TRANSLATION STUDIES

The Spanish Classics under Scrutiny: Translating Honour for Modern English-speaking Audiences

Jorge Braga Riera
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

> SEGISMUNDO [to Rosaura]: I cannot look at your beauty, / if you want me to think of your honour
>
> (*Life is a Dream*, tr. Nilo Cruz, 57)

From 1660 to 1700, England turned to the seventeenth-century Spanish comedy of intrigue in search of a breath of fresh air for the London theatrical scene. As a result, Hispanic drama in translation enjoyed a period of popularity that was never to be repeated until very recently, when a group of translators in the UK and America[1] started to confine their efforts to the production of actable versions of the Spanish classics. Nevertheless, and as pointed out by many (Zatlin 2005, Boyle and Johnston (eds.) 2008, Paun de Garcia and Larson (eds) 2008), the occurrence of upright beaux, respectable ladies and daft *graciosos* on the Anglo-Saxon stages is still scarce, if not incidental. Undeniably, this is in part due to the intricate problems inherent to the translation of the *comedias*: the three unities rule, register, polymetry, long monologues and lexicon, etc., as well as the recurrent motifs of the genre, that is, the conception of monarchy, love (with its fussy attitude towards sex)[2] and, of course, honour. In fact, honour is one of the issues that has proved troublesome when transferring Spanish classical drama for today's English-speaking audiences, with various translation mechanisms being applied in order to accommodate it to the recipient culture(s).

Curiously, the disturbance that the rendering of honour into English may cause is not a recent phenomenon. As far back as 1668[3], John Dryden, in his version of Calderón's El astrólogo fingido, felt free to include some lines of his own and express his aversion to one of the pillars of the Spanish plays that were triumphing in London at that time:

> BELLAMY: Will you in, Sir?
> MELCHIOR: No, Sir, 'tis not for my Honour, to be assisting to you; I'll to Don Alonzo, and help to revenge the Injury you are doing him.
> […]
> WILDBLOOD: Nay, and you talk of Honour, by your leave, Sir, I hate your Spanish Honour ever since spoil'd our English Plays. (*An Evening's Love*, Act V, 370).

It is hardly surprising, then, that the concept of honour (though useful, as a foreign element, to discuss issues in the domestic sphere) was not so noticeable in the English translations of the seventeenth century, especially because of its being a constant obstacle for the amorous inclinations of certain ladies. But this does not mean that it did vanish in the target plays; indeed, as proved somewhere else (Braga Riera 2009), the word

---

[1] It is not coincidental, as suggested by Thacker (1999: 20), that his growing trend is parallel to the strong emphasis that translation has received lately on a number of new postmodern perspectives (postcolonial, feminist, etc.), especially in the US.

[2] Love and honour appear as paramount elements in the development of the original plots, since a happy resolution is always subject to a greater imperative: that a father or brother should see his honour restored.

[3] This year refers to date of performance. The English printed version of the play, entitled *An Evening's Love, or the Mock Astrologer,* came out in 1671.

"honour" occurred more frequently than did Spanish *honor* in the originals. However, we must bear in mind that Spanish *honor* (social category) and *honra* (reputation) are distinct concepts. The protagonists of the *comedias* being nobles, conflicts of honour derive from the rivalry between beaux or the confrontation between a suitor and the lady's father or brother, as the honour of an entire family may be affected by the inappropriate behaviour of a woman. In the English comedies, "honour" covered both concepts, *honor* and *honra*, as well as other meanings, such as "privilege", "pleasure", "oath", "pride", etc.[4] Hence, the fact that the English term occurred more often does not mean that the subject received more weight in the target plays, but quite the opposite.

The same tendency can be observed in contemporary translations of the Spanish Golden Age plays, although in this case references to honour are even rarer. Just as their colleagues of the English Restoration period did, current practitioners show a tendency to downplay or eliminate considerations of honour. As translator Adrian Mitchell puts it in his introduction to *Life is a Dream*, "honour is such a strange word in England these days" (1990: 3). Paun de Garcia and Larson go even further and assert that the pervasive presence of this theme is usually "irrelevant, or even repugnant" (2008: 3) for current adaptors of Spanish plays. For his part, director Jonathan Mundy, when staging Johnston's *The Gentleman from Olmedo*, mentioned the courage and imagination required to get "the mind of an English actor into that of the Spanish psyche" (McGrath 2008: 136). Although many modern translators generally attempt to respect the concept of honour as a way to remain exotic or "faithful" to the source[5], the relaxation of the oft-repeated motif seems to be the trend, which results in target texts with a substantially altered moral structure (Paun de Garcia and Larson 2008: 3). The following lines will try to bring to light some of the downplay mechanisms resorted to by current translators and practicing theatre professionals in the process of accommodating honour to the foreign audience. To this aim, a corpus of translations, staged in North America and the UK during the period 1990-2010, will be used for illustrative purposes. The comparative analysis reveals how notions of "honour" can be minimized by means of elimination, substitution, compensation or even mockery.

Sometimes translators find it difficult to maintain aspects of honour which they consider hard to understand, so they make them disappear. These range from short phrases (Nilo Cruz's *Life is a Dream*[6] is an extraordinary example in this sense) and references (such as allusions to the condition of "old Christian" in Cervantes's *Electing a Sheriff in Podunk County*[7], in which honour equals reputation), to complete verses: in *La vida es sueño*, Rosaura's father wanted her "casada, noble y honrada" (322), whereas in Cruz's version, Clotaldo just hopes she gets "properly married" (63); in *Peribanez*[8], the actual lines with which Casilda approves of her cousin's murder (as required under the laws of honour) are omitted, since they are regarded as difficult for modern audiences (British in this case) to struggle with (Thacker 2004: 265). Needless to say, in the latter example, the spirit of the original is totally distorted, something which is also noticeable when decision-making directly affects characters: in *Friendship Betrayed* (2003)[9], Lauro

---

[4] See Barber's study (1957) for an extensive analysis of this concept in the English Restoration literature.

[5] In many cases, the translator simply avoids translating those *comedias* which are overly concerned with honour (Dixon 2008: 120).

[6] This adaptation was first staged by The South Coast Repertory in Costa Mesa, California, on Feb 9, 2007, under the direction of Kate Whoriskey.

[7] Ben Gunter presented his translation of *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo* in Quincy (North Florida), in 2004. Formally speaking it is not a *comedia*, but a one-act interlude (*entremés*).

[8] Translated by Tanya Ronder from Lope's *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña*, it was premiered on May 1 2003 at the Young Vic, London.

[9] Larson's translation was first mounted in El Chamizal in 2003, and was directed by David Pasto; its second production (directed by Karen Berman) dates back to July 2006.

is eliminated and Gerardo is portrayed as weak and effeminate, quite unlike the purpose of author María de Zayas in La traición de la amistad.

As seen with Gerardo in *Friendship Betrayed*, substitution can also emerge as an alternative strategy. This is particularly evident in the treatment of the typical forced marriages required by the code. José Rivera, for instance, added a totally new scene to his *Sueño*[10] and married Rosaura to Segismundo (and not to Astolfo, as done in Calderón's work); what is more, both Karen Berman (director of the 2009 performance of *Sueño*) and Munby (director of the 2010 London production) agreed on this change as key to satisfying the wishes of the spectators (Reed 2011: 32). A similar view is expressed by James Maraniss, responsible for the English libretto of Lewis Spratlan's opera *Life is a Dream* (premiered at the Santa Fe Opera in 2010), who highlights "the inadequacy of the social order" and suggests that "Segismundo's sacrificial conversion may prove inadequate in truly resolving the underlying chaos" (Reed 2011: 32)[11]. Svich (2006) also de-emphasized the subject of honour in her rendition of Lope's *La prueba de los ingenios* and twisted the ending by unexpectedly pairing two men, noble Ricardo and servant Estacio, a union that would have never occurred in Lope, given both the gender and the social class of the characters involved (Ostlund 2010: 157)[12].

