Translating as a Way of Producing Knowledge across Boundaries

Hélène Buzelin

This chapter is an attempt at recontextualising and furthering an early contribution in which I explored the relations between translation studies, ethnography and the production of knowledge (cf. Buzelin, 2004/2007). The first part presents the sources of inspiration and research that had nourished, at the time, this understanding of translation as a way of producing knowledge across boundaries. As more than fifteen years have passed since this piece was written, the second part questions, with the benefit of hindsight, to what extent this conception of translation has made its way and is now well accepted in translation practice, research and training. Elements of the answer are searched in TS literature on the topic.

1 The Context and Sources of Inspiration

To begin with, it is worth recalling that the chapter entitled "Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge" was originally written and published in French in the translation journal Meta.

1.1 Stories of Translation and Migration

Soon after its publication, Paul St-Pierre, a senior colleague at Université de Montréal, offered to translate this article into English so as to include it in a collective volume he was preparing with Prafulla C. Kar and which

came out under the title In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations (cf. St-Pierre & Kar, 2005). Two years after its release at Pencraft India, a new edition was published in the "translation library" series by John Benjamins, both in print and in digital format. These changes in the language (from French to English), the status (article to chapter) and the format (print to digital) of the initial text—made possible thanks to intellectual affinities and professional ties—are in themselves revealing of how ideas (and knowledge) are produced and how they circulate through multiple forms of translation. Among its contributors, the volume edited by St-Pierre and Kar contained two chapters that will be referred to below: "Translation and society: the Emergence of a Relationship" by Daniel Simeoni (the opening chapter of the book) and "Translation and Métissage" by Alexis Nouss.

The 2004 article published in Meta was to a large extent informed by a doctoral research (1997–2002)[1] conducted at the department of French language and literature of McGill University (Montréal, Canada). The latter had developed expertise, both practical and theoretical, in the translation of literary sociolects (particularly in American literature) thanks to the works of Annick Chapdelaine and Gillian Lane-Mercier (1994/1997/2001) as well as Judith Lavoie (1994/1997/2002). Inspired by the research produced by these scholars, but moving away from the American domain, the research I undertook would address the challenges of translating into French English Caribbean fictions making use of vernacular languages. Another decision, in line with the work that had been done previously at McGill, was to approach the question not only through an analysis of existing translations of English Caribbean creolized narratives, but also from a practical and reflexive viewpoint by trying to translate one particular novel. For this practical part, which constituted the core of the thesis, the choice was set on The Lonely Londoners by Indo-Trinidadian writer Samuel Selvon.

This novel relates the experience of the so-called Windrush Generation, a generation of migrants from the British colonies, mostly but not

1 The doctoral thesis submitted in 2002 gave way to a monograph published three years later (cf. Buzelin, 2005).

exclusively from the West Indies, who came to London after World War II to help rebuild the country. Selvon, who belonged to this generation and who had migrated himself to Britain in 1950, expresses in a tragi-comic mode the daily life of those migrants: the initial fascination for the capital city, but also the racism, poverty and exclusion they faced, their solidarity, the loneliness, nostalgia, and longing for home. Beyond the topic, what made the novel unique was its style, as it was entirely narrated in a literary English very much informed by Trinidadian dialect, something unpreceded. The novel opens as follows:

> "One grim winter evening, when it had a kind of unrealness about London, with a fog sleeping restlessly over the city and the lights showing in the blur as if is not London at all but some strange place on another planet, Moses Aloetta hop on a number 46 bus at the corner of Chepstow Road and Westbourne Grove to go to Waterloo to meet a fellar who was coming from Trinidad on the boat-train." (Selvon, 1956, p. 7)

The reviews published at the time show that Selvon's prose let no critic indifferent[2]. Despite its longstanding success and its recognition, with time, as a classic[3], the book was translated in very few languages, and not in French. Hence my decision to try to take up the challenge, fully aware that it would be a difficult one, but hoping that the experience would be

2 Among the early reviews are the following: "cadenced prose which catches the special rhythms of the speech of the people without distortion or artifice."(cf. Baltimore Sunday Sun, 01/12/1956) "poetical novel [...] making effective use of dialect" (Times, 6/12/1956, p. 13); "the West Indian idiom in which it is written is (I feel) a literary trick rather than the author's authentic voice"; (Spectator, 14/12/1956, p. 882); "the idiom [...] is West Indian, with its curious grammar and slang words" (The Times Literary Supplement, 21/12/1956, p. 761); "written in the language of the Trinidad streets, a strange tongue that will be unfamiliar to most Barbarians and nearly all Englishmen and Americans" (Bim, 1956, p. 61).

3 After its release in American and Canadian publishing houses in the fifties, the novel was included in the Longman Caribbean Writers series in 1985, and in Penguin's Modern Classics series in 2006. In October 2018, it was picked up as the book of the month by the Guardian's Reading group.

enriching and produce some form of knowledge. This decision was to a large extent inspired by Antoine Berman's definition of traductology.

1.2 Antoine Berman's Legacy

A key figure in contemporary translation studies and one of the founders of traductology in France, Antoine Berman (1942–1991) is, among other things, the author of The Experience of the Foreign. Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany[4] and Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne published posthumously in 1995[5]. In the opening chapter of the first essay, a chapter entitled "La traduction au manifeste" – rendered in English as "The Manifestation of translation" but that could also be read as "Translation Manifesto" –, he provides his definition of translation:

> "The very aim of translation—to open up in writing a certain relation with the Other, to fertilize what is one's Own through the mediation of what is Foreign—is diametrically opposed to the ethnocentric structure of every culture, that species of narcissism by which every society wants to be a pure unadulterated Whole. There is a tinge of the violence of cross-breeding in translation. […] The essence of translation is to be an opening, a dialogue, a cross-breeding, a decentering. Translation is 'a putting in touch with,' or it is nothing. (Berman transl. by Heyvaert, 1992, p. 4)[6]

4 The essay was released in 1984 in French under the title L'Épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique and appeared in 1992 in an English Translation signed by S. Heyvaert.

5 The original title of this essay is Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne. Its English translation by Françoise Massardier-Kenney came out only fourteen years later, in 2009.

6 Original citation: "La visée même de la traduction – ouvrir au niveau de l'écrit un certain rapport à l'Autre, féconder le Propre par la médiation de l'Étranger – heurte de front la structure ethnocentrique de toute culture, ou cette espèce de narcissisme qui fait que toute société voudrait être un Tout pur et non mélange. Dans la traduction, il y a quelque chose de la violence du métissage. […] [L]'essence de la traduction est d'être ouverture, dialogue, métissage, décen-

S. Heyvaert chose the term "cross-breeding" to render the concept of "métissage" used by Berman. Nouss (2007), who took over this idea of translation as métissage and reframed it in a post-structuralist (rather than dialectic) epistemology, aptly notes that the root of the concept métissage also refers to the action of weaving, and therefore could be translated as misweaving or interweaving. Nouss explains how this conceptualisation allows to move away from an either/or logic toward an inclusive one where translation and original, foreign and domestic, are inextricably linked and transforming one another.

> "Métissage […] is an assemblage of affiliations and identities which is never fixed once and for all and in which the different parts retain their identity and history. In a similar way, the translated text exists through its difference from the original, and the original makes known and legitimizes its own existence only in and through the translation. Thus an ethics of métissage constitutes a basis for a politics of translation." (Nouss, 2007, p. 245)

Observing that translation has often been diverted from its very aim, its essence, Berman asserted the need for a history, an analytic and an ethics of translation, three components of what he called traductology. In the concluding chapter consisting of two sections, The Archeology of Translation and Translation as a New Object of Knowledge, he clarifies the goal and epistemology of traductology. He affirms that:

> "First of all, as experience and as operation, it [translation] is the carrier of a knowledge sui generis on languages, literatures, cultures, movements of exchange and contact, etc. The issue is to manifest and articulate sui generis, to confront it with other modes of knowledge and experience concerning these domains. In this sense, translation must be considered rather as a subject of knowledge, as original and source of knowledge. In the second place, this knowledge, in order to become a 'knowledge' in the strict sense, should take

trement. Elle est mise en rapport ou elle n'est rien." (Berman, 1984, p. 16, emphasis in the orignal)

> on a definite, quasi-institutional and established form, suited to further its development in a field of research and teachability. This has sometimes been called traductology […] But that does not mean, at least not in the first place, that translation should become the object of a specific 'discipline' concerning a separate 'region' or 'domain,' precisely because it is not anything separate itself." (Berman & Heyvaert, 1992, p. 181–182)[7]

The scholar adds that this inter-discipline rests on two hypotheses: first, translation is the model for any process of communication; second, translation's role is "constitutive of all literature, philosophy, and all human science" (Ibid. 183)[8]. Yet, this role is overshadowed, as historically translation has often been reduced "either as the modest transmission of meaning, or as the suspect activity of injecting the language with strangeness. In both cases, translation is denied and obscured." (Ibid. 188)[9]. In Berman's view, one of the fundamental tasks of traductology is to fight this obscuring, which could only be done by creating…

---

7 Original citation: "Tout d'abord, le fait qu'en tant qu'expérience et opération, elle est porteuse d'un savoir sui generis sur les langues, les littératures, les cultures, les mouvements d'échange et de contact, etc. Ce savoir sui generis, il s'agirait de le manifester, de l'articuler, de la confronter aux autres modes de savoir et d'expérience qui concernent des domaines. En ce sens, il faut considérer plutôt la traduction comme sujet de savoir, comme origine et source de savoir. / En second lieu, ce savoir devrait, pour devenir un « savoir » au sens strict, prendre une forme définie, aussi institutionnelle et établie, propre à permettre son déploiement dans un champ de recherche et d'enseignabilité. C'est ce qu'on a voulu appeler parfois la « traductologie ». […] Mais cela ne veut pas dire, du moins en premier lieu, que la traduction devienne l'objet d'une « discipline » spécifique portant sur une « région » ou un « domaine » séparés, dans la mesure où elