreign, is the 'other'.

In his preliminary remarks, Venuti complains that 'the fact of translation is erased by suppressing the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, assimilating it to dominant values in the target-language culture, making it recognisable and therefore seemingly untranslated. With this domestication the translated text passes for the original'. However, these critical remarks would have to be relativised. The role of the text type, the genre, as well as the purpose of the target text are factors that decisively influence the final linguistic form and the lay-out of the target text. A distinction can be made between more or less conventionalised text types that exist in both cultures, and text types which are introduced into the target culture only through translation, for example Bible translations that gave many languages their first written form. In the case of translating text types that are highly conventionalised, the conventions of the target culture have to be taken into account, because in these cases the target addressees expect to read a text in a recognisable, familiar form. A case in point would be instruction manuals, for which domestication would be the only effective strategy (unless the purpose, the skopos of the target text, is to show what the source text looks like). Technical or legal texts too, often respond in a

relatively predictable way to a series of conventional norms. On the other hand, literary texts, as a rule, do not conform strictly to predictable norms and conventions — and it is mainly with reference to literary texts that foreignisation versus domestication has traditionally been discussed (cf. Schleiermacher, 1838; and also Weck, 1876 who said: 'So steht denn der Übersetzer mitten inne zwischen zwei Forderungen, die zu versöhnen fast unmöglich erscheint. Auf der einen Seite ruft ihm der Dichter zu: habe Ehrfurcht vor meinem Eigentum; nimm mir nichts, aber schiebe mir auch nichts unter! Auf der anderen Seite verlangt das Publikum: habe Achtung vor meinem Geschmack; bringe mir nichts, als was mir gefällt und wie es mir gefällt!' [The translator is in the middle of two demands that seem almost impossible to reconcile. (On one side, the author calls out to him: respect my property, don't take anything away from me, and don't attribute anything falsely to me. On the other side, the audience demands: respect our taste, give us only what we like and how we like it].)

Séguinot's concept of strategies is a wider one, as can be seen in her discussion of the factors translators have to take into account, factors such as understanding constraints by the form and functions of the source text, interpreting the visual means, understanding the underlying object or concept, and how to react when there is no access to the product.

The term translation strategy is also often used synonymously with translation principle, translation method or translation technique. Categories here may be literal versus free translation, or principle of transparent translation versus principle of equal effect of source text and target text. The treatment of specific translation problems, for example how to deal with wordplays or ambiguity, how to translate proper names, how to translate metaphors, or how to overcome lexical gaps, are also sometimes discussed under the heading of translation strategies, although the term translation technique might be more appropriate.

The question of how one should translate has been asked again and again, and it has been answered differently in the literature. (Savory (1968: 54) has summarised the seemingly contradictory alternative demands made of translation and stated them in the form of simple juxtapositions:

(1) A translation must give the words of the original.
(2) A translation must give the ideas of the original.
(3) A translation should read like an original work.
(4) A translation should read like a translation.
(5) A translation should reflect the style of the original.
(6) A translation should possess the style of the translation.
(7) A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
(8) A translation should read as a contemporary of the translation.
(9) A translation may add to or omit from the original.
(10) A translation may never add to or omit from the original.
(11) A translation of verse should be in prose.
(12) A translation of verse should be in verse.

A strategy may best be seen as the idea of an agent about the best way to act in order to reach a goal. This overall goal will dominate a number of lower level,

more detailed, decisions and actions. As soon as we ask what the purpose of a translation is, and who it is for, reformulation, paraphrase, textual explication, and so on, come in naturally as part of translation (cf. Schäffner & Herting, 1994).

The Role of Translators and Translation Ethics

In her discussion of the translation of advertising, Séguinot raises a number of points that relate to questions such as: What do translators have to know? Which activities are truly translational activities, and which ones are outside the realm of a translator's work? Where can we draw a line? This becomes especially obvious in the field of translating advertising, which seems to be a borderline case between translation and marketing.

Both Venuti and Séguinot stress the fact that translators should have knowledge of the foreign language and the culture. Only then can they successfully realise their role as interlingual and intercultural mediators. Séguinot points out that in a changing world, the boundaries of knowledge needed by the profession are also changing. She presents a number of points a translator should know which have not traditionally been seen as specific tasks of a translator. These points are that translators need to understand the basics of marketing and legal jurisdictions; they should know that many cultures have taboos concerning references to sex and alcohol, and they should be aware of standardisations or regulations.

When all such aspects are included in translation, a theoretical consequence would be that for explaining this phenomenon it would not be necessary to make a distinction between translation and adaptation. Being aware of what is expected of translators will also have consequences for translator training — a topic which was discussed at length at one of the two CILS seminars. Translators cannot obviously be prepared for each individual translation problem they may have to face. But what can be taught are generalisable translation strategies and translation techniques. Strategies have to do with problem-solving and decision-making. Decision-making in translation is largely subject to normative constraints resulting from text-type conventions or norms within the target culture. Such norms can be taught and learned and put to use. In addition, translators have to be aware of the fact that cultures not only express ideas differently, but they also shape concepts and texts differently.

The translator, as the expert communicator, is 'at the crucial centre of a long chain of communication from original initiator to ultimate receiver of a message: a human link across a cultural frontier' (Chesterman, 1993: 74). This metaphor also stresses the ethical responsibility of the translator, an aspect that is of particular relevance for both papers.

Traditore traduttore — the translator as the traitor — is one of the most often used clichés in translation. But translators have an important role to play, for example as 'rewriters' of works of literature. The German writer Günter Grass gives a convincing example of how translators are not traitors to the original authors but a vital link, in that they play an important role in taking texts to a wider audience. He reports about week-long meetings with translators who were to translate his novels 'The Flounder' and 'Meeting at Telgte':

> I have never been so thoroughly, painstakingly, precisely and rigorously wrung out as I was by my translators. They ... met ... with the author to go over 'The Flounder' line by line. What I should have known now became abundantly clear to me: translators are the keenest of readers. They discover all the author's tricks, notice when he cheats and are aware of his absurdities. (Grass, 1984: 19)

In the context of conservative versus transgressive effects of translations and of ethics in translation, Venuti introduces the concepts of ethnocentric and non-ethnocentric translation. He is very much in favour of the latter since it promises 'a greater openness to cultural differences, whether they are located abroad or at home [and] they may [thus] well be worth the risks.'

Séguinot speaks out against restricting the responsibilities of the translator and advocates taking on a managerial role when she says at the end of her paper: 'Going global successfully means taking control of the final product, researching the cultural and marketing aspects, and making sure the translation conforms to the legal constraints.'

An ethics of translation means first of all that translators, that is, *all* translators, not only translators of literary texts or advertising, take responsibility for their actions, and that they have to be trained and equipped to be able to do so. Only then will the role and the status of the translator and of translation studies as an academic discipline be fully recognised in society.

Jakob Grimm compared translation to crossing a river, which works nicely in German because of the polysemy (über*setzen* = translate, *über*setzen = cross the river):

> Über*setzen* ist *über*setzen, traducere navem. Wer nun, zur seefahrt aufgelegt, ein schif bemannen und mit vollem segel an das gestade jenseits führen kann, musz dennoch landen, wo andrer boden ist und andre luft streicht. (Störig, 1963: 111)

This metaphor, in its relevance for translation (i.e. the ship is the text, the navigator is the translator, the passage across the sea or river is the translation process, and the land beyond the two shores are the source and target cultures), can be expanded in the following way:

(1) *Before the departure*
(a) Who sends the ship off on its voyage? Why? Who chooses the cargo and the crew? Who decides about the destination of the journey?
(b) The translator as the responsible navigator must be able to take the ship safely to the other shore
(c) The ship must be solidly built in order to safely take the cargo and/or the passengers to the other shore. This parts of the metaphor relates to conventions of use and to text typologies, to macro- and micro-levels of the text.

(2) *Between the shores, while at sea*
(a) Careful navigation is required. The conditions of the water and the weather have to be taken into account. This relates firstly, to the social embeddedness

of translating, and secondly, to decision-taking concerning the structure of the target text and thus the translation strategies and techniques required.

(b) The value of the cargo has to be judged for the target culture. This relates to the propositional content and the information arrangement in the text as well as to text comprehension.

(3) *Where another wind is blowing.*

(a) How is the text received in the target culture? What effects does it have? Are ship, crew and cargo welcome and accepted in the new culture?

All these questions are relevant for translation, and the answers we find to each of them decide about the translation strategies and techniques to be employed in each individual case.

The huge number of texts that are translated annually throughout the world is evidence that translation is a vital element in fostering intercultural communication.

Future Seminars

The next issue of the journal deals with the topic of 'Multilingualism and monolingualism in Quebec and Catalonia' and the two contributors are John Edwards, St Francis Xavier University, Nova Scotia and Charlotte Hoffmann, University of Salford.

Anyone interested in attending future seminars should contact the Editor, CILS, Department of Languages and European Studies, Aston University, Birmingham B4 7ET, UK (Tel: +44 121 359 3611 ext 4234; e-mail: s.m.wright @aston.ac.uk)

References

Chesterman, A. (1993) Theory in translation theory. *The New Courant* 1, 69–79.

Grass, G. (1984) A tribunal of translators. *Translation* 12, 19.

Macura, V. (1990) Culture as translation. In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds) *Translation, History and Culture* (pp. 64–70). Pinter: London and New York.

Neubert, A. (1985) *Text and Translation (Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge 8).* Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Nida, E. (1994) Sociolinguistics as a crucial factor in translating and interpreting (manuscript).

Savory, T.H. (1968) *The Art of Translation.* London: Cape.

Schäffner, C. and Herting, B. (1994) The revolution of the magic lantern: A cross-cultural comparison of translation strategies. In M. Snell-Hornby (1994) (ed.) *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (pp. 27–36). Philadelphia, New York: Benjamins.

Schleiermacher, F. (1838) Über verschiedene Methoden des Übersetzens. *Sämtliche Werke, Abt. 3: Zur Philosophie, Bd.* 2. Berlin.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach.* Philadelphia, New York: Benjamins.

Störig, H.J. (ed) (1963) *Das Problem des Übersetzens.* Darmstadt: Deutsche Buchgemeinschaft.

Venuti, L. (1994) Publishing strategies in translation (manuscript).

Vermeer, H. (1992) Is translation a linguistic or a cultural process? In M. Coulthard (ed.) *Studies in translation/Estudos in tradução, Ilha do Desterro* 28, 37–49.

Weck, G. (1876) *Prinzipien der Übersetzungskunst.* Rawitsch.

TRANSLATION AND THE FORMATION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES

Lawrence Venuti

Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences, Temple University, Anderson Hall (022–29), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122, USA

Abstract Translation wields enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures, while it simultaneously constructs domestic subjects. Translations can have conservative or transgressive effects. Often the translation is erased by suppressing the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, assimilating it to dominant values in the target-language culture, making it recognisable and therefore seemingly untranslated. Foreignising and domesticating are seen as the two main translation strategies. By examining several translation projects from different periods it is shown how translation forms particular cultural identities and maintains them with a relative degree of coherence and homogeneity. The examples fall into the broad category of literary texts. Particular consideration is given to the ethnocentric canon of Japanese fiction in English which reflects a domestic nostalgia for an exotic pre-war Japan; English translations of Aristotle's *Poetics* and their effects on classical scholarship; and the controversies surrounding Jerome's translation of the Old Testament in the early Christian Church. The paper concludes with a consideration of how translation creates possibilities for cultural resistance, innovation, and change.

Introduction

Translation proceeds according to a double bind that gives it the potential to produce far-reaching social effects. As a rule, the translator aims to communicate a foreign text, so that the work of translation is governed by a notion of equivalence that is developing and variable, an equivalence to an interpretation of a foreign form and meaning, usually worked out in the translating process and rarely articulated independently of it. Yet because this interpretation is determined by various domestic factors — most decisively, the translator's knowledge of the foreign language and culture, as well as their relation to domestic cultural values — a translation always communicates a foreign text that is partial and altered, supplemented with features peculiar to the translating language. In fact, the goal of communication can be achieved only when the foreign text is no longer inscrutably foreign, but made comprehensible in a distinctively domestic form.

Translation is thus an inevitable domestication, wherein the foreign text is inscribed with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies. This process of inscription operates at every stage in the production, circulation, and reception of the translation. It is initiated by the very choice of a foreign text to translate, always an exclusion of other foreign texts and literatures which answers to particular domestic interests. It continues most forcefully in the development of a translation strategy that rewrites the foreign

text in domestic dialects and discourses, always a choice of certain domestic values to the exclusion of others. And it is further complicated by the various forms in which the translation is published, reviewed, read, and taught, producing cultural and political effects that vary with different institutional contexts and social positions.

By far the most consequential of these effects, I want to argue, is the formation of cultural identities. Translation wields enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures. The selection of foreign texts and the development of translation strategies can establish peculiarly domestic canons for foreign literatures, canons that conform to domestic aesthetic values and therefore reveal exclusions and admissions, centres and peripheries that deviate from those current in the foreign language. Foreign literatures tend to be dehistoricised by the domestic selection of texts for translation, removed from the foreign literary traditions where they draw their significance; and foreign texts are often rewritten to conform to styles and themes that currently prevail in domestic literatures. These effects may well assume national proportions: translation can create stereotypes for foreign countries that reflect domestic cultural and political values and thereby exclude debates and conflicts that do not appear to serve domestic agendas. Translation is instrumental in shaping domestic attitudes towards foreign countries, attaching esteem or stigma to specific ethnicities, races, and nationalities, able to foster respect for cultural difference or hatred based on ethnocentrism, racism, or patriotism. In the long run, translation figures in geopolitical relations by establishing the cultural grounds of diplomacy, reinforcing alliances, antagonisms, and hegemonies between nations.

Yet since translations are usually designed for specific cultural constituencies, they set in motion a process of identity formation that is double-edged. As translation constructs a domestic representation for a foreign text and culture, it simultaneously constructs a domestic subject, a position of intelligibility that is also an ideological position, shaped by the codes and canons, interests and agendas of certain domestic social groups. Circulating in the church, the state, and the school, a translation can be powerful in maintaining or revising the hierarchy of values in the translating language. A calculated choice of foreign text and translation strategy can change or consolidate literary canons, conceptual paradigms, research methodologies, clinical techniques, and commercial practices in the domestic culture. Whether the effects of a translation prove to be conservative or transgressive depends fundamentally on the discursive strategies developed by the translator, but also on the various factors in their reception, including the page design and cover art of the printed book, the advertising copy, the opinions of reviewers, and the uses made of the translation in cultural and social institutions, how it is read and taught. Such factors mediate the impact of any translation by assisting in the positioning of domestic subjects, equipping them with specific reading practices, affiliating them with specific cultural values and constituencies, reinforcing or crossing institutional limits.

I want to develop these observations by examining several translation projects from different periods, past and present. Each project exhibits in an especially

clear way the process of identity formation at work in translation, as well as its diverse effects. The aim is to consider how translation forms particular cultural identities and maintains them with a relative degree of coherence and homogeneity, but also how it creates possibilities for cultural resistance, innovation, and change at any historical moment. For, notwithstanding the fact that translation is summoned to address the linguistic and cultural difference of a foreign text, it can just as effectively foster or suppress heterogeneity in the domestic culture.

The Representation of Foreign Cultures

In 1962 the classical scholar John Jones published a study that challenged the dominant interpretation of Greek tragedy, which, he argued, was not only articulated in academic literary criticism, but inscribed in scholarly editions and translations of Aristotle's *Poetics*. In Jones's view, 'the *Poetics* which we have appropriated to ourselves derives jointly from modern classical scholarship, and from Romanticism' (Jones, 1962: 12). Guided by a Romantic concept of individualism, in which human agency is seen as self-determining, modern scholars have given a psychological cast to Aristotle's concept of tragedy, shifting the emphasis from the action to the hero and the audience's emotional response. This individualistic interpretation, Jones felt, obscures the fact that 'the centre of gravity of Aristotle's terms is situational and not personal', that ancient Greek culture conceived of human subjectivity as socially determinate, 'realised in action and recognised — intelligibly differentiated — through its truth to type' and 'status' (Jones, 1962: 16, 55). Jones's study was favourably reviewed on publication, despite some complaints about his unfamiliar 'jargon' and 'a certain opacity of language', and over the next two decades it gained enormous authority in classical scholarship (Gellie, 1963: 354; Burnett, 1963: 177). By 1977 it had established a 'new orthodoxy' on the question of characterisation in Aristotle's *Poetics* and Greek tragedy, overcoming the long dominance of the hero-centred approach and receiving both assent and further development in the work of leading scholars (Taplin, 1977: 312; Goldhill, 1986: 170–1).

