



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijscl.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

**Translation Studies:
Pre-Discipline, Discipline, Interdiscipline, and Post-Discipline***

Edwin Gentzler^{1a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received February 2014
Received in revised form May 2014
Accepted May 2014
Available online May 2014

KEYWORDS:

Translation studies
Pre-discipline
Discipline
Interdiscipline
Post-discipline

Abstract

In the West, Translation Studies as a discipline has a very short but lively history. Founded in the early 1970s in the Low Countries—Holland and Belgium—translation studies is a fairly new field. Yet, today some theorists suggest that the discipline is too limited to translated texts and excludes much translation data being generated from other fields of inquiry, including theater, art, architecture, ethnography, memory studies, media studies, philosophy, and psychology. This paper has four sections: ‘Pre-Discipline’, in which I discuss the period after World War II and up until the 1970s; ‘Discipline’, which discusses the founding period of translation studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s; ‘Interdiscipline’, which focuses on the expanding field in its many collaborations with outside groups in the 1990s and 2000s; and (4) Post-Discipline, a new phase that further expands the definitions of the field. I refer to some of my work from *Translation and Identity in the Americas* (2008) and discuss the concept “post-translation studies” as posited by Siri Nergaard and Stephano Arduini in their article “Translation: A New Paradigm” (2011) in the introduction to the new journal called *translation*.

© 2014 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Professor, Email: gentzler@complit.umass.edu
Tel: 413-545-2203

^a University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA

*An earlier unpublished version of this paper was presented at the International Conference on Interdisciplinary Translation Studies at Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran, on April 30, 2013.

1. Introduction

In the West, Translation Studies as a discipline has a very short but lively history. Founded in the early 1970s in the Low Countries—Holland and Belgium—Translation Studies is very new comparatively, as many academic disciplines date in the hundreds of years at European universities. The University of Bologna, often considered the oldest university in Europe, dates back to 1088, but their translation program is only some twenty years old, founded in the 1990s. Translation Studies as a discipline in and of itself began in Belgium at the University of Leuven in 1976, but the university itself, the oldest extant Catholic university in the world, dates back to 1425. Founding a new academic discipline in the West is not easy, fraught with territorial battles, but nevertheless can be quite invigorating.

That is not to say that the activity of translation or the training of translators is young at all. Translation goes back thousands of years. Mashad, on or near the Silk Road, must have deep roots in translational activity, connecting powerful kingdoms including Rome, Parthia, Kushan, and China, and later Persian, Arabic and Ottoman empires. Translation probably began as “discipline” within international trade, and the earliest translated documents include lists of products and prices. My guess is that in Iran, translations took place in Chinese, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Roman, Indian, and other languages, with Middle Iranian Sogdian being one of the leading languages along the route. In the seventh century, the Chinese Buddhist Monk, and famed traveler and translator Xuanzang, whose travels to India served as the basis for the great Chinese novel *Journey to the West*, noted that Sogdian boys were taught to read and write by the age of five, forming one of the earliest great literate cultures. My guess is that literacy during that time included learning other languages, too, especially the Indian and Chinese languages, making such early “schools”, probably more apprenticeships than classrooms, among the first in translation. For me, as a translation scholar, and comparatist, it is a great honor to be invited to speak in Mashad, one of the cradles of translation studies.

This talk has four sections: ‘Pre-Discipline’, which discusses the period after World War II and up until the 1960s; ‘Discipline’, which discusses the founding period of Translation Studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s; ‘Interdiscipline’, in which the field expanded by collaborating with outside groups in the 1990s and 2000s; and ‘Post-Discipline’, a new phase that further expands the definitions of the field as I speak.

2. Pre-Discipline

Translation history in the West dates back to the Roman period, when the Romans began translating from Greek culture in order to enrich and expand their historical and cultural knowledge and hone their oratorical skills, as before the printing press, most translations were carried out orally. In *After Babel* (1975), George Steiner lumped all of translation theory before Roman Jakobson into a pre-World War II category, primarily concerned with the faithful vs. free debate, and primarily found in prefaces to published literary translations. Most Western scholars date the history back to Cicero, who, for example, in *De optimo genere oratorum* [On the Best Kind of Orators] while discussing his translations of the Greek orators Demosthenes and Aeschines, talked in terms of not proceeding word for word, but instead preserving the character and energy of the language throughout (Cicero, 1949). The theologian and translator Saint Jerome, best known for his translation of the Bible into Latin, cites Cicero’s translations style and suggested that translating literally might actually be more confusing than translating sense-for-sense (Saint Jerome, 1976). This type of speculation about translation strategy is characteristic of the 2000 years of translation history in the West, and why it is called a *pre-discipline*. Practicing translators in general would make suggestions about how best to translate, usually referring to their own work and strategy, and invariably couched in discussions along the word-for-word translation or sense-for-sense axes. The pre-discipline did not study what translators actually do, but instead came up with norms or guidelines on what they *should* do. Today this period is known as prescriptive and pre-disciplinary translation.

In Europe, the pre-disciplinary phase derived primarily from philology, linguistics, and language studies. Philology studied the history of language and literature, with a strong emphasis on establishing the original texts and sound interpretations of those respective texts. Translation figured heavily in philological investigations, especially in terms of deciphering older and often dead languages, including Egyptian, Sumerian, Assyrian, and Hittite languages. But in terms of modern languages, translation took on a secondary status, as the study of original texts took precedence. Linguistics, too, tended to investigate and describe languages, and became heavily invested in structure and syntax of language, paying little attention to translation in the theory and less to practice, relegating translation to the applied branch. And in literary studies, translation was viewed as an anathema, secondary and derivative rather than original and inventive.

In the United States, the history is much the same. While philology never quite caught on in the country, linguistic programs closely followed their European brethren, and translation was relegated to the rather marginal branch called applied linguistics, more interested in problem solving and pragmatics than theoretical and cognitive research. Even with the beginnings of generative grammar in the States, translation figured poorly, with Chomsky saying that just because generative grammar implied deep structures and universal grammars, he saw no easy correlation between generative grammar and translation.

Today, much has changed, and I will say in the age of multilingual, movement, migration, and all the cultural and behavioral bridges to be negotiated via translation, applied linguistics is seeing a surge social and pragmatic investigations into translation. But in the United States, few linguistic departments have translation programs: Kent State comes to mind, as does the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

While translation was not taught inside the university, translation flourished on the outside, both literary and non-literary translation. In my article "Translation, Counter-culture and The Fifties in the USA" (1996), I talked about a pre-disciplinary boom

in literary translation. "The Fifties" refers to a small literary journal by that name published by Robert Bly in Minnesota. Many creative writers during this period, frustrated with English-only journals and isolationist policies of the country, turned to translation to import new ideas and forms. In 1956, Bly received a Fulbright grant to study in Norway and translate Norwegian poets; it was there he discovered the work of Pablo Neruda, Antonio Machado, Federico Garcia Lorca and other new and experimental poets in Latin America, Spain, France, and Germany, and immediately began translating them into English. When he returned to the USA, he started a new literary journal *The Fifties* to publish translations and new verse from USA writers. Soon many other poets were translating and submitting translations to the journal, and other small presses in the USA. By the time *The Fifties* turned into *The Sixties*, a veritable translation boom was underway. Langston Hughes had translated Lorca; W.S. Merwin was translating Spanish and Provençal poetry, Lawrence Ferlinghetti and Jack Kerouac were in Mexico translating and writing Mexican poems, Gary Snyder went to Japan to translate Japanese. Pasternak manuscripts were being smuggled out of Russia, translated and published in the West in the late 1950s, leading to his Nobel Prize in 1958. Jorge Luis Borges was first translated in the late 1950s. A whole series of post-World War Eastern European poets, including Zbigniew Herbert, Tadeusz Różewicz, and János Pilinszky, were translated during this period, often by East European immigrants in the United States after World War II. In 1965, Ted Hughes and Danny Weissbort founded *Modern Poetry in Translation*. International Poetry Festivals celebrated these writers and more. The professional organization ATA was founded in 1959. The PEN American Center founded its Translation Committee also in 1959. Thus, led by creative writers and small presses, outside of academia, the translation boom was on.

In the 1950s and early 1960s, translation was still not welcomed in the universities. But it grew rapidly outside the walls of academia, and it was not just literary translation. The American Translators Association, a non-academic professional organization, was founded in 1959. After World War II, the United States emerged as a world economic

and political power, trade increased, technology improved, travel and communication became easier, and U.S. media—especially television and film—became increasingly popular. Translation at the international level increased rapidly. In addition, the United States became one of the preferred countries for immigration, and peoples from all over the world came into the country. In late 1940, Congress passed legislation expanding immigration quotas, allowing for war brides, for displaced persons, and for war refugees. In the 1950s, America was flooded with immigrants, many Russians, Germans, and East Europeans who had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, all needing translation services for housing, jobs, health care, school, and social services. In 1965, restrictions against Asian immigrants were lifted, and a new wave of immigrants from the east began arriving from the East. Within the United States translation also grew rapidly, and jobs were filled largely by untrained bilingual immigrants.

According to the *United Nations International Migration Report* (2013), the United States continues to lead the world in terms of allowing the most number of immigrants to enter the country. More than 45.7 million immigrants live in the United States. Considering the economic opportunities in the United States, and given its history of welcoming migrants, it is perhaps not unsurprising. A large portion of these immigrants need translation services, from the immigration hearing itself, to accessing social services providing housing, job placement, education and training, and health care. Most of these services are provided outside the university and in languages not taught in the universities, and seldom studied by translation studies scholars.

My guess is that much translation in Iran also takes place outside the university, especially along the borders, in the refugee camps, and in the ports and inner cities; the website Ethnologue lists 78 languages spoken in Iran: 10 are institutional, 4 are developing, 26 are vigorous, 31 are in trouble, and 4 are dying. Significantly no European languages—no French, English, Dutch, Portuguese—are counted, although many Iranians have European languages as second and third

languages, and are translating all the time. Ethnologue also mentions no Indian, Central Asian, or East Asian languages, which is a bit hard to believe given Iran's history and location at a crossroads between continents.

In addition to its multilingual cultural make-up, Iran also is one of the world's kindest host nations to immigrants. Since the 1979 revolution, Iran is consistently in the top three of countries accepting refugees, now host to the third largest refugee population in the world. According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, at its peak, in 1991, Iran hosted over four million refugees. Today that number is ca. 882,000 refugees, some 80% from Afghanistan, but with 42,000 others, including Tajiks, Bosnians, Azeris, Eritreans, Somalis, Bangladeshis and Pakistanis. Iran's refugee policy is also comparatively very generous and includes free education, health services, literacy training and other essential services. My guess would be that translation services are part of the support, as without translation services, no health services.

Translation in many countries largely takes place outside of the university, and community service groups, volunteers in refugee camps, members of the immigrant community, often the children of immigrants, some very young, are the ones providing translation services and ensuring communication within borders. University trained translators are the exception, not the rule. Even today there are too few translation training programs in the universities to keep up with demand.

3. Discipline

The beginning of translation being studied and taught in the university in the United States came as an outgrowth of the Creative Writing Workshop, yet going was slow. At Iowa, for example, while the Writers Workshop, founded in 1936, became a model for teaching and studying creative writing at the university, translation was not part of the program until the late 1960s. Despite the fact that the leading poets and best small presses were publishing translations, academic interest was slow. Edmund Kelley writes, "In 1963 there was no established and continuing public forum for the purpose: no translation centers, no

associations of literary translation as far as I know, no publication devoted primarily to translation, translators, and their continuing problems” (Kelley, 1981, p. 11; quoted by Weissbort 1983, p. 7).

In the 1970s and 1980s things begin to change. In my book, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (1993), I covered the beginnings of the discipline of Translation Studies in the West. In it, I looked at the discipline as it emerged in a parallel fashion in several regions: In the United States, a more literary approach as an outgrowth of the Creative Writing Workshop; in Germany out of more linguistic and scientific disciplines; in Russia and Eastern Europe, translation studies emerged out of Russian Formalism; in Belgium and Holland out comparative literary and historical studies; in Israel out of cultural and systems theory; and in France out of literary stylistics, and later influenced by poststructural and semiotic paradigms. In 1970 in Slovakia, Anton Popovič published *The Nature of Translation*, the proceedings from a 1968 conference in Bratislava. In 1972 in Holland, James Holmes, an American, published his “Name and Nature of Translation Studies”, which many consider the founding document of the discipline, and certainly in many countries the name and methods have held strong. In 1973 in France, Henri Meschonnic published “Propositions pour une poétique de la traduction”, a systematic set of major principals governing translation. In 1976, an historic conference was held in Leuven, Belgium, in which several pioneers of the field, including José Lambert, André Lefevere, and Itamar Even-Zohar presented papers, including the Israeli Itamar Even-Zohar’s “The Position of Translated Literature in the Literary Polysystem” in a 1978 collection of papers from the conference. In 1977, in Germany, Wolfram Wilss published his *Übersetzungswissenschaft: Problema und Methode*. In 1978, back in Belgium, André Lefevere publishes his essay “Translation: The Focus of Growth of Literary Knowledge.” In 1980, in Israel, Gideon Toury published *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, and Susan Bassnett published the first edition of *Translation Studies* in the famous Methuen series.

All of this has happening at the same time, often as a result of the academic upheavals and new generation of questioning scholars educated during an earlier period. It was a very exciting time, as these scholars were inventing and establishing new programs of study. In *Translation in Systems* (1999), in a section called “The Invisible College,” Theo Hermans talked about the excitement of creating a new discipline, the late night meetings and conversations, early conferences and publications, personal networks, the creativity and insights of just a handful of scholars from a variety of countries discussing new ideas, and feelings of solidarity and joint purpose (Hermans, 1999, pp. 12-14). These pioneers in the field were the ones that developed a theoretical apparatus, organized conferences, recruited colleagues, and begin training students.

Surprisingly, I was one of the first scholars to attempt to bridge the gaps, to begin to see the similarities rather than the differences. While conducting research, I also lectured in many of the above places, but in the USA, when I talked about Descriptive Translation Studies in the Low Countries, the literary translators in the USA would resent my suggesting that this alternative approach to translation studies had any merit. Or if in Holland, I might talk insights derived from deconstruction and translation, and again derision would arise from the descriptive studies scholars, who believed in empirical studies and considered a translated text a fixed entity. Each regional pocket of scholars insisted that their way of studying translation was the right way, or the best way, and much in-fighting occurred, between linguistics and literary paradigms, between target approaches and transfer approaches, and most polemically, between structural and post-structural investigators. At the time, I lobbied for a multi-theoretical approach, thus the title of my book *Contemporary Translation Theories*, but it would invariable be criticized for not emphasizing any one particular theory enough. Today, the criticism continues, but it is quite different. Instead of not emphasizing one theory enough, I am criticized for not including *enough* theories. Where is the Finnish theory? The Slavic? Why not include Arabic or Chinese translation theories? Film and Media? Gender? Immigrants and

Refugees? Today I find these questions very valid, and the need for interdisciplinary investigations is only increasing.

4. Interdiscipline

The first move toward interdisciplinarity in translation occurred within the field during the early 1990s, what might be called intra-disciplinary translation studies, or interdisciplinary studies within varying disciplines of translation studies. After two decades of fighting between linguistic oriented branches and literary-oriented branches, translation studies began to coordinate and respect varied approaches. In 1988, Mary Snell-Hornby published *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* or later in an anthology edited with Franz Pöchhacker and Klaus Kaindl, *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (1994) combined literary, linguistic and cultural studies approaches, allowing for different types of approaches depending upon the nature of the text to be translated. For example, a literary text might allow more innovation and creativity in translation than a scientific text, in which there might be less variance and innovation. However, as José Lambert has pointed out, such calls for more interdisciplinarity have led to little institutional change, and with the exception of a few individual forays in Biblical Studies or Media Studies, have had little impact on the field (Lambert 2012, p. 81). My school at UMass hangs on to the comparative literature framework diligently; Leuven defends its descriptive approach dogmatically; Germany holds its functional approach dearly.

Instead, many translation studies turned to interdisciplinary investigations from *outside* the field. Media Studies in particular began conducting research and training in translations from the discipline of Media and Film studies, working both inside and outside Translation Studies. So too in many other fields; soon one began to see conferences, collections and monographs on topics such talking about crossing boundaries, integrated approaches, and interdisciplinary investigations. In 1996, Sherry Simon's *Gender in Translation* appeared, combining Québécois feminism with Translation Studies paradigms. A year later, *Translation and Gender* (1997)

by Luise von Flotow appeared; Douglas Robinson published *Translation and Empire* (1997); and Peter Fawcett published *Translation and Language* (1997), part of a series with St. Jerome called Translation Theories Explored. The key conjunction here is the word 'and' in the titles. This interdisciplinary period focus on parallel developments within different disciplines, and the fields developed in their own paradigms, only occasionally overlapping. Many works followed: *Translation and Minorities* (1998) edited by Larry Venuti; *Postcolonial Translation* (1999) edited by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi; *Deconstruction and Translation* (2001) written by Kathleen Davis; *Translation and Religion* edited by Lynne Long (2005). More titles followed on Translation and Ethics, Psychology, Philosophy, and several books on Translation and the Media. As the field grew in the 1990s and early 2000s in a very productive fashion, no single scholar or school had enough tools to investigate the entire range of fields in which translations occurred. Translation suddenly had many partners and collaborators, and it was a very fruitful period. By borrowing ideas and concepts from other disciplines, translation studies scholars were able to gain great insight into additional translational phenomena, and the field experienced another boom.

In another sense, this interdisciplinary period did not go far enough. For example, in 1998, the Canadian scholar Ginette Michaud edited an anthology of work on Translation and Psychology, published in a special issue of *TTR*. She pointed out that studies of psychoanalysis and translation tend to be grouped under certain rubrics, such as the translation of psychoanalytical texts, or translation within psychoanalytical discourse, and tended to avoid larger theoretical concerns. The problem of translation *within* psychoanalysis has invariable been one of the central problems, and the theoretical complexity of "translating" from an unconscious non-discourse into any language or symbolic system is fraught with difficulties. It was left to post-disciplinary translation studies to begin to address such fundamental questions that go to the root of any given discipline.

5. Post-Discipline

The shift from inter-discipline to post-discipline has less to do with “and” and more with “in”. In what kinds of discourses do translations inhere, and what kinds of methodologies are needed to study such embedded translations? While I profited mightily from interdisciplinary research into translation in my book on *Translation and Identity in the Americas* (2008), I also tried to not avoid the hard theoretical questions. I found that translation inheres in many forms that translation studies scholars ignored. I looked at both successful translations and failures in translation, largely due to larger social or psychological factors. Rather than focusing on translations as they occur *across* national borders, I instead looked at research on identity politics, and on language minorities and domestic translational policies *within* countries. I also looked at work in literary genres such as translation *in* theater or translation *in* fiction, but also on community translation and interpreting that often takes place out of sight—in the Latino barrios and slums, on Indian reservations, in the Chinatowns and Little Italies, in refugee camps, even in prisons, where a large groups of Hispanic men are incarcerated. What I discovered was that translation inheres in many aspects of communication, sometimes called translation, and sometimes not, hiding within other discourses in a dominant language. These are not texts generally studied by translation studies scholars, but my guess would be that translation in minority communities comprises 80-90 % or all translational phenomena.

Poststructuralist investigations played a significant role in my research. I turned to scholars such as Derrida, author of *Monolingualism of the Other* (1996/98) and Abdelkébir Khatibi, author of *Amour bilingue* (1990) who suggest that no culture is ever monolingual, and that translation inheres within every monolingual statement. It is a different kind of understanding of translation. Khatibi, for example, when discussing his colonial situation in northern Africa, discusses how this type of translation is hidden from view, “The ‘maternal’ language is always at work in the foreign language. Between them occurs the constant process of translation, and

abysmal dialogue, very difficult to bring to the light of day” (Khatibi, 1981, p.8, quoted by Mehrez, 1992, p. 134). Derrida discusses what he calls the “law of what is called translation” as follows: “—We only ever speak one language . . . (yes, but) —We never speak only one language . . .” (1998, p. 10), showing that there is never monolingualism without a hidden presence of multilingualism. The kind of translation Derrida is referring to is not the kind studied in disciplinary translation studies programs; rather it is a complex shifting multilingual fabric upon which all languages, all discourses, rely. Translation thus inheres within language. This translational fabric belongs neither to one language or another, nor is it ever directly communicable. Once it is named or cited in any given language, its complex multilingual hidden nature is hidden again. To think about the hidden discourse, one has to think in terms of absences not presences, negative space rather than material objects, or palimpsests rather than fixed texts. This marks the beginning of post-disciplinary translation studies (see Gentzler, 2008, pp. 27-31).

I realize that to talk about translation studies in a post-disciplinary fashion is difficult for many, especially when in some parts of the world translation studies as a discipline is in its infant stages. I also realize that the way I talk about it as a hidden condition underlying any given national language or culture is hard, especially when I refer to scholars such as Khatibi or Derrida to support my claim. Let me give a couple other examples that might help. In my book *Translation and Identity in the Americas*, in the last chapter, I talked about border writing. There I cited the example of Mexican performance artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña, who, in a work called *The New World Border* (1996) reverses the poles between original and translation, between monolingualism and multilingualism, portraying the monolingual English-only culture as the minority. Indeed much of the translation work is done by the audience members, in this case the bilingual Latinos who can decode the multilingual references through a process of auto-translation. The play itself is written and performed in multiple languages, including English, Spanish, French, various dialects of Spanish, Spanglish, Gringoñol, Franglé, Nahuatl and some

Neanderthal grunting. Translation is always happening on stage and in the audience; it is not something that comes *after* an original, but simultaneously; in fact, translation is one of the compositional elements. Gómez-Peña refers to an author is referred to as an “intercultural translator”, “a political trickster” or an “intellectual coyote” (1996, p. 12).

For Gómez-Peña, the distinction between original artist and translator disappears: all artists are translators who interconnect, reinterpret, and redefine all the time. And in terms of cultural landscapes, Gómez-Peña refuses to think in terms of national states and national languages with borders in between and instead imagines a space where the borders expand to cover the entire continent, creating a huge border zone no longer defined by race, language, or nation-state, where translation is not seen as a secondary, minor activity, but an always ongoing creative process (see Gentzler, 2008, pp. 157-65). My guess is that the borders in the Middle East, largely drawn by France and England after World War I, are fairly arbitrary, leaving large groups of people displaced and in unfamiliar territories, geographically, linguistically, and culturally.

Perhaps the leading theorist steering me in a post-translational studies direction has been Canadian translation theorist and cultural studies scholar Sherry Simon. In her book *Translating Montreal: Episodes in the Life of a Divided City* (2006) questions the limits of traditional translation definitions and goes beyond them, focusing also on the cultural conditions conducive to translation, such as, in this book, the multicultural life of the city of Montreal and the hybrid forms of communication that take place there, not just in translation, but also *before* and *after* translation. Indicative of post-disciplinary translation studies, she offers a new definition: “I give translation an expanded definition in this book: writing that is inspired by the encounter with other tongues, including the effects of creative interference (2006, p. 17). Simon looks at translational and multilingual markers all over the city: in the creative writing, the theater, the art and architecture, but also the monuments, museums, churches, schools, stores, courts, even the signage in the streets, all of which offer a palimpsest of

semiotic and translational markers that she feels are very positive and productive for artistic creation. Simon has gone on to write a new book *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Translation and Memory* (2011) in which she expands upon that notion, viewing translation in many places as the cultural foundation upon which *all* cultural constructions are founded. Some of cities she discusses include Montreal, Trieste, Calcutta, Barcelona, Dakar, and Manila, and again she looks at the translational nature of the post-translation forms in a variety of fields, including creative writing, art, and architecture. Plurilingualism is seen as a positive force: accents, code-switching, translations are enriching, facilitating. Translators are viewed as cultural heroes, ensuring the circulation of ideas and as agents initiating new forms of expression and ideas. Translators transform social and literary relations: major literary figures emerge, such as Nicole Brossard inventing a polyvalent feminist language in Montreal; Franz Kafka inventing German prose strange to itself in Prague; Paul Celan inventing a haunting multilingual poetic language in Czernowitz. Her list is persuasive: without translational culture as a foundation, no Tagore without multilingual Calcutta, no Joyce without Trieste, no Jalāl ad-Dīn Rumi without Konya, no Ferdowsi without Mashhad.

The name post-translation studies was coined by Siri Nergaard and Stefano Arduini in their article “Translation: A New Paradigm” (2011), the introduction to the launching of a new journal called *translation*. They write, “We propose the inauguration of a transdisciplinary research field with translation as an interpretive as well as operative tool. We imagine a sort of new era that could be terms post-translation studies, where translation is viewed as fundamentally transdisciplinary, mobile, and open ended” (2011, p. 8). They go on to open the field to thinking on translation from *outside* the discipline—from art, architecture, ethnography, memory studies, semiotics, psychology, philosophy, economics, and gender studies. As Gayatri Spivak in *Death of a Discipline* (2003) discussed the opening up the field of comparative literature, which she viewed as Eurocentric and based on national languages, to a broader array of disciplinary investigations, which necessarily

included gender, minority, and third world discourses and their translation. Research on translational phenomena need not be inscribed within a single discipline, difference need not be reinscribed in the dominant discourse, but allowed to flourish, to inform, and to instruct. In as much Nergaard and Arduini suggest that investigators be open to poststructuralist theory, gender studies, and border studies, demonstrating more interest in the happenings along the edges, the interstices, and the transversal and transgressive movements than what is going on in the mainstream. Their journal is beginning to reflect that interest. Special issues of the journal are planned on memory, edited by Bella Brodzki and Cristina Demaria; on space, edited by Sherry Simon; on conflict, edited by Emily Apter and Mona Baker; and on economics, edited by Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon. Often the discourse of the outside field can help scholars better identify and analyze the translational phenomena within those discourses than those developed from within the discipline of translation studies.

To give one last example of such post-disciplinary investigation, I would like to report on a course that I co-taught this year with a young Indian scholar by the name of Chandrani Chatterjee, a Fulbright Visiting Scholar from the University of Pune, India, and author of the book *Translation Reconsidered: Culture, Genre, and the "Colonial Encounter" in Nineteenth-Century Bengal* (2011). We titled our course "Beyond Translation: Rethinking Post-colonial Studies", but the course challenged many traditional concepts in the entire field. By "beyond translation," we felt that literary and linguistic investigations were not enough to explain the role of translation in the colonial and post colonial encounters between East and West. Instead, we opened the course to possible semiotic, ethnographic, psychological, genre and gender studies, film studies, and any number of social and political studies. The focus of the course was on nineteenth-century translations and Western-influenced discourses in Calcutta and selected other cases in central Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East. Areas covered include literary and cultural translation, but also print and translation, genre and translation, gender and translation,

and caste and translation, all of which widened the field of study.

Again, Gayatri's Spivak's work in rethinking comparative literature in light of translation, area studies, and subaltern studies proved valuable. Our attempt was not to apply a broad Western postcolonial discourse to the subject matter, wherein Western discourse is imposed on Eastern who are portrayed as unwitting recipients, or in Spivak's words, a woman from Palestine ends up sounding like a man from Taiwan (1993, p. 182). Rather, we wanted to look at specific situations, focusing on the two way flow of ideas and discourses and the often complex hybrid intersections, engaging in the specificity of writing within the colonial and subaltern situations. The course had a half dozen units, and some of the more productive units included (1) Cities, including looking at the multilingual landscapes of Montreal, New York, and Calcutta; (2) Genre, with units on the epic, the novel, and theater; (3) Print, looking at the emergence of print culture in Europe and India and its impact on translation; (4) Gender, looking at gender portrayals in India, Canada, and North Africa; and (5) Caste, focusing primarily on India, but comparing subaltern studies in Europe and India. What we found was that translation, rather than being a footnote to cultural development, play a huge role in cities, communities within cities, small neighborhoods, and even upon individuals, inscribed within the people's psyche, as it were. Restricting translational analysis to literary and linguistic concerns proved too limiting, actually hindering the larger considerations of social change.

In the Genre section, Chandrani Chatterjee's work proved invaluable. When considering the Bengali novel, traditional postcolonial studies have argued that the Bengali novel was modeled on, copied, or borrowed from the English. Yet Chatterjee's research, particularly on popular novels, and the novel was massively popular in Kolkata, shows that the Bengali novel is very different from the English form. Studying the translation of words, sentences, chapters, or even full texts proved inadequate, for Chatterjee argues that it was the genre of the novel itself that was translated, incorporated, and made into its own in India. By looking at the entire genre in

Bengali culture, how it was adapted, functioned, and consumed, by studying similarities with the English form and differences, and by focusing on what was imitated and what was created new, added, and invented, we discovered new processes of translation, and new modes of reception. For example, the satirical and social critical possibilities of the novel form were picked up and expanded in Bengal culture to criticize Anglicized Indians, Western education systems, stagnant relations between married couples, and middle and lower class struggles for existence, at times tragic. This new form—realistic and critical—helped pave the way for major social change to follow. Chatterjee writes:

We can attempt to understand the genre of the novel in Bengal as an “answering word” in Bakhtinian terms. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, “Every word is directed towards and answer and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates” (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 280) . . . For the novel as a form to flourish in India, it needed to be rendered in indigenous terms so that it could translate and adapt the British model to Indian needs . . . Such appropriation of the form of the novel can best be understood as cultural translation. (Chatterjee, 2010, p. 137)

In the course, one of the livelier exchanges came between Professor Chatterjee and a student working on Persian translation, who drew many parallels. In Iran, the rise of the novel in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, a time of considerable political upheaval, was linked to distinct historical traditions of narrative work in Persia, including narrative poetry by writers such as Firdawsi and Nezami, but it also followed a wave of translations from Europe, France in particular, and political interests by nations such as Britain and Russia. As in India, where the Indian novel emerged from a wave of European translations, particularly British, and soon turned into Indian rewritings, so too in Persia did the form become quickly adapted and made into its own Persian form, to the point that translation, importation, and adaptation are less useful concepts, and rewritings, furtherings, and creative

transposition are more useful. In Iran, the novel was very useful in introducing satire and social criticism, and it may have played a role in contributing to the decline of the Qajar rulers. To take just one example, one of the earliest Persian novels, *Hajji Baba of Ispahan*, for many years thought to be written originally in Persian, was actually a translation of an English novel written by the British diplomat and writer James Morier. Today the novel appears quite prejudiced against aspects of Persian life, but at the time, my student suggested, the translation was funnier and more ironic than the original, while at the same time more poetic and intricate in a manner typical of Persian poetry, serving as a bridge between Persian poetry and a new genre of the prose novel form. Indeed, during this period, a new genre emerged as well as a new dialect of colloquial Persian in writing. The form and the language allow for new topics to be addressed, including works dealing with the lives of ordinary people, which emerge for the first time. To study the novel in Persia, one has to go *beyond* translation studies and include genre studies, dialect studies, international movements, reception studies, and economic relations. Chatterjee’s thinking about translation in a larger framework and reflections upon translation’s role in broader social constructions is illustrative of movements not just in India, but also may initiate a focus on marginalized groups and topics seldom considered by more traditional translation studies approaches. And translation, rather than being a minor genre in both India and Iran, might be viewed as one of the primary factors leading to revolutions to follow.

6. Concluding Remarks

Translation thus finds itself in an inside/outside relation with its own discipline. On the one hand, it was very exciting to create new disciplines when nothing existed before. There is no denying advances made in linguistics and literary studies by university programs have been substantial, and in those parts of the world where the field of translation studies is just emerging, I am in full support. But the very fact that the disciplines exist within university frameworks with their emphasis on major languages, data-driven research, and scientific methodologies, also

