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Chapter 1

Introduction

GUNILLA ANDERMAN and MARGARET ROGERS

On the afternoon of Friday 1 October 1999, the day immediately following St Jerome’s day, scholars of Translation Studies from around the world assembled at the University of Surrey to participate in a symposium to pay tribute to Professor Peter Newmark and his work. Following the presentation of Peter Newmark’s keynote paper entitled ‘No global communication without translation’, the proceedings continued with an at times very lively Round Table discussion, as Peter Newmark jostled with translation theorists and scholars, answering their questions related to the paper, and in turn challenging their responses. The event concluded with a dinner and the presentation of a Liber Amicorum – Word, Text, Translation including contributions from scholars and friends engaged in the field of Translation Studies.

The present volume, Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives, owes its origins to this event. It consists of the keynote paper, a record of the Round Table discussion, and contributions to the discussion on the eight topics chosen by Peter Newmark for consideration as translation issues in the new millennium and of particular interest to him. The topics selected and discussed in this volume are: ‘The nature of translation’; ‘Types and kinds of translation’; ‘Valid and deficient texts’; ‘English as the lingua franca of translation’; ‘Social translation and interpreting’; ‘Later modes of translation’; ‘The assessment of translation’; and ‘The university and the market’.

The book is divided into two main parts. The first part contains the kick-off summary by Peter Newmark of his keynote paper, as well as a record of the ensuing Round-table discussion. Participating in the discussion were the following contributors to the Liber Amicorum as well as two colleagues from Multilingual Matters, Mike Grover and Tommi Grover:

Gunilla Anderman, University of Surrey, UK (Chair)
Reiner Arntz, University of Hildesheim, Germany
Simon Chau, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong
David Connolly, translator and translation consultant, European Educational Organization, Athens, Greece
Contributors to the volume absent on the day were Patrick Chaffey, University of Oslo, Norway; Jan Firbas, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic; Viggo Hjørnager-Pedersen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; Eugene Nida, University of Michigan, USA; Eithne O’Connell, Dublin City University, Ireland; and Mary Snell-Hornby, University of Vienna, Austria. Janet Fraser, University of Westminster, UK was able to attend in the evening. Members of professional organisations attending included Graham Cross of the Institute of Translation and Interpreting (ITI) and Eyvor Fogarty, ITI and Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT), with Henry Pavlovich, Institute of Linguists, joining after the Round Table discussion.

The second part of the book starts with Peter Newmark’s full-length keynote paper, followed by contributions on each selected topic by participants attending the symposium as well as scholars and practitioners invited to contribute. We are grateful for this further opportunity to include papers from Peter’s many friends and colleagues previously unable to contribute to Word, Text, Translation. In addition, in order to extend the discussion of ‘English as the lingua franca of translation’, a chapter by David Graddol has also been included, reproduced by kind permission of AILA and the author.¹

It is our hope that the present volume will have retained some of the liveliness of the discussion on the day, and that the views expressed by the participants and assembled authors will in years to come provide an interesting record of a cross-section of views on trends and issues of concern in Translation Studies at the beginning of the new millennium.

The nature of translation, the first topic ambitiously tackled in Peter Newmark’s paper, is a heading under which most writing on translation could be accommodated. The papers in this section tackle broad issues, ranging from a reassessment of semantic/communicative translation, Peter Newmark’s well-known concepts, through an intriguing view of the source text-target text (ST-TT) relationship, and an experiential view...
of literary translation informed by a number of other disciplines, to the reception of texts as translations or original works. A common theme is the creative aspect of translation, seen from different perspectives.

Engaging with Peter Newmark’s widely-acknowledged distinction between semantic and communicative approaches to translation, Albrecht Neubert views the translator (cf. also Kuhiwczak (this volume)) as both interpreter/critic and creator; he argues that, rather than being two types of translation, semantic and communicative translation (for which he prefers to use the semiotic label *pragmatic*) constitute two complementary methods within one type, although operating at different levels. Semantic translation is concerned with procedures, communicative with intentions, the latter acting as a filter for the former. Neubert also challenges Newmark’s claims about the untranslatability of certain English words on the basis of his work in corpus studies, pointing to the importance of context and meaning potential for words. Referring to an English word such as *privacy*, considered by Newmark as ‘untranslatable’ in some languages, Neubert shows how the translator might make expert use of the context in the TT, just as the ST contextualised its meanings; this in turn enables Neubert to render *privacy* in German in a number of different ways. Newmark’s point, however, is that in certain situations context may not always be readily available to allow easy transfer of individual lexical items from ST to TT. Evidence supporting this claim may be gleaned from the fact that *privacy* has now been borrowed into Italian as ‘la privacy’ (cf. John Dodd’s comment in the Round Table discussion).

Attempts to define ‘translation’ are legion and various, often reflecting specific aspects of the social and ideological contexts of their provenance. In describing translation as ‘a dynamic reflection of human activities’, Peter Newmark allows us a tantalising glimpse of a more universal world. In her contribution ‘Looking forward to the translation: on a dynamic reflection of human activities’, Kirsten Malmkjær attempts to elaborate this view from the perspective of philosophical semantics, at the same time engaging with one of the most challenging ideas to emerge in Translation Studies in recent years, namely Toury’s ‘Source Text Postulate’ (1995: 33–4). What is challenging is the fact that a ST has to be postulated at all rather than presupposed. Malmkjær concludes – unsurprisingly but for novel reasons – that one of the factors distinguishing translations from monolingual communications is indeed the influence of the ST on the TT, a view which she nevertheless argues is consistent with Toury’s TT-oriented view of equivalence. Central to Malmkjær’s argument is the so-called ‘forward-looking nature’ of human communication, according to which a translation can be seen as a future but, in some sense, still shaped response to the original text. In other words,
translations can be understood as being at the confluence of two dimensions: temporal (past and future language use) and linguistic (source and target languages). Translations are therefore distinguished from monolingual communications not only by the obvious bilingual factor, but also by the realisation of the less predictable, temporal perspective in an instance of language use which cannot be fully anticipated. It is in this interaction between the ST, an aspect of the past, and the TT, a text (to be) created in the future, that Malmkjær sees a truly ‘dynamic reflection of human activity’, as envisaged in Newmark’s paper.

As readers of *The Linguist* and Peter Newmark’s books will know, the style of writing which he uses often manifests itself in concise to-the-point observations on aspects of translation, frequently wide-ranging and, often, stimulating and highly personal. Similarly, in his equally very personal contribution, Marshall Morris seeks to stimulate the thoughts of fellow literary translators by pointing to different sources of inspiration which, he argues, can support and enlighten the translation process. In presenting his thoughts ‘With translation in mind’, Morris refers to sources in linguistics, psychology, history, philosophy, sociology and social anthropology. The emphasis throughout is on the experiential aspects of translating, a perspective which may often be lost in more rationally-based analyses.

At times throughout history the dividing line between translation and adaptation has been difficult to draw, as for instance in the United Kingdom during the Victorian Age (cf. Hale, 2001). In her analysis of a number of Spanish translations of Washington Irving’s *The Alhambra*, Raquel Merino illustrates how the boundary between translation and adaptation becomes hard to identify in the context of a popular text which is reproduced in both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) in a number of versions. ‘Tracing back (in awe) a hundred-year history of Spanish translations: Washington Irving’s *The Alhambra*’ describes an ongoing study to (i) compile a bibliographical catalogue of Spanish versions of the Alhambra text, and (ii) trace the texts themselves. Based on the texts so far identified, Merino chooses a number of characteristics which she then uses as a basis of comparison between STs and TTs; in addition she also compares individual STs and TTs. A study of these characteristics, including the sequence of the tales, the number of tales, and the text of selected opening paragraphs, leads to the provisional conclusion that some texts presented as translations are more likely to be adaptations.

Questions raised in relation to the second topic, ‘Types and kinds of translation’, move us along the continuum of questions about translation from the general to the more specific, on the one hand to consider the hermeneutic and creative aspects of translation in the context of literary
translation, and on the other to consider the relative importance of typological and stylistic factors in translation.