Jones's study proved so effective in causing a disciplinary revision partly because he wrote critiques on the standard translations of Aristotle's treatise. He shrewdly demonstrated that scholarly translators imposed the individualistic interpretation on the Greek text through various lexical choices. From Ingram Bywater's 1909 version he quoted the passage in which Aristotle discusses *hamartia*, the error of judgement made by characters in tragedies. Jones read the English translation symptomatically, locating 'discrepancies' or deviations from the Greek that reveal the work of the translator's ideology, Romantic individualism:

> There are three discrepancies to be noted between Bywater's translation and the Greek original. Where he has 'a good man' the Greek has 'good men'; where he has 'a bad man' the Greek has 'bad men'; and where he renders 'the change in the hero's fortunes' the Greek has 'the change of fortune'. The first and second of his alterations are not quite as trivial as they seem, for they contrive jointly to suggest that Aristotle has in mind a

> single dominant figure throughout, when in fact his discourse shifts from plural to singular. These two alterations help pave the way for the third, which is, in the whole range of its implications, momentous. [...] Aristotle's demand that the change of fortune shall be brought about by the *hamartia* of 'the intermediate kind of personage' does not entitle us to style that personage the Tragic Hero; for to call him the hero can only mean that we put him at the centre of our ideal play — as commentator after commentator has alleged that Aristotle does, thrusting the hero on his treatise. (Jones, 1962: 19–20)

Jones was careful to stress that the discrepancies in Bywater's translation are not errors, but calculated choices designed 'to make Aristotle's indisputable meaning plainer than it would otherwise have been' (Jones, 1962: 20). Nonetheless, to make the meaning plain was to make it anachronistic by assimilating the Greek text to a modern cultural concept, 'the now settled habit in which we see action issuing from a solitary focus of consciousness — secret, inward, interesting' (Jones, 1962: 33). The same Romantic inscription is evident in scholarly renderings of the Greek word *mellein*. Jones pointed out that this verb can have several meanings, including 'to be about to do', 'to be on the point of doing', and 'to intend doing'. Both Bywater and Gerald Else (1957) made choices that psychologise Aristotle's concept of tragic action by introducing intentionality and introspection: 'intending to kill', 'intending to betray', 'meditating some deadly injury' (Jones, 1962: 49).

The case of Jones shows that, despite strict canons of accuracy, even academic translations construct distinctly domestic representations of foreign texts and cultures. And these representations, assigned varying degrees of institutional authority, may reproduce or revise dominant conceptual paradigms in academic disciplines. Translations can precipitate a disciplinary revision because the representations they construct are never seamless or perfectly consistent, but often contradictory, assembled from heterogeneous cultural materials, domestic and foreign, past and present. Thus, Jones was able to detect what he called 'discrepancies' in Bywater's translation, discontinuities with the Greek text that signalled the intervention of a modern individualistic ideology.

Yet disciplines also change because competing representations emerge to challenge those in dominance. Although Jones undoubtedly illuminated neglected and distorted aspects of Aristotle's *Poetics* and Greek tragedy, he was himself translating and therefore constructing a domestic representation that was also anachronistic to some extent, even though more compelling than the current academic orthodoxy. As reviewers suggested, Jones's concept of determinate subjectivity reveals an 'existentialist manner of thinking' that enabled him both to question the individualism of classical scholarship and to develop an interdisciplinary method of reading, not psychological but 'sociological' and 'anthropological' (Bacon, 1963: 56; Burnett, 1963: 176–7; Lucas, 1963: 272). At points, Jones's critique of the orthodox reading clearly resembles the thinking of philosophers like Nietzsche who were important for the emergence of existentialism. Just as *On the Genealogy of the Morals* treats the concept of an autonomous subject as 'the misleading influence of language', wherein '"the doer" is merely