serve to limit their effectiveness and the breadth of range of topics being investigated. In this age of movement and migration, of globalization and transnational investigations, of Internet access and instant communication, translation is growing in leaps and bounds, and smaller groups in lesser-known languages and open-source and crowd-sourcing practices grow whether the university discipline is involved or not. I tend to like this inside-outside relationship, and find it healthy for the profession. My teaching has learned from practice, and I feel my teaching informs my practice. Translation inheres in every discourse; there are many borders impeding communication that have little to do with national languages or disciplinary boundaries. Every language has its multilingual roots and its translational aspects. Every discipline depends upon and thrives within translation matters. My question today is why not embrace the new definitions, accept the wider field, be open to new approaches from new places, whether they be in your own specific discipline or not. Translation today knows no institutional boundaries, and it is time for scholars to catch up to the practice.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1994). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogical imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (pp. 259-422). Trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bassnett, S., & Harish T. (Eds.). (1999). *Post-colonial translation: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chatterjee, C. (2010). *Translation reconsidered: Culture, genre and the "colonial encounter" in nineteenth century Bengal*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cicero, M. T. (1949). *De inventione: De optimo genere oratorum; Topica*. Trans H. Mortimer Hubbell. London: Heinemann.
- Davis, K. (2001). *Deconstruction and translation. Translation theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Derrida, J. (1996/98). *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre: Ou la prothèse d'origine*. Paris: Galilée. Trans. P. Mensah (1998). *Monolingualism of the other; or The prosthesis of origin*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ethnologue: Languages of the World: Iran. Web: <https://www.ethnologue.com/country/IR>, accessed April 28, 2014.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The position of translated literature in the literary polysystem. In J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, & R. van den Broeck (Eds.), *Literature and translation: New perspectives in literary studies with a basic bibliography of books on translation studies* (pp. 117-27). Leuven: Acco.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and language. Translation theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Flotow, L. (1997). *Translation and gender: Translating in the "era of feminism"*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Gentzler, E. (2008). *Translation and identity in the Americas: New directions in translation theory*. London: Routledge.
- Gómez-Peña, G. (1996). *The new world border*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in systems: Descriptive and systems-oriented approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Holmes, J. S., de Haan, F., Popovič, A. (Eds.). (1970). *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Holmes, J. S. (1970). Name and nature of translation studies. Amsterdam: Translation Studies Section, Department of General Studies. Also in Holmes, J. S. (1988). *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Keeley, E. (1981). The state of translation. *Modern Poetry in Translation*, 41(2), 7-18.
- Khatibi, A. (1983). *Amour bilingue*. Montpellier: Fata Morgana. Trans. R. Howard (1990), *Love in two languages*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lambert, J. (2012). Interdisciplinarity in translation studies. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 3., pp. 81-88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lefevere, A. (1978). Translation: The focus of growth of literary knowledge. In J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, & R. van den Broeck (Eds.), *Literature and translation* (pp. 7-28). Leuven: Acco.

- Long, L. (Ed.). (2005). *Translation and religion: Holy untranslatable*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mehrez, S. (1992). Translation and the postcolonial experience: The francophone North African text. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology* (pp. 120-38). London: Routledge.
- Meschonnic, H. (1973). *Propositions pour une poétique de la traduction, pour la poétique II*. Paris: Gallimard. Trans. A. Pym (2003). Propositions for a Poetics of translation. In Henri Meschonnic: Texts on translation. *Target*, 15(2), 337-53.
- Michaud, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Psychanalyse et traduction: Voies de traverse/psychoanalysis and translation: Passages between and beyond*. *TTR*, 11(2), 107-130.
- Nergaard, S., & Arduini, S. (2011). Translation: A new paradigm. *Translation: An interdisciplinary Journal, inaugural issue*, 8-17.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and empire. Translation theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Saint J. (1976). *Letter 57: To pammachius: On the best method of translating*. Trans. L. G. K. Ottawa, École de traducteurs et d'interprètes. See also *The Catholic encyclopedia: Fathers of the church: Letters of St. Jerome*. Web <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3001057.htm>, accessed April 20, 2013.
- Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. London: Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Snell-Hornby, M., Pöchhacker, F., & Kaindl, K. (1994). *Translation studies: An interdisciplinary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simon, S. (2006). *Translating montreal: Episodes in the life of a divided city*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Simon, S. (2012). *Cities in translation: Intersections of languages and memory*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. (2003). *Death of a discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spivak, G. (1993). *The politics of translation. Outside in the teaching machine*. London: Routledge.
- Steiner, G. (1975). *After babel: Aspects of language and translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- United Nations International Migration Report* (2013). Department of economic and social affairs, population division. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations High Commission on Refugees Country Operations Profile: Islamic Republic of Iran* (2014). Web: <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/page?page=49e486f96>, accessed 25 April 2014.
- Venuti, L. (Ed.). (1998). Translation and minority. *Special issue of The Translator*, 4(2), 135-144.
- Weissbort, D. (2006). Classical Latin and early Christian Latin translation. In D. Weissbort & A. Eysteinson (Eds.), *Translation: theory and practice a historical reader* (p. 22). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weissbort, D. (1983). *Foreword to modern poetry in translation*. New York: MPT/Persea.
- Wilss, W. (1977). *Übersetzungswissenschaft: Problema und methode*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.