Piotr Kuhiwczak’s pithy and coolly-evaluative chapter sets literary translation in the context of literary criticism and creative writing rather than that of Applied Linguistics. Literary translation, he points out (like the study of English literature), has a relatively recent provenance in the early twentieth century; it further develops, he argues, ‘the characteristic features of both creative writing and literary criticism’. Having raised some consequent questions about the teaching of literary translation, in which a case-by-case approach is the norm and a now unfashionably evaluative framework based on text typology is recommended, Kuhiwczak goes on to discuss the translation of one of the types identified, namely highly-conventionalised texts. In so doing, he illustrates that a translation can sometimes improve stylistic aspects of the original, at the same time missing its poignancy and allusions. His conclusion invites us to consider whether the technical details of translation analysis enable us as readers to understand the nature of translation.

The second chapter in this section adopts a linguistic perspective. A recurrent issue in the assessment of contrastive phenomena is the relative weight of establishing, on the one hand, typological factors, and, on the other, stylistic ideals. Using Mark Twain’s views as a starting point, Gunnar Magnusson’s paper discusses typological differences and their effects on style and discourse in English and German. The contrastive topics selected for discussion are: gender, case, compounds, and separable verbs. Magnusson’s discussion extends beyond formal comparisons to the use to which available structures are put in discourse, that is texts, the milieu of translators. The relative complexity of German is compared with English, both formally and stylistically, using numerous examples from Mark Twain’s well-known essays on the German language. Magnusson ends with a radical proposal of his own, to which, he surmises, Mark Twain would not have been unsympathetic. If the capitalisation of nouns were abolished, as happened in 1948 in the case of the Danish language, the additional difficulties experienced in processing structures such as nominal embeddings would lead to formal as well as stylistic changes.

In his contribution on ‘Meaning, truth, and morality in translation’, Martin Weston, like Peter Newmark, adopts a view of translating and interpreting which prioritises language use over more abstract models. He does, however, disagree with Newmark about the translator’s duty with respect to texts which are ethically ‘deficient’. Which brings us to the third topic: ‘Valid and deficient texts’. Weston sets out by re-examining the triadic model of interpreting and translating in which an intermediate stage of ‘disembodied’ meaning is interposed between
the SL and TL. Basing his critique on the abstractness – and therefore inaccessibility – of the pensée non formulée or the deverbalised thought, as well as its implied but unjustified universality, he also rejects a four-part model, in which the intermediate stage is split into SL and TL meaning. Instead, Weston appeals to a Wittgensteinian notion of meaning as the use to which language is put, as articulated in the work of the linguist W. Haas. For the translator, the expressions with which he or she works are therefore the key to translating, not ‘mythological entities and correspondences’. Clearly influenced by his professional experience in the Registry of the European Court of Human Rights, Weston challenges Peter Newmark’s injunction for the translator to intervene in the interests of ‘truth’, arguing that the translator’s duty is to the text at all times.

Asymmetry in translation, in particular literary translation, attracted the early attention of translation theorists of the Polysystem School. Accordingly, translation into English, as a global lingua franca, normally exhibits a greater degree of assimilation than translation into lesser used European languages. While this ‘domesticating’ tendency has been critically evaluated by some authors with respect to literary texts, Peter Newmark’s remarks on the status of ‘English as a lingua franca of translation’ – our fourth topic – are practically motivated: English is accessible to the speakers of many languages. In his intriguingly entitled piece on English, ‘The decline of the native speaker’, David Graddol argues that in the future English, as a lingua franca, will be used mainly in multilingual contexts as a second language for communication between non-native speakers. Peter Newmark’s examples of the inappropriate use of English in, for example, the context of tourism demonstrate the need for revision when translators are of necessity second-language users. Graddol’s carefully analysed and evaluated statistics show a clear trend: more English, but in the context of growing multilingualism rather than at the cost of other languages. For translation, this implies a growing demand for translators working into English, increasingly to be met by non-native speakers; as a result, a growing training need for language two (L2) translators as well as language one (L1) speaker revisers may be anticipated.

The influence of English on other languages has been well documented, particularly from a lexical perspective, and is often perceived to be pervasive or even invasive. Yet Juliane House shows in her contribution ‘English as lingua franca and its influence on discourse norms in other languages’ that its influence stops short of changing the make-up of texts. House’s results are reported as part of a larger study which aims to analyse discourse norms in German, French and Spanish texts in three genres: popular science texts, economic texts from global organisations,
and software manuals. The data consist of three corpora: the ‘primary’
corpus of translations produced to appear simultaneously with the ST, a
kind of ‘covert’ translation; a four-language ‘parallel’ corpus of texts
from the same genres; and a further translation corpus from German,
French and Spanish into English, again in the same genres. The three
corpora are supplemented by other data such as interviews and back-
ground documents. Based on a subset of the German translation texts
and a control sample of authentic ‘monolingual’ German texts, House
proposes that German texts cannot easily be categorised as strongly
content-oriented, as previously claimed by authors such as Clyne. Using
a Hallidayan framework to describe the functions of lexico-grammatical
patterns (micro-context) supplemented by the concept of genre (macro-
context), she shows that the German texts in her sample do not adopt
anglophone strategies for involving the reader, including what House
calls ‘genre mixing’ whereby an English text may start: Suppose you are a
doctor in an emergency room, while the German translation starts with a
statement in the third person. Other differences include the degree of
explicitness in the presentation of information, the German texts being
more explicit than the English texts analysed.

In cultures which are used to perceiving themselves as monoglot, the
social relevance of translation and interpreting is often hard to establish.
Anglo-Saxon cultures, such as that of the United Kingdom, are cases in
point: the social marginalisation of translation and interpreting for groups
which often have minority status has economic and legal consequences,
often masked by social prejudice. Writing on our next topic, ‘Social
translation and interpreting’, Ann Corsellis analyses the needs, obstacles,
and possible solutions involved in the Cinderella field of public service
interpreting and translating in the UK; the intersection of professional
language skills and society is clearly apparent. In her challenging
contribution we learn about the expectations and learning experiences of
the three principal groups: public service personnel, linguists, and the
potential users of the services. Corsellis’s argument, arising from many
years’ experience and activism in the field, is that effective solutions lie
in the relationships between these groups. Practical and realistic through-
out, Corsellis gives us a unique insight into a system in evolution, in
which a gradual process of acknowledgement, professionalisation, and
action is emerging, more clearly so in the legal than in the medical field.
The development of public service interpreting and translation in the UK
may even be seen as a microcosm of social change. As Corsellis rightly
reminds: ‘Multilingualism is not a problem. It is a fact. It only becomes a
problem when it is not responded to effectively.’

While public service translation and interpreting may be viewed as
having a low social profile, largely hidden from the majority community,
audiovisual translation is, in contrast, a highly visible area of translation. Both are, however, areas in which systematic training has been largely neglected, as Peter Newmark accurately acknowledges by including them for discussion, the latter under the topic, ‘Later modes of translation’. While the use of surtitling for opera performances, the mode in which Peter Newmark expresses a particular interest, is now often extended to foreign language theatre productions, it is in subtitling that developments are at present taking place with breathtaking speed. In his informative survey, ‘Audiovisual translation in the third millennium’, Jorge Díaz Cintas outlines some of these developments and reminds us of the need for university-level training instead of on-the-job learning, as well as of the need for more diverse and empirically-based research to replace speculative or prescriptive approaches. Díaz Cintas sees audiovisual translation as an increasingly important part of Translation Studies, itself a fast-evolving discipline. Indeed, the theme of Díaz Cintas’s contribution is change: an increase in the demand for audiovisual translation, including subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing; changing preferences in so-called ‘dubbing’ or ‘subtitling’ countries; the simultaneous production not only of subtitled and dubbed films, but also of versions in several languages for the new DVD technology; and the exploration of audiovisual media (film with voice-over) to present information disseminated by the EU in 11 languages. One of the potentially most interesting developments is the different viewer/listener behaviour which some of these changes may elicit, through, for example, the opportunity to actively compare not only dubbed versus subtitled versions of films, but also versions in different languages. Picking up an issue discussed elsewhere in this volume, namely the global influence of English (cf. Graddol; House), Díaz Cintas casts doubt on hypothesised future scenario ruling out the need even for subtitling in some European countries.

As new modes of translation emerge, the need to respond to Peter Newmark’s call for more clearly formulated and uniformly applied methods of assessment of translation and interpreting competence, the penultimate topic discussed in his paper, will grow more urgent. In their contribution on ‘Translation and interpreting assessment in the context of educational measurement’, Stuart Campbell and Sandra Hale tacitly acknowledge Peter Newmark’s call for action in this field by drawing attention to the largely intuitive basis of the majority of assessment in these areas, whether in an educational or a professional context. Campbell and Hale set out to survey the literature concerned with research in educational measurement, and in particular in language testing, using a checklist of criteria against which assessment procedures might be measured. They arrive at the conclusion that many items are already
relatively well covered, including: the purpose of the test instrument (aptitude, placement, formative, summative, accreditation), competencies assessed (for example, L1 and L2 knowledge, transfer competence, speed, accuracy, memory, terminology, etc.), and form of the test (for example, timed translation, interpreting role play, multiple choice test, etc.). They note, however, that two crucial items in particular are notably absent from the research literature, namely validity (is the test measuring what it is supposed to measure?) and reliability (how consistent is the test?). Given that translation and interpreting are socially important jobs, Campbell and Hale plead for a more considered approach to testing, linking this ultimately to the relevance of the skills and the standard of performance for which translators and interpreters are accredited.

The final topic in Peter Newmark’s paper, ‘The university and the market’, critically and polemically remarks on the influence of the market, not only on universities as institutions but also on Translation Studies as a discipline. In certain circumstances, the translator’s decision to accept or reject a translation job may be an ethical one: if, for instance, the value system expressed in the ST conflicts with the translator’s, what options are available? This is the problem that is confronted by Gerard McAlester in his contribution entitled ‘A comment on translation ethics and education’. In arguing that translators should consider the option of not translating a text at all if they find it morally offensive, he adds to the options considered by Newmark, according to whom translators can, if in their opinion the text is liable to ‘provoke or mislead’, correct informative texts (how is not clear) or gloss historical or authoritative texts. The issue is then, for McAlester, to allow moral issues into the translation classroom, reflecting the truly vocational aspect of the profession as a calling, and balancing the market-oriented view. In contrast to Martin Weston, who argues that the translator’s duty is to the text, McAlester concludes that the ultimate responsibility of the translator is to his or her conscience – opposing views, in some ways reflecting St Jerome’s sentiments on the calumnies of his work: ‘If I correct errors in the Sacred Text, I am denounced as a falsifier; if I do not correct them, I am pilloried as a disseminator of error’ (Bobrick, 2001: 6).

These words of St Jerome were written more than 15 centuries ago. Just over the threshold of a new millennium, plus ça change …?
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Part 1
Chapter 2

**Round-table Discussion on Translation in the New Millennium**

**Opening Address by Gunilla Anderman**

First of all, then, welcome to everyone. I am particularly pleased to be able to welcome representatives of the professional organisations as well as colleagues from academia. So may I welcome Eyvor Fogarty from FIT (Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs) and the ITI (Institute of Translation and Interpreting), Mike Shields from the TA (Translators Association), and Graham Cross, Chair of the ITI. Henry Pavlovich of the IoL (Institute of Linguists) will be joining us later. I am also delighted to welcome: Reiner Arntz (University of Hildesheim, Germany), Simon Chau (Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong), David Connolly (European Educational Organization, Greece), John Dodds (University of Trieste, Italy), Kurt Kohn (University of Tübingen, Germany), Piotr Kuhiwczak (University of Warwick, UK), Hans Lindquist (Växjö University, Sweden), Sylfest Lomheim (Agder College, Norway), Gerard McAlester (University of Tampere, Finland), Albrecht Neubert (University of Leipzig, Germany), Gideon Toury (Tel Aviv University, Israel). We are very pleased that representatives from the professions as well as academics are with us today. So, thank you for coming and again welcome to everybody.

**Professor Peter Newmark**

If you don’t mind, first I would like to say thank you very much for coming, in so far as you’re coming for me – I’m very flattered. And, thank you very much also for organising this. Secondly, I have been told to ‘keep it informal’ – well, I usually am informal anyway. Now, my job is to introduce the sections, which might not exactly follow my paper. I have tried to give you a wide range of things to discuss. This is an invitation, but it is not in any way comprehensive, and I hope that you will discuss here the things that you are really interested in.

**The nature of translation**

So, the first section is ‘Aspects of the nature of translation’ and I’m going to talk very briefly. As you see, I don’t think – unlike, for instance,
Mary Snell-Hornby – I don’t think translation changes in essence at all. There are three or four what I call ‘dualities’, rather than ‘dualisms’; dualism suggests a certain opposition, duality simply two subjects which I want to mention, to bring out: on the one hand, a simplified message, and on the other hand the full meaning, and there is always this choice. Then, translation is partly a science and partly an art, I would say also a craft and a matter of taste. I think science is the search for truth – this is an old-fashioned word in Translation Studies. To me the scientific aspect is, above all, non-literary, it’s about things, it’s about reality, it’s about facts, it’s impersonal, and it’s about objects. The other is the aesthetic, or, if you like, translation as an art, and this is imagination, which is so important. This is beauty, this is literary translation, this centres on people, as literature does.

Types and kinds of translation

We know translation is always an approximation – imagination brings it nearer. This is so, I think, in many types of texts. That is the secondary part of translation (‘secondary’ is the wrong word, but here it means secondary to ‘Scientific Truth’). It applies to non-literary translation as well as literary translation, although in literary texts imagination, on the whole, has a far greater role, often the more important role. I transfer from this to the non-litterary – which I now often call ‘encyclopaedic’, and literary is more ‘dictionary’. Non-literate centres in names, in titles, in capitalised words (remember, these are big generalisations), while the literary is the dictionary, the world of the mind, what is here; the non-literary is more particular, the dictionary side is more general, as you see in my paper, it’s ‘lower case’. Then there’s a different kind of contrast – between fresh language and clichés.

Increasingly, use of language is always very important in translation – ‘writing well’, I call it – and it needs definition, which I can’t do exactly now; but a contrast between words that are so often used that they more and more lose their meaning, and words that are freshly used. This contrast, I think, again applies in all translation. These are only glimpses, but I think that’s all I’d like to say here.

Valid and deficient texts

My next section is on the need for a terminology in translation, for certain words which are needed in translation, and for agreed meanings of them. Now, I just give you, as my examples, a ‘valid’ text and a ‘deficient’ text. A valid text is one that is, immediately, you might say, translatable. It’s logical, it’s accurate, it’s ethical, and it’s elegant. A deficient text is one that needs some kind of treatment, either within the text, or – if it’s a historical text or a famous text (I often give Mein Kampf as an example
here) – which needs some kind of gloss, normally on the part of the trans-
lator. Secondly, I give you a contrast between ‘mistakes’ which are due to
ignorance (they are listed very briefly in my paper) and what I call ‘devia-
tions’, which is where the translation follows some kind of idea about
translation, as so many translators do, owing to what I call misguided
teaching. The third point is what I call ‘creative deviations’, where the
imagination, the creativity, of the translator is required, particularly in chal-
lenging texts, they are essential to any kind of imaginative translation.

In general for the first type, if one is assessing an exam (and I’ll return
to that), you would not normally penalise deviations as heavily as you’d
penalise mistakes. In my paper I’ve a section here on the importance – if
one is discussing translation or writing about translation – of examples of
live, raw quotations creating the main link between translation practice
and translation theory. Normally, the more examples and comments on
examples, the more instructive – educative – such a text is.

Translating out of the language of habitual use

This is an important matter, because of translationese and false friends.
I think I give five examples from Trier – I was writing this paper partly
when I was in Trier – showing that these mistranslations, such as prob-
ably written, as I say, by a German (but might have been written by an
English person), are fairly harmless, but they do stick out, and therefore
any kind of municipal authority, I think, must have at least one reviser to
ten service translators.

English as the lingua franca of translation

This section is self-contained, I hope. I’m suggesting that the role of
English is now established. And I recount, I hope, an amusing incident in
Brussels, suggesting that it was arrogance. It often is arrogance, but it’s
something that has to be recognised

Social translation and interpreting

Now to this concept – again, you may reject it – I hope I’ve defined it
in my paper. With the decline of ideology, the realisation is increasingly
important that, as I’ve put it, this is an age of migrations, public service
translators, public service interpreters; I say that they come first, because
social translation is centred on the poor and the disadvantaged, because
they are in another country, because of the enormous amount of transla-
tion work that they require. I’ve also said that social translation comes
between the other two, that is, literary and non-literary, because social
translation, unlike literary translation, is centred on real people, and here
I talk about the difficulties of words that represent human qualities, and
I’ve pointed out that Tytler discussed this aspect of translation over 200
years ago: the fact that such words ought to be universal, but they are strongly influenced by culture, which is always the greatest barrier to translation. It relates also to acronyms and to institutional terms.

**Later modes of translation**

I leave it for somebody else to discuss Machine Translation. I feel I’m not qualified to do so. But in my paper I’m interested in surtitles, and the growing future of surtitles. I’ve defined the concept, so I’m not going to define it again; but most people even now, when I mention it, think I’m talking about subtitles – but it’s not the same thing at all. It’s the translation of opera texts projected above or alongside the stage which has also been extended to foreign plays and, soon I hope, will be to Lieder texts.

**The assessment of translation**

I’ve brought up again the matter of the assessment of exams – translation exams – because I think what goes on is that two or three people write about assessing translations, while many people don’t believe in it at all and say that translation always works in its time and its place, and why introduce standards, or qualities, or values, into it. Well, it is essential, and again, there is my reference to *valid texts*. I’ve given you the four terms: valid texts, deficient texts, mistakes, and deviations – all these in a way are closely related to the matter of assessment of exams.

**The university and the market**

The last thing – and, in a way, the most important thing – is what I call ‘The University and the Market’. Now that translation in many countries has become a discipline, there’s a reaction: once it’s in the university you say ‘but this is not the real world; the real world is the market’. You know what I mean: we are facing the challenges of the market. I am not for a minute suggesting that the market should be ignored. It must be taken into account, but I’m suggesting that if you are in a university, there are other things: and I’m talking about the values embodied by universities – represented, if you like, by Cardinal Newman and by Wilhelm von Humboldt (but I think Alexander is, in a way, much more important): it’s humanistic ideas, more general ideas, that are important, that language has been marketised in too many cases. Norman Fairclough has written well about this.¹ This is something that the translator has to guard against on the lowest level – simply on the matter of what I call ‘P.R. language’ or ‘media language’ – in other words, a mass of clichés; on a higher level, humane ideals and values, which is what Humboldt and Newman were talking about. To say simply the real world is a market, as is often done (and I’m particularly concerned with translation – what I’ve read about in Germany, but also in this country), is completely absurd,
I think. The danger of the university ideal is that it is, certainly,
generalised. As far as I remember, Newman, in his book *The Idea of the
University* in 1854, suggested that you shouldn’t have professional or
technical subjects in the university. I don’t agree with that, because I
believe it’s the examples that bring us into the real world, and I think the
eamples are very important. But these university values of humaneness,
and the primacy of both society and the individual in any kind of activity,
I think, are very important, and again it’s regrettable, I think, that some
proponents of Translation Theory are also talking about the customer all
the time, the ‘client’; the readership simply becomes ‘clientèle’, so
anything the clientèle says must go. And this is the last point. I have
written here words that I’ll leave you with: the need to discriminate
between an important text – and by that I mean a text that says important
things, humane things – and the opposite, which the translator has to do.

I am suggesting – and this is positively my last sentence, which is
a development, I think, from the paper – that if one writes about
translation, it’s aesthetics and ethics that are, simply, usually, neglected or
completely misinterpreted.

**The Discussion**

**Gunilla Anderman**

Thank you Peter. Now, let’s start with the first topic, The Nature of
Translation. So, can I then, please, ask first Gideon, and then Albrecht and
Piotr, who have indicated an interest, to make a contribution to the first
section, to give us their views on this particular part of Peter’s paper. So
we’ll start with Gideon.

**Gideon Toury**

I’m no longer sure that it’s only Section 1: maybe it’s a general over-
view which focuses on Section I, but it’s not reducible to it – if you don’t
mind I’ll do it that way.

Let me first warn you that what I am trying to do is put some basic
reactions to the written version of Peter’s position paper – but it is not too
much removed from what we have just heard (and we have all read the
written version) – in my non-native English, for some kind of English has
certainly become the lingua franca, not only of translation itself, but of
Translation Studies as well. So, some kind of English – that’s what you
have to expect, no more, no less. I will no doubt have produced what
Peter has so emphatically called, more than once today, a deficient text,
namely in stylistic terms. I did, however, try to make my text valid in all
other respects, namely: logical, factually accurate, and ethically sound –
or, at least, not too unsound. I’ll be following just one thread out of many,
hopefully, one that will result in a fair amount of ‘fair’ coverage of Peter’s argumentation – that unique English word ‘fair’ that you have discussed in the written version but never referred to in the oral version.

As some of you may know, one of my concerns is that, when translation is discussed, very often hats are too easily changed, and levels that had better remain separate are too often mixed together, by which I mean the unholy trinity of the theoretical, the descriptive-explanatory and the ideologically motivated. Thus, when Peter says – and I’m quoting from the written paper, but you quoted it almost verbatim at the beginning of your presentation today – when Peter says that the nature of translation in its essence does not change, he must have in mind what human beings, when acting as translators, may in principle be doing, rather than what they are allegedly supposed, or are required to do, even less so, what a particular translator did, is doing, or will be doing at any particular moment, in any particular place, or with regard to any particular text. It is the initial potential that may be said to be unchanging, unless we accept – I don’t, but maybe there are those who would accept it – unless we accept that the human mental apparatus itself is still undergoing changes – namely, changes of essence, rather than mere extent. For instance, that our memory was once different from what it is now, or that it will be essentially different in the future. Because, if this is the case, then the possibilities themselves of realising the general notion of translation may also change.

According to our assumption, changes do not occur in terms of the initial possibilities, but rather in the distribution of the actual realisations of those possibilities that are to be encountered in the world of our experience, as well as those among the realisations which, for one reason or another – or rather, for a combination of different reasons, would be regarded as preferable. Consequently, there is a lot of difference between talking about translation in terms of what it can initially be, and what it is, under this or that set of circumstances; what it is required to be, and what it tends to be. Each one of these question areas is legitimate, as well as interesting; and each one of us may choose an area to his or her own liking. Still, it should be realised that they belong to different domains of Translation Studies, and it simply won’t do to mix them all in one neutral, or neutralising bag. Thus, saying that the mode of translation or the ensuing text is unacceptable is not the same as saying that it is impossible, or even non-existent. The first claim is normative (unacceptable), the second – theoretical, the third – descriptive. Looked at from a different angle, acceptability is a sociolinguistic notion referring to the cultural status of an initial possibility which itself is basically cognitive.

Finally, existence is just a raw fact which can be positive or negative, or even lack any value tag whatsoever. Peter always says that I don’t give
examples, so I decided to bring an example. This is an example that Peter and I have been arguing about, and disagreeing upon in the past. Take the *King James Version* of the Bible. In principle, this 1611 text could have been produced in 1999 too; however, I do not think it would have, in view of the dominant concept of translation. Moreover – and this is where we disagree – if it did emerge now, I don’t believe it would have counted as a very good translation, not even of the Bible, if only, but by no means solely, because of the host of instances of interference it contains. ‘A very visible translation indeed’ – quote, unquote – today’s culture critics would probably claim, which for them, but probably for them only, in the overall subversive frame of reference they entertain, would have counted as a coveted mode of translation, even though not necessarily as a real option, much less so a dominant one, certainly not in English. Had I had some more time, I would have started wondering aloud – and I’m picking out another example which is in the paper but which you have not quoted today – what Peter would have made out of the fact that there are some 40 Hebrew translations of the Goethe poem you cited at the beginning of the paper (of the written version), of the number of different translations, as well as the multiple concept of translation underlying them. However, I don’t have that kind of time, and therefore I will do my wondering in silence. Thank you.

**Gunilla Anderman**

Thank you very much. Any quick comments here?

**Peter Newmark**

One quick comment would be that the *King James Version* that was quoted by Gideon, I don’t call it a quotation, that’s an illustration. For a quotation, I must have a quotation. The only other point is that, as I’ve said with poetry, it’s inevitable that there should be an enormous number of versions. There’s nothing there that contradicts anything, because there are so many constraints, because imagination has played such a strong part; and it’s simply not surprising, given that even in a concrete text, a normal non-literary text, no two translations normally are the same – not at all surprising.

**Gideon Toury**

But what I said is not just that the number was great, and not only that each one of them was different from the rest of them, but that they were representative of different approaches to what translation is at different periods of time. And this is something you keep skipping over – something which you seem not to like because it has been misrepresented, or even abused – the historicity argument, but it doesn’t make it any more wrong.