Other translators have opted for replacement strategies, as well. In the above-mentioned *Peribañez…*, the protagonist laments the fact that his honour, which is questioned, due to the immoral behaviour of the *comendador*, has become the focus of a popular song. Its English equivalent, however, prefers to focus just on the pain:

> PERIBÁÑEZ: Pena tengo con razón,
> Porque honor que anda en canciones
> Tiene dudosa opinión (*Peribáñez…*, 146)
>
> PERIBANEZ: But still they are singing about her. Us. And it shakes my sickened soul! (*Peribanez*, 52).

Consequently, the English Peribanez shows a personality that is distinct from that in the source play. Also, the attitudes to sex and the verbal register displayed in some target texts are sometimes more daring than expected: American Fenisa (*Friendship Betrayed*) does not hide her sexual activity, whereas the original keeps her virginity intact; Kidd, in *Don Juan, Ladykiller of Seville* (2004)[13], has Isabela giggling, with Don Juan under her skirt, a reference that is absent in the source. Similarly, kissing and sex scenes abound in *Peribanez*, *Life is a Dream*, and *Sueño*, which reflects an intrepid vision of the characters' honourability.

At other times, these substitutions are compensated for by explanatory expressions. In Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla*, Isabela takes Don Juan for her beloved Octavio and lets him into her house; despite the misunderstanding, she knows the consequences this unsolicited act has (loss of honour), so when discovered by the king, she exclaims: "¡Ay perdido honor!" (69). This concept is explicitly clarified in Dakin Matthews' version (2006: 5)[14]: "I'm ruined, I'll die!". Similar is the remark by

[10] Hartford (Connecticut) was the venue chosen for the premiere of *Sueño* in 1998, which was carried out by the Hartford Stage Company. Rivera's translation was also the script used by director José Carrasquillo (Theatre Olney, Washington D.C.) in summer 2000.

[11] This pairing Segismundo-Rosaura was also chosen by translator Williamson in his search of an "American happy-end" version of Calderón's masterpiece (2001).

[12] The translation, which she entitled *The Labyrinth of Desire*, was produced by the University of California in La Jolla (November 2006).

[13] Michael Kidd premiered his version of *El burlador de Sevilla* in Toronto (October 2004) under the direction of Julie Florio.

[14] Dakin Matthews' translation of *El burlador de Sevilla* was first performed in North Hollywood with Anne McNaughton as the director.

fisherwoman Tisbea later on in the play ("¡Dejas a una mujer deshonrada!", 110), which becomes "To ruin a girl like me!" (34).

Furthermore, humour may be used as a valid mechanism to do away with phrases or situations in which some form of honour is present. In La elección de los alcaldes de *Daganzo*, Rana talks about the qualities a fair mayor should have. His answer is radically different in English:

RANA: No es bien que el poder quite la crianza,
Ni que la sumisión de un delincuente
Haga al juez soberbio y arrogante (*La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*, 111).

RIBBIT: Got no home? Away you roam!
Welfare mother? Marry some brother!
Beat your wife? Hey, that's life! (*Electing a Sheriff in Podunk County*, 5).

In the following extract, the expression *dar las plantas* is used in *La vida es sueño* as a sign of reverence (honour as social rank). Although this respect is maintained in the translation, the English statement is more audacious:

TODOS: Danos tus plantas
CLARÍN: No puedo, porque
Las he menester para mí (La vida es sueño, 258-9).

ALL: Allow us to kiss your feet.
CLARIN: No, I can't do that,
I haven't washed them (Life is a Dream, 1990, 68).

An analogous example in this same play is that of the expression *besar los pies* ("kiss one's feet") addressed to King Basilio, which has the following result in the hands of the translator:

ROSAURA: Tus pies beso mil veces.
CLARÍN: Y yo las viso,
Que una letra más o menos,
No reparan los amigos (La vida es sueño, 163).

ROSAURA: I kiss your feet, Your Grace.
CLARIN: I'll kiss you any place (Life is a Dream, 1990, 28).

Another example of this kind is found in the first act of Calderón's famous play. Rosaura makes it clear that the intention of her trip to Poland is to find her lost father and win back her honour; in Mitchell and Barton's translation, the seriousness of this purpose is totally mocked at, as seen in the following verse (absent in the original): "I rose up one morning / and hurried to the fair, / for I had heard the rumour / that the folk sold honour there" (10). The teasing effect is even more emphasized if we bear in mind these words were not meant to be recited, but sung.

On top of this, the lack of decorum expected in high-rank figures is also exploited for humorous effects. Notice, for instance, Casilda's words when addressing her maid in *Peribanez*: "What are you, mistress of a whore-house?" (72). For its part, *Sueño* is filled with excessive profanity, and irreverent expressions such as "stupid mammal", "shitty" or "asshole" are constant.

Finally, the decisions taken by some directors regarding costume may put to disadvantage the severity of certain situations in which honour is at play. Carrasquillo, for example, opted for a luminous head-dress for noble Astolfo in his direction of Sueño, and JoAnne Akalaitis, following Mitchell and Barton's stage directions, made Rosaura open the show galloping on a hobbyhorse, dressed in the gold-trimmed attire of a matador (Bechtel 2000: 406). Both her outfit (far from the mantillas women in the Siglo de Oro used to wear to protect their reputations) and that worn by servant Clarion (in a bright golden polyester suit and platform shoes) did nothing to heighten the seriousness required by the opening scene.

Though brief, this comparative analysis shows how honour emerges as a difficult topic for modern translators of Golden Age plays, who consequently provoke the alteration of the source texts. Thus, the importance of the conflicts stirred by questions of honour is usually smoothed or minimized, when not mocked at, by some, omitted or substituted by others – whichever suits the translators' purposes better. The resulting plays become more contemporary and intendedly audience-friendly, although, as pointed out by some scholars (Thacker 2008: 18), they may mislead the spectators to accept a parody as something genuinely Lopean or Calderonian. Ethically-doubtful translations as they may be, the success of many of these performances (and others not referred to here) proves that audiences can certainly be stirred by a play in which honour is the motivating power. After all, as critic Fenton says (2003), "we pursue honour in various of its aspects all the time". The Spanish Golden Age Season, which started in Bath on September 12, has proved, again, to what extent honour as the driving force of the Spanish classics is still vibrant today[15].

References

Barber, Charles L. 1957. *The Idea of Honour in the English Drama 1591-1700*. Gothenburg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.

Bechtel, Roger 2000. Review of *Life is a Dream*. *Theater Journal* 52/3: 405-407.

Boyle, Catherine and David Johnston (eds) 2008. *The Spanish Golden Age in English: Perspectives on Performance*. London: Oberon Books.

Braga Riera, Jorge 2009. *Classical Spanish Drama in Restoration English (1660-1700)*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brioso, Héctor (ed) 1999. *El burlador de Sevilla.* Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Cruz, Nilo (trans) 2008. *Life is a Dream.* New York: Dramatists Play Service.

Dixon, Victor 2008. Beyond the Canon. In Boyle, Catherine and David Johnston (eds) *The Spanish Golden Age in English: Perspectives on Performance*. London: Oberon Books, 119-132.

Dryden, John 1760. An Evening's Love, or The Mock Astrologer. In Derrick, S. (ed) The Dramatick Works of John Dryden 2, London: J & R Tonson, 266-383.

Fenton, James 2003. Honour Bound. *The Guardian*, 24.5.2003.

González, Felicidad and Fernando Doménech (eds) 1994. La traición en la amistad. Madrid: Asociación de directores de escena de España.

Gunter, Ben (trans) 2007. *Electing a Sheriff in Podunk County, Florida.* Internet edition at http://spanish-golden-age-plays.wikispaces.com/Cervante+on+Stage+Project+%28_Ben+Gunter%29 (accessed 12.8.2013).

Huerta Calvo, Javier (ed) 1997. La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo. Entremeses. Madrid: Edaf.

Johnston, David (trans) 1992. *The Great Pretenders/The Gentleman from Olmedo.* London: Absolute Classics.

Kidd, Michael (trans) 2004. *Don Juan, Ladykiller of Seville.* Unpublished script.

Larson, Catherine (trans) 1999. *Friendship Betrayed.* Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Maraniss, James (trans) 2000. *Life is a Dream: Opera in Three Acts*. New York: Associated Music Publishers.

Marín, Juan María (ed) 1987. *Peribáñez y el comendador de Ocaña.* Madrid: Cátedra.

Matthews, Dakin (trans) 2006. *Don Juan, the Trickster of Seville.* North Hollywood: Andak Theatrical Services.

McGrath, David 2008. Interview with Jonathan Munby. In Boyle, Catherine and David Johnston (eds). *The Spanish Golden Age in English: Perspectives on Performance*. London: Oberon Books, 133-140.

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino (ed) 1971. La prueba de los ingenios*. Obras de Lope de Vega.* Madrid: BAE, 275-338.

Mitchell, Adrian and John Barton, (trans.) 1990. *Life is a Dream.* Woodstock: Dramatic Publishing.

[15] The Theatre Royal Bath brought to the stage three brand-new translations of Spanish Golden Age drama: *A Lady of Little Sense*, translated by David Johnston; *Don Gil of the Green Breeches*, translated by Sean O'Brien; and *Punishment without Revenge*, in a new translation by Meredith Oakes.

Ostlund, DeLys 2010. The transformation of *La prueba de los ingenios* into *The Labyrinth of Desire*: Adapting Lope de Vega for a Contemporary American Audience. *Comedia Performance* 7/1: 143-169.
Paun de Garcia, Susan and Donald R. Larson (eds) 2008. *The Comedia in English: Translation and Performance*. Woodbridge: Tamesis Books.
Paun de Garcia, Susan and Donald R. Larson 2008. The *Comedia* in English: An Overview of Translation and Performance. In Paun de Garcia, Susan & Donald R. Larson (eds) *The Comedia in English: Translation and Performance*. Woodbridge: Tamesis Books, 1-33.
Reed, Corey A. 2011. Calderonian Engines of Change: Performance, Design and Hybridity in Lewis Spratlan's Opera *Life is a Dream*. *Performance Studies* 9: 9-37.
Rivera, José (trans) 1999. *Sueño: A Play in Three Acts.* Woodstock: Dramatic Publishing.
Ronder, Tanya (trans) 2003. *Peribanez.* London: Nick Hern Books.
Ruano de la Haza, J. M. (ed) 1994. *La vida es sueño*. Madrid: Castalia.
Svich, Caridad (trans) 2006. *The Labyrinth of Desire, La prueba de los ingenios*. Unpublished script.
Thacker, Jonathan 1999. Rethinking Golden-Age drama: The *Comedia* in its Contexts. *Paragraph* 22: 14-34.
Thacker, Jonathan 2004. Review of *Peribáñez*. *Comedia Performance* 1/1: 260-265.
Thacker, Jonathan 2008. History of Performance in English. In Boyle, Catherine and Johnston, David (eds) *The Spanish Golden Age in English: Perspectives on Performance*. London: Oberon Books, 15-30.
Williamson, Laird (trans) 2001. *Life is a Dream.* Oregon: The Official Script of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival 2001 Production.
Zatlin, Phyllis 2005. *Theatrical Translation and Film Adaptation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Renaming Gender in Translation

Mirko Casagranda
University of Calabria

1. Gender and Translation

As seminal works like *Gender in Translation* by Sherry Simon (1996) and *Translation and Gender* by Luise von Flotow (1997) testify, in the last twenty years the interplay between Gender and Translation Studies has been particularly fruitful and has originated manifold approaches and methodologies that have broadened the scope of research in both areas. Among them I would like to mention what I have defined elsewhere (Casagranda 2011, 2013) as 'transgendering translations', a term that brings Transgender Studies to the fore and tries to put forward an epistemic framework that is the theoretical background to this article.

By *transgendering translation* I mean the translation of texts that subversively question gender as a non-homogenous and non-heteronormative category by showing its instability as a cultural paradigm and a linguistically performed social act. Such 'transgender texts' play with the structures of language, so that the gender opposition, embodied by personal pronouns like *she-he* in English or *elle-il* in French, is challenged. In other words, "the texts that present a non-dichotomous use of linguistic gender may be considered as transgender, because they contribute to the subversion of the binary system of the male/female divide" (Casagranda 2013: 115).[1] It is the case, for example, of a genderless narrator who speaks in the first-person singular and omits any anaphoric reference to gender-marked pronouns. This is possible, of course, in languages like English that are grammatically neuter.

When we translate such texts into a grammatically gendered language like Italian, however, we are often forced to assign gender to what has none in the source text because

[1] The term *transgender* is to be understood here in its broader sense, i.e. an umbrella term encompassing every social, cultural and linguistic practice that challenges the traditional and hegemonic assumption that 'male' and 'female' are monolithic, stable and oppositional categories.

there are no equivalent genderless structures in the target language. I metaphorically compare these translations to surgical sex reassignments operated on the bodies of hermaphrodites and intersex individuals and claim that such surgical translations "regender language as they regender human bodies and human identities" (Casagranda 2011: 210). From a literary and linguistic point of view, a text may be re-gendered too and made to conform to the hegemonic discourses on gender.

Since naming is one of the most pervasive and culturally rooted strategies to convey and shape one's identity, it goes without saying that the perception and representation of gender is moulded through and by names as well. Consequently when we cross gender in language and translation, i.e. when we either do not reveal gender or we shift from one gender to the other, we often do so by means of 'transgendering' naming practices. In other words, naming is to gender, as renaming is to crossing gender.

2. Naming Gender

The starting assumption of this article is the fact that "[t]he subject is at least in part constituted as a social being by being named" (Humphrey 2006: 158) and that "subjects are brought into existence and classified through speech acts such as naming" (vom Bruck 2006: 226). Indeed, together with the examination of a baby's sexual organs, naming is the first linguistic act a human being is identified with as soon as s/he comes to the world and becomes a member of society.

Building on John Stuart Mill's philosophy (1919), Saul Kripke defines proper names as singular referring terms, i.e. rigid designators that denote without connoting. In other words, a name – unlike a noun – refers to one referent only (even when the same name is used for different persons or places). Anderson points out that, according to Kripke, a name is not part of the linguistic system, since it contains "only a concept of a referent that gives access to encyclopaedic information, indiosyncratic information particular to that or those individuals that bear(s) the name" (Anderson 2007: 158). By denoting only, names are not descriptive, i.e. they do not describe any quality of their referent (despite the fact that they might have been chosen to bestow such quality on the name-bearer), and have no semantic property beyond onymic reference, i.e. they do not connote. Planet Venus, for instance, will (likely) always be identified by the name Venus, which is its rigid designator, even though a descriptive sentence like "the second closest planet to the Sun" could be used to replace it. On the other hand, such a name does not add anything to what the planet actually is – the reasons why it was named after the goddess of love and fertility are not taken into account.

As singular referring terms, proper names are similar to other linguistic structures, such as definite descriptions, e.g. *The King of France*, pronouns, e.g. *you, she*, demonstratives (deictic words), e.g. *this, that*, and indefinite descriptions, e.g. *a Martian* (Schwarz 1979: xi). From a Millian perspective, these structures have no meaning beyond their denotative function. Other approaches, however, have proved that this is not always the case, especially among non-western language systems. As a matter of fact, together with onomastics and the linguistics of names, anthropology and ethnography have also largely contributed to the study of names as part of syntactic and grammatical systems and as the expression of social information about gender, kinship, class, etc. Consequently, proper names "cannot simply refer to themselves, but rather need to be examined as words embedded in grammar that is made meaningful in a social world" (Bodenhorn and vom Bruck 2006: 8).

The categorial and not only the referential property of names (Anderson 2007: 119) is also proved by the fact that gender is often conveyed through names and that, on the other hand, there are hermaphroditic names (Anderson 2007: 112) that show no differentiation in gender.[2] Proper names, moreover, can be employed as social labels whenever a referent's distinctive quality is associated with the universally recognised feature(s) of a famous person, like Einstein, for an extremely clever person, or Mother Teresa, for a morally and religiously committed one (McConnell-Ginet 2003: 74).

Being embedded in culture and society, names have a sociopragmatic role that goes beyond the illocutionary function of speech acts. Indeed, "conferring a name (on someone or something) is a performative act that involves a subject-constituting power and takes place within a wider field of conventions and ideological relations" (Humphrey 2006: 158). Naming, thus, is a way of negotiating social and power relations, which means that through names we perform power in a process involving those who confer names and those who are named, as well as the connotations of those names.

Given that both naming and gender are performative acts, we can come to the conclusion that naming gender is also a linguistically and socially constructed performative speech act, encompassing practices of power that aim at maintaining the hegemonic gender dichotomy. Nevertheless, since "the named person is […] able to exert agency largely within and by means of linguistic conventions concerning when names may (or may not) be used" (Humphrey 2006: 159), it is possible to subvert the gender binary system by acts of re-appropriation, which, going back to the above-mentioned medical metaphor, are a refusal of surgical sex reassignment.

In other words, given the performativity of names and their semantic instability, i.e. the fact that names are not necessarily rigid designators, because their meaning is constantly negotiated, the named subject may exert power to manipulate, change and rename gender and to unsettle the naming practices that have forced a problematic gender identity upon him/her. Subjects, indeed, are empowered to exploit "the instability and possibilities of subversion that are inherent in the everyday reiteration of names and the reference order that their usage can both affirm and undermine" (Blom Hansen 2006: 203-204).

3. Renaming Gender in Translation

Transgender texts are discursive places where gender is constantly renamed and problematized by means of naming practices that can be classified as follows: a) the same name is maintained for both male and female referents; b) names are changed from masculine to feminine and vice versa; c) gendered names are avoided in favour of genderless or hermaphroditic ones; d) names are avoided *tout court*. An example of each strategy is briefly given in the following paragraph.

In *Orlando* by Virginia Woolf (1928), the same name – Orlando – is maintained after the protagonist morphs into a female body and shifts to a female identity.[3] In *Middlesex* by Jeffrey Eugenides (2002), on the other hand, the pseudo-hermaphrodite at the centre of the novel rejects the female name she has been identified with since her birth (Calliope, shortened as Callie) and renames her/himself as Cal, after deciding against the surgical sex reassignment that would turn him/her into a biologically female human being. Whereas *Love Child* by Maureen Duffy (1971) presents a genderless character with a gender-neuter name (Kit), the protagonist of *Self* by Yann Martel (1996) is nameless. The last three novels are all written in the first-person singular, which is a common narrative device when the gender ambiguity of the main character is the key element of the plot.

---

[2] Hermaphroditic names may not always be considered as such. Indeed, over the years, names may shift from one gender to the other (and vice versa) and undergo a phase during which they refer simultaneously to male and female referents.

[3] During the writing process of *Orlando,* however, Virginia Woolf considered using the name Orlanda as well (Palusci 2011: 224).

What are the consequences for the translator of such texts? This is an apparently easy task, since a name is “strictly untranslatable” (Anderson 2007: 158), which means that, whenever a name is found in the source text, it should be maintained in the target text. How come, then, that Alessandra Scalero, the Italian translator of *Orlando*, translated the sentence “he was a woman” (Woolf 1998: 97) as “Orlando era una donna” (Woolf 1996: 93)? Generally speaking, the shift from proper name to other singular terms (especially pronouns and demonstratives), and vice versa, is not particularly problematic, as they are singular referring terms used also for onymic reference. In this particular case, the name Orlando has been chosen over the third-person singular pronoun *egli*, although in Italian it sounds more natural to omit the subject pronoun. The sentence “era una donna”, however, would fail to convey the striking opposition between “he” and “woman” which is at the core of the novel; hence the replacement with Orlando, which translates the gender property of the English third-person singular pronoun “he”.

The shift from proper names to other singular terms, however, can be extremely problematic in source texts where the gender of the subject is not clearly specified or is not even mentioned. Assigning gender in translation to what has none, by misusing and mistranslating proper names and other referring terms, is what I label “renaming gender in translation”, i.e. a practice of surgical translation that manipulates the gender identity of the characters and hijacks the gender discourse of the source text. Moreover, since proper names are not linguistically independent from the morpho-syntactic system in which they are used, the morphemes that mark gender in grammatically gendered languages, e.g. adjective and past participle endings, should be taken into account when dealing with proper names and singular referring terms in translation, because they must be in concord with the subject.

Indeed, when we translate a sentence like “I was born twice” (Eugenides 2002: 3) as “Sono nato due volte” (Eugenides 2003: 11), we use the Italian androcentric form expressed by the past participle *nato* and, at the same time, we assign a specific gender (male) to a referent that in the source text has an ambiguous gender. In so doing, we are renaming the protagonist of the novel way before s/he actually decides to do so. Even though it is true that the narrator is telling his story at the age of forty, i.e. years after he decided to live as a man, the Italian translation ought to maintain the gender-neutrality of the source text by means of another tense, like the past historic *nacqui*, which is used for the same structure elsewhere in the novel: “I was born a week after New Year’s” (Eugenides 2002: 17)/ “Nacqui una settimana dopo Capodanno” (Eugenides 2003: 28).

The examples taken from *Orlando* and *Middlesex* are but two of the several cases that are found in transgender texts and transgendering translations, where genderless names are omitted or replaced by gendered singular terms and the gender-neuter language of the source text is manipulated so that gender is reshaped through naming strategies. Besides a thorough development of the theoretical framework, such analysis does indeed deserve extensive study and opens up to further investigations.

References

Anderson, John M. 2007. *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blom Hansen, Thomas. 2006. Where Names Fall Short: Names as Performances in Contemporary Urban South Africa. In Gabriele vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn (eds). *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 201-224.

Bodenhorn Barbara and Gabriele vom Bruck. 2006. “Entangled in History”: An Introduction to the Anthropology of Names and Naming. In Gabriele vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn (eds). *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-30.

Casagranda, Mirko. 2011. Trans/Gendering Translations? Crossing Gender in Translation. In Eleonora Federici (ed.). *Translating Gender*. Bern: Peter Lang, 205-214.

Casagranda, Mirko. 2013. Bridging the Genders? Transgendering Translation Theory and Practice. In Eleonora Federici and Vanessa Leonardi (eds). *Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice in Translation and Gender Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 112-121.

Duffy, Maureen. 1994 (1971). *Love Child*. London: Virago Press.

Eugenides, Jeffrey. 2002. *Middlesex*. London: Bloomsbury.
Eugenides, Jeffrey. 2003 (2002). *Middlesex*. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori, Italian translation by Katia Bagnoli.
Humphrey, Caroline. 2006. On Being Named and Not Named: Authority, Persons and Their Names in Mongolia. In Gabriele vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn (eds). *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 158-176.
Martel, Yann. 1996. *Self*. London: faber and faber.
McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 2003. "What's in a Name?" Social Labeling and Gender Practice. In Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff (eds). *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. Oxford: Blackwell, 69-97.
Mill, John Stuart. 1919 (1843). *A System of Logic Ratiocinative and Inductive: Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific Investigation*. London: Longmans.
Palusci, Oriana. 2011. 'He was a woman'. Translating Gender in Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*. In Eleonora Federici (ed.). *Translating Gender*. Bern: Peter Lang, 215-226.
Schwarz, David S. 1979. *Naming and Referring. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Singular Terms*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Translation*. London: Routledge.
vom Bruck, Gabriele. 2006. Names as Bodily Signs. In Gabriele vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn (eds). *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 226-250.
von Flotow, Luise. 1997. *Translation and Gender. Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
Woolf, Virginia. 1998 (1928). *Orlando*. London: Penguin.
Woolf, Virginia. 1996 (1928). *Orlando*. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori. Italian translation by Alessandra Scalero.

Translation Transformations of Noun Phrases in EU Documents

Mihaela Cozma
University of the West, Timişoara

1. Introduction

Producing a good translation, be it of the literary or of the specialized type, involves the appropriate and comprehensive rendering of the source text material into a different language. Since it is now widely agreed that the translator is not supposed to reproduce word-for-word the format of the original, but to create a similar semantic and stylistic effect, it is obvious that the linguistic features of the target text are not expected to closely mirror those displayed by its source. In other words, the translated text presents a set of specific lexical, syntactic and discoursal features and these features are only partly determined by those of the original; on the one hand, they may be also influenced by the rules of the target language as a system and by norms of usage valid in the target culture in the case of each particular type of texts, on the other.

As an illustration of the manner in which the translation is influenced by the format of the source text and conforms, at the same time, to the various norms of the target context, this paper will focus on the transformations undergone by certain syntactic structures in legal texts as a result of the process of translation from English into Romanian. More specifically, the paper will analyze the noun phrases characteristically displayed by EU legislative texts originally written in English in comparison to their official Romanian translations. For this purpose, I have selected a bilingual corpus of texts which, according to the Directory of European Union legislation (cf. http://eur-lex.europa.eu), represent typical examples of "legislation in use" (i.e., regulations, decisions, directives, agreements concluded by the member states as a result of their external relations, etc.). I also want to mention that reference to the EU documents that I have analyzed is made by means of the CELEX number (e.g. 32010R0778, 22013A0302), which is a unique combination of symbols consisting of elements like the code of the sector to which the document belongs, the year in which the document was adopted, the type of document (represented by a letter) and the number of the document, made up of four figures.

2. Aspect of noun phrase complexity

At the syntactic level, one of the most striking characteristics displayed by the legal discourse – in its realization both as English and as Romanian texts – is represented by the high frequency and the extraordinary complexity of the noun phrases, in the sense that many of the features in any given stretch of language are operating within the structure of a nominal group. This general characteristic of the EU documents in my corpus should actually come as no surprise, since a similar aspect was noted both by the researchers involved in the study of legal English (e.g. Crystal and Davy 1969, Danet 1985, Bhatia 1993) and by those interested in the language of the Romanian normative documents (e.g. Stoichiţoiu-Ichim 2001).

On a closer examination of the noun phrases in the EU texts, one of the first features noticed by the discourse analyst is the marked preference for rich modification. Even if this feature is present both in the English and in the Romanian texts, the two linguistic variants of the EU documents also reveal some differences that must be pointed out here.

Thus, in the English texts, pre-modification is well illustrated, but is generally determined by grammatical rules and not by the text producer's intentions, being mostly represented by a series of adjectives that can only take a pre-head position: e.g. "*efficient* management" (32011R0973), "*military* headquarters" (22011A0930(01)), etc. The texts also contain nouns in pre-modification, which are preferred to prepositional phrase post-modifiers, probably because they are associated with a more synthetic form of expression, typical of English: e.g. "throughout the *project* cycle" (32009D0336), "*tractor* categories" (32010L0062), etc.

The Romanian counterparts of English pre-modifying adjectives and nouns are generally placed after their head nouns, as the translations of the examples offered above clearly illustrate: "gestionare *eficientă*" (cf. "*efficient* management" – 32011R0973), "cartierul general *militar*" (cf. "*military* headquarters" – 22011A0930(01)), "pe parcursul ciclului *proiectului*" (cf. "throughout the *project* cycle" – 32009D0336), "categoriile de *tractoare*" (cf. "*tractor* categories" – 32010L0062). This indicates that pre-modification in the Romanian texts is rather poorly represented. In spite of that, the translated texts in my corpus reveal at least two situations when the pre-modifying position of a certain element is dictated by features that are mainly stylistic:

a) Even if the adjective could have been placed after its head noun, the text producer chooses to use a pre-modifying position in order to give it some emphasis or, maybe to achieve a greater balance and elegance of expression: e.g. "*noi* proiecte şi programe" (32009D0336) (cf. the English "new projects and programmes"), "*propriile* tabele" (32009L0082) (cf. the English "their own tables"). In close relation to this, I must mention the cases when, in addition to an adjective, a certain noun is also modified by other elements, and one or two of these modifiers are placed before the noun, while the other(s) follow(s) it: e.g. "*respectivul* stat *terț*" (22011A0930(01)) (cf. the English "that other State"), "*noile* date *transmise*" (32010L0054) (cf. the English "the new data submitted"). Since the choice of the adjective that precedes the head noun is not grammatically regulated, the result is a noun phrase which gives certain emphasis to the pre-modifying element.

b) The adjective and the noun it pre-modifies are constituents of some set phrase or expression: e.g. "*libera* circulaţie" (32011R0492) (cf. the English "freedom of movement"), "*bune* practici" (32009H0708) (cf. the English "good practice"), "*prezenta* directivă" (32010L0054) (cf. the English "this Directive"). Here we deal with the translator's choice of an expression as a whole, as dictated by the lexico-semantic norms of usage functioning in the Romanian context.

The aspects discussed so far represent sound arguments in support of the idea that the remarkable complexity characterizing EU texts is due to the presence of both pre- and post-modifiers in the case of the English documents and mainly to the use of multiple post-modification in the Romanian translations of these texts. Drawing on Pârlog (1995: 95, 124), the complexity of a noun phrase generally manifests itself under three forms: (1) more than one modification applies to a single head, (2) the modification contains an item to which, in turn, some further modification is added and (3) the modification applies to more than one head. I must stress that the pattern which may be considered characteristic of the vast majority of the noun groups in this type of discourse is one which combines at least two, if not all the three possibilities presented above:

> ST: "The number and percentage *of checks, broken down in* <u>*substitution*</u> *checks* and <u>*specific substitution*</u> *checks referred to in paragraphs 2 and 2a of Article 10, carried out* per <u>*customs*</u> office *of exit where the products for which a refund is claimed leave the* <u>*Community's customs*</u> territory."/ TT: "Numărul și procentul *de controale, defalcat pe controale de substituție și controale de substituție specifice*, prevăzute la articolul 10 alineatele (2) și (2a), *executate pe birou vamal de ieșire în cazul în care produsele pentru care se solicită restituiri părăsesc teritoriul vamal al Comunității."* (32008R0159)

3. A comparative approach to noun phrase structure

As regards the means of expressing the various modifiers found in the analysed noun phrases, the English and the Romanian variants of the EU texts display both important similarities and considerable differences.

The most important feature shared by the two linguistic versions of the documents is that, in most situations, the modifiers are expressed by nouns: e.g. "distortions *of competition*"/ "denaturarea *concurenței*" (32009L0056); "a request *for an exemption*"/ "o cerere *de scutire*" (32011R0969), etc.

I must stress that, in the Romanian documents in my corpus, the percentage of modifying nouns is even greater than in the case of their English sources. This happens because the participles and the gerunds, which are so numerous in the English documents, are very frequently rendered by Romanian nominal elements: e.g. "the Treaty *establishing* the European Community"/ "Tratatul *de instituire* a Comunităţii Europene" (32009L0002), "by *drawing* on the principles underlying a CQAF"/ "prin *stabilirea* principiilor care stau la baza CCAC" (32009H0708), "any person suspected of *attempting* to commit, *committing* or having committed acts of piracy"/ "orice persoană suspectată de *tentativa* de a săvârși, de *săvârșirea* sau de a fi săvârșit acte de piraterie" (32011A0930(01)). Besides such target text nouns used as translation solutions for certain English non-finite verb forms, the Romanian texts in my corpus also contain instances of modifying nouns whose role is to render the meaning of some original finite clauses: e.g. "ensure *that* information *is disseminated* to stakeholders effectively"/ "să asigure *diseminarea* eficientă a informației în rândul părților interesate" (32009H0708).

Moreover, sometimes, as a result of explicitation, the Romanian translations of the EU documents use modifying nouns even in contexts where the source text employs an adjective: e.g. "*ocupational* safety"/ "siguranţă *la locul de muncă*" (32010L0062), "*technical* projects"/ "proiecte *cu caracter tehnic*" (32009D0336). But situations like these represent the exception rather than the rule.

A special place among the adjectival modifiers is that of the adjectives derived from past participles, whose status is generally preserved in the process of translation from English into Romanian: e.g. "the criteria *laid down* in Directives 92/66/EEC), …"/ "criteriile *stabilite* în Directivele 92/66/CEE, …" (32013D0347), "acts of the institutions *adopted* prior to accession"/ "acte ale instituțiilor *adoptate* înainte de data aderării"

(32013L0015). These adjectives, which may be interpreted as reduced relative clauses with verbs in the passive voice, make an important contribution to the concision of the discourse under analysis.

Fairly often, post-modifiers are represented by relative clauses, which contribute to the complexity of the sentence and represent, at the same time, an important means of ensuring its clarity: e.g. "That exchange of information should also cover 'near misses' *which Member States regard as being of particular technical interest* …."/ "Respectivul schimb de informații ar trebui să acopere, de asemenea, "evenimentele la limita de producere a unui accident" *pe care statele membre le consideră ca fiind de interes tehnic special* …." (32012L0018).

It must be noted that the Romanian EU documents contain more relative clauses than their sources, because modifiers of this type are often used as translation solutions for other types of syntactic elements present in the English variant of the documents, such as:

- non-finite forms of the verb:

> e.g. " … the assessment of the amounts *to be excluded* on grounds of non-compliance with European Union rules …"/ "evaluarea sumelor *care trebuie excluse* din motive de neconformitate cu normele Uniunii Europene …" (32013D0123)

- adjectives:

> e.g. "projects in the field of higher education *eligible for funding* …"/ "proiectele din domeniul învățământului superior *care pot fi finanțate* ..." (32009D0336)

- or even nouns:

> e.g. " Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 … laying down specific hygiene rules *for food of animal origin* " / "Regulamentul (CE) nr. 853/2004 … de stabilire a unor norme specifice de igienă *care se aplică alimentelor de origine animală*." (32011R0045)

The reason why the Romanian variants of the EU texts make frequent use of relative clauses is that, by clearly delimiting the reference of the word they modify, such structures generally increase the explicitness of the translated texts. However, there are situations when their use results in structures which are quite difficult to follow. The example below, in which the resulting Romanian text contains several relative clauses, supports my statement:

> ST: "… it is necessary to provide for a period of protection with respect to the *proprietary* information submitted in support of the approval of such active substances or the authorisation of biocidal products *containing them which is longer than the period of protection for information concerning existing active substances and biocidal products* containing them."

> TT: " … este necesar să se prevadă o perioadă de protecție pentru informațiile *<u>pentru care</u> există drept de proprietate*, prezentate în sprijinul aprobării acestor substanțe active sau al autorizării produselor biocide *<u>care</u> le conțin, <u>care</u> să depășească perioada de protecție a informațiilor cu privire la substanțele active existente și la produsele biocide <u>care</u> le conțin*." (32012R0528)

There are rather rare instances when the Romanian translator tries to preserve the synthetic form of expression characterizing the original texts and renders the participial modifiers of the English texts by means of gerunds: e.g. "The monitoring processes, *including* a combination of internal and external evaluation mechanisms, have to be defined by Member States …"/ "Procesele de monitorizare *incluzând* o combinație între mecanismele interne și externe de evaluare trebuie definite de statele membre …" (32009H0708). As opposed to English, such structures are less frequent in the Romanian everyday language use and, consequently, present a greater degree of formality than the potential relative clauses that could have been used instead.

All the pre- and post-modifiers discussed so far cluster around their head nouns and, sometimes, further take their own modifiers, thus leading to the formation of very complex nominal groups. However, the agglomeration of modifiers and the placement of all the modifying elements as close as possible to the word they are meant to qualify may, indeed, reduce ambiguity, but sometimes lead to sentences which are awkward both grammatically and stylistically, as is the case of the fragment below:

> ST: *"Commission Regulation (EU) No 778/2010 of 2 September 2010 approving non-minor amendments to the specification for a name entered in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications"*
>
> TT: "*Regulamentul (UE) nr. 778/2010 al Comisiei din 2 septembrie 2010 de aprobare a unor modificări care nu sunt minore ale caietului de sarcini al unei denumiri înregistrate în Registrul denumirilor de origine protejate și al indicațiilor geografice protejate*" (32010R0778)

4. Conclusion

The analysis of the noun phrases present in EU documents has revealed that the English and the Romanian nominal groups are similar in that they are characterized by a great number of constituents and in that many of the modifying constituents are expressed by nouns. However, in addition to this type of modifiers, the nominal phrases characterizing the English texts also contain adjectives as well as many non-finite forms of the verb; the latter are generally rendered into Romanian either as relative clauses, by means of expansion, or, again, with the help of nouns. Due to the type of constituents present in the Romanian noun phrases, the language of the translated EU documents has a rather "nouny" character and, therefore, sometimes, the formulation becomes awkward. The constituents of the noun phrases in the English EU documents, on the other hand, present a greater typological variety, reflecting, at the same time, a more synthetic form of expression.

From a practical perspective, the comparative analysis performed in this paper might point to some of the translation problems that the Romanian translator working in this field is likely to encounter. I must stress, however, that, by relating the results of my research to the real translation behaviour, my intention is not to suggest appropriate translation solutions for the type of texts in discussion. In line with the suggestions made by the Descriptive Translation Studies (cf. Toury 1995: 17), I consider that such scientific and research findings may help the world of translation experience reach certain conclusions, but the conclusions must be drawn by the practitioners themselves and not by the theorists or the researchers of the field.

References

Bhatia, V. K. 1993. *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.

Crystal, D. and D. Davy. 1969. *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.

Danet, B. 1985. *Legal Discourse*. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol.1: Disciplines of Discourse*. London: Academic Press – Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, pp. 273-291.

Pârlog, Hortensia 1995.*The English Noun Phrase*. Timişoara: Hestia.

Stoichiţoiu-Ichim, A. 2001. *Semiotica discursului juridic*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Access to European Union law: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/

For a Clear Definition of the Discipline of Translation Studies, or Why the Earth is Not Flat

Florence Lautel-Ribstein
Université d'Artois, France

1. Introduction

Over the last thirty years in France, the word "traductology" has led to numerous and sometimes polemical publications. It is a *non-equivalent* equivalent of the expression "Translation Studies" that is supposed to completely cover this discipline. Its ambition is to reflect on translation practices and the associated theories they give rise to, as well as on the history of translation. The "traductology" commentary required at the competitive examinations for future teachers in French secondary schools has done little to improve things. In fact, it has rather gone against the research in the international community of translation specialists, because of a lack of clear definition of what "translation[al]ist" and "traductology" actually mean, as well as of both a real and official recognition of this discipline as an independent section within the framework of the CNU (The National Committee for Universities).

Indeed, the "traductology" commentary, which, for the sake of intellectual honesty, should perhaps be called by its real name, an exercise in applied linguistics, contradicts the scientific development of this field nationally and internationally, because of its isolation from all the disciplines that translation studies actually overlap. It has quite naturally made a great number of professional and university translators snigger, philosophers of language shrug their shoulders, made literature specialists sigh, and created feelings of embarrassment among numerous linguists, who usually prefer less sterile and more fruitful issues related to translational approaches. And, one must add, rightly so: for the earth is *not* flat. The dominant model for the "traductology" commentary by those who prepare for the competitive examinations is based on the use of dictionaries and manuals, and focuses on language acts only. It is also one that values directly or indirectly the dissociation of semantic processing *out of* context and pragmatic processing *in* context where, according to Pierre Cadiot (2010: 14), "the signification of a word is first the object of fixation and 'referential' as well as 'ontological' individuation, that assumes globally a certain atomism of meaning coupled to categories of entities – or objects – and syntactic configurations" (my translation)[1]. This approach favours a type of "realism" and allows for a first fixed relationship between / perception / representation / conscience on the one hand, and language on the other. The well-known triangle for "designation, referencing and categorisation" outlined by Georges Kleiber (1999) allows us to point out that the lexicon is here understood as being, Cadiot (2010: 15) says, "a completed and prior synthesis, and reserves the examination of improperly adapted usages for the next stage, where secondary mechanisms related to derivation or inference intervene"(my translation)[2]. If this is the basis for the teaching of translation to our students, well then, yes, the earth *is* flat. And flat will also be, *ipso facto*, the translations they will produce. Indeed a translation reveals quite a great deal and a lot more than one imagines: its coherence and its unity – or their absence – show the depth of reflection that

[1] " … la signification d'un mot fait d'abord l'objet d'une première fixation, d'une première individuation ' référentielle' et 'ontologique', assumant globalement un certain atomisme du sens couplé à des entités – ou objets – catégoriels et s'appuyant à des configurations (syntaxiques) ".

[2] " une synthèse achevée et préalable, et réserve l'examen d'emplois mal ajustés à un second temps, où interviennent des mécanismes secondaires de dérivation ou d'inférence ".

has been problematized, the possible attachment to language acts alone, with disregard for discourse analysis or, on the contrary, the taking into account – especially for a literary text – of the process of subjectivation to the work in the source text following the critical positioning of the translator.

Need one be reminded that the aim of Translation Studies is to translate better and not simply to engage oneself *a posteriori* in a descriptive linguistic exercise of the act of translation? Never in the living memory of translation specialists has such an exercise improved a single translation by a student. The proof is in the undeniable quality of the translations of some students and their poor performance in the above-mentioned linguistic commentary or, *a contrario* (and especially), the quality performances of other students in the so-called "traductology" exercise, and their persistently mediocre translations in spite of years of preparation for the monolithic analysis of these "language acts". It is high time, therefore, to turn away from the classical and mechanical sign theory (signifier / signified) and its avatars, and move towards more rewarding translational strategies that are often incompatible with the desire for over simplification of the discipline, even for the sake of pedagogical purposes.

Two points need to be clarified rapidly. They concern:

- the definition of the discipline and the expertise of those who are deemed to represent it;
- a larger and more structured basis of reflection on the translational approach taught at university.

2. What is "Traductology" or Translation Studies?

Forced marriages have never been a good thing. In France, the example of Translation Studies and Applied Linguistics is no exception. It has eliminated a good number of potential candidates from the field of translation research and continues to do so because of a certain confusion that reigns in this area.

So what is a translation[al]ist or Translation Studies expert?

Such a specialist is:

a) a *practicing translator*: a practitioner is someone who has been involved in literary translations for a long time and who translates and publishes works whether in the literary or more specialised fields. A lecturer in translation is a person who sometimes has reluctantly accepted to give courses on the subject at his university, following the not so extinct belief that translation is simply an ancillary activity; s/he is not necessarily a translation specialist. Translating is a highly demanding activity. It is time-consuming, requires investment and immense modesty. Expertise in this domain can only (if ever) be achieved after dealing with those works that resist translation.

b) a *translation theorist,* or at least someone who has meditated upon the relationship between language and reality, language and perception, the semiotic system and process and language, as well as the link between language theories and translation theories. In short, someone who explores the three fields of Translation Studies: the *pragmatical* (the study of translation practice); the *analytical* (the study of translations from a theoretical perspective on language); the *critical* (the study of discourse on translation). The theorist, who is aware of and draws from the debate between different specialities such as philosophy, linguistics, semiotics, literary criticism, sociology, psychology on the one side, and Translation Studies on the other side, remains nevertheless someone who sets the cornerstones for a theoretical approach arising from practice, and *not* the opposite. The translation process is so rich and complex that it becomes a virtual necessity to draw from all these fields in order to support its practice and discern the "theorems for translation" (to use the well-known title of a key work in translation theory) and not to artificially apply theory to practice.

c) a *historian of translation*. We translate into a given culture that has its own values which nourish the horizon of expectancy for the translator and the reader of translations. The historian is also a researcher who contributes to this vast, demanding and necessary academic enterprise; in the French Sorbonne, under the supervision of Jean-Yves Masson and Yves Chevrel, with the publication of the *History of Translations into French* (Editions Verdier, 2012), such researchers have taken a critical, lucid look at themselves and have become aware of belonging to a sociolinguistic group at a given moment in the history of translation theory and practice. If we cannot translate as people did at the time of the *Belles Infidèles*, we still need to know why. Whether we decide to use rhyme or not when translating poetry, we still need to know the history of rhyme and the history of the translation of rhyme in order to make a choice.

d) a *specialist in the subject* s/he translates. A simple cliché? For literature specialists, knowledge not only of the work to be translated, but of *all* the writer's works, of the genre and the period when the text was created is an obvious necessity. But what is obvious is far from always being done. Let us just take a single example: the first page of *The Waves* by Virginia Woolf in its different translations. Here we notice that the phenomenological approach, underpinning the exploration of the observer's point of view, extends down to the rhythmic movements of the sentence. How many translators have taken into account this philosophical view of perception? How many of them make us relive and physically feel the movement of the waves through the ebb and flow of the phrasing?

Not everyone can be a translation[al]ist. Translation Studies are a complete and difficult discipline that requires the mastery of numerous specialities, a great deal of humility when faced with the complexity of the task, and a mind that is open to diverse intellectual horizons, with applied linguistics covering just a very small part of one of the possible sources for reflection in this field. A lack of interest in any area can have unfortunate consequences for the quality of the translations, but also for the teaching of the subject in our universities and therefore the training of students studying translation. Official recognition of this discipline and the work of the translators/translation[al]ists is overdue. Such recognition would be the right response. It would eliminate from the outset any amateurism in this area and allow future PhD students to be supervised by those academics who provide the appropriate guarantees.

3. Learning to translate not words, but points of access to the world

An exploration of the "meaning" compacted in a segment of discourse (morpheme, word, set phrase, sentence…) would need to be explained in advance in order to create a better framework for the understanding of the resolutely holistic or global nature of any linguistic product, and therefore of any translation. What translation practice teaches is the need for an analysis of discourse even before language acts. Indeed, we learn from the literary text that there is no possible realism with an ontolgy of meaning as a precondition. The pragmatics proposed in the eighties by Ray Jackendoff or Geoffrey Nunberg, from which a certain form of "traductology" evolved, still prevails. If it adapted the interpretation to the context, it always did so downstream, from a morpho-lexical, codified and conventional meaning. The appeal of inference came back to legitimize its first individuation, without taking into consideration its predicative, argumentative, discursive, figurative or polysemic destiny. The "signifier" remained the isomorphic correlate of the "signified", the *viaticum* of content, in the form of minimal units of meaning, substantial features, etc. The translator of literary texts is first to learn very quickly to separate himself/herself at all costs from any dogmatic desire to fix the meaning of words. Merleau-Ponty (1964:131-32) already emphasised in the following way that:

> 'the unequivocal meaning is only a part of the meaning of the word… there is always, somewhere beyond, a halo of meaning that manifests itself in new and unexpected directions, … there is language working on itself that, even in the absence of other invitations, sets language off on another adventure, and makes an enigma of the meaning of the word itself'[3]. (my translation.)

The subsequent stage in this logic, and a particularly dangerous path to follow, is the one we enter in order to understand and translate figurative, metaphorical, analogical or fixed meanings as secondary, where any "signified" finds itself with a value that is commonly called "literal". When translating literature, there is no marginalization of phenomena such as metaphoricity, polysemy, etc. On the contrary, they tirelessly return to centre stage, as they are at the heart of the translation process. Similarly, we may doubt the ontological organisation of words into grammatical categories, qualities, states, etc. The difference between substances and qualities or between entities of the first degree (and the second) forces the translator not to invest in organising semantico-notional fields with their logical links to describe the world of experience, but to rebound towards lesser known semantic horizons, to leave his/her mark on writing that reflects the discontinuous nature of semantic values, their fuzziness, or even their "sloppy identity".

All of this leads to an apprehension of meaning, first of all as perception, and not as conceptualization and representation. Words refer back firstly to *qualities of presence*. For Jean-Jacques Rousseau, meaning is first of all figurative and metaphoric. For Georges Gusdorf, they are *indexes of value* (1992:12). In short, words have to be seen as access points to situational experiences rather than representational ones, or associated by the speaker of the text to values under construction or just being reshaped. Translation refers back to a second "world" under construction, an open work, and not the stacking up of isolatable entities. In literary translations especially, notions of category, reference, naming actually appear very late in the semantic genesis. Cadiot (2013: 30) speaks about a "hyletic skein (i. e. pure sensations), an aggregate of *affordances*, or again, *proto-predications* covering et recovering the perceptual and discursive field of its presence" (my translation). Such an analysis fits in with a sort of methodology for translation that we can use by taking Merleau-Ponty's definition of perspective (1945: 380):

> 'I do not have a particular perspective, and then another, and between them a degree of understanding, but each perspective enters the other and, if we were to use the word synthesis, it would be a 'transitional synthesis'[4].

In literary translations, when the holist approach is applied to the principle of transposing values to access meaning, with a view to analysing the discourse, it has a twofold benefit: it enables an understanding of the literariness of the text in greater depth and prevents the translator from any attempt at a purely source-centred translation, given that the target text constructs and reconstructs itself from new clues in a perceptive network. In order to give a few examples of general principles for translation, we could also reflect on two *semiotic systems* that are more or less in line with the general translational approach we advocate:

a) *Polyphony*, the fact that discourse can be attributed to several voices, the speaker, the interlocutor, the narrator, the common voice, etc. Polyphony can cross

---

[3] "La signification univoque n'est qu'une partie de la signification du mot… il y a toujours au-delà un halo de signification qui se manifeste dans des modes d'emploi nouveaux et inattendus, … il y a une opération du langage sur le langage qui, même à défaut d'autres invitations, relance le langage dans une nouvelle histoire, et fait de la signification de mot, elle-même, une énigme."

[4] "Je n'ai pas une perspective, puis une autre, et entre elles une liaison d'entendement, mais chaque perspective passe dans l'autre et, si l'on peut encore parler de synthèse, il s'agit d'une « synthèse de transition ».

through the fabric of grammar; certain discourse connectors (*well, always,* etc.) are the traces of someone else's implicit discourse.

b) *Autonymy*, a characteristic whereby discourse has the ability to *show itself*, to present its own case.

In these two situations, we shall retain the principle (for targeteers in translation) of *discursive modulation*, *polysemic unbundling* working on the hermeneutic resources of the target language.

Textual semantics with its consequences for a translational approach based on discourse analysis is far from being the only possible basis for the teaching of Translation Studies. Alongside the theory of semantic forms by Cadiot and Visetti (2001), we have in semiotics, the theory of instances of enunciation by Jean-Claude Coquet (2007), who creates a continuum between language, world and being; or following the cognitivist approach, the theory of cognemes" by Didier Bottineau (2012), who highlights the role the signifier plays in the emergence of representations. All of these theories allow principles for translation to be constructed and express the great limitations of an approach based both on the fragmentation of the text into isolated units and an excessive attachment to one ontological layer of meaning. The absence of such theories in the teaching of Translation Studies could well lead back to fetishizing the source text through a series of words-concepts.

Galileo might disapprove.

References

Bottineau, Didier 2012. La poésie multilingue de Roy Eales: "le corps entre quatre langues" ou la pratique de l'inverbation". In *Revue SEPTET* 3, 271-88.

Cadiot, Pierre et Yves-Marie Visetti 2001. *Pour une théorie des formes sémantiques*. Paris: P.U.F.

Cadiot, Pierre 2010. Individuation et idées confuses. In *La Tribune Internationale des Langues Vivantes* 48, 14-25.

Cadiot, Pierre 2013. Sémantique, traduction et micro-circulations du sens. In *Revue SEPTET* 4, 30-40.

Cadiot, Pierre et Florence Lautel-Ribstein 2011. Entretien avec Pierre Cadiot et Florence Lautel-Ribstein : Théorie des formes sémantiques : un tournant épistémologique en traduction . In *Revue Translationes* 3, 261-70.

Coquet, Jean-Claude 2007. *Phusis et logos. Une phénoménologie du langage*. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

Gusdorf, Georges 1992, 12 éd. *La parole*. Paris: PUF.

Kleiber, Georges 1999. *Problèmes de sémantique*. Lille: Presses du Septentrion.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 1945. *La phénoménologie de la perception.* Paris: Gallimard.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 1961. *La prose du monde.* Paris: Gallimard.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 1964. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Paris: Gallimard.

ON HUMAN AMBITION

The Living Image: Biographical Narratives in Presidential Campaigns

Anna Romagnuolo
Università della Tuscia, Viterbo

The purpose of this study is to highlight recurrent features in US presidential advertising campaigns, with a particular focus on TV electoral commercials and autobiographical films used at national conventions to extol the nominee's virtues and boost his popularity. The typical generic structure of presidential candidates' campaign stories, greatly exploiting family-life narratives and national myths, will be examined both in TV adverts and political films for their relevance to individual and collective self-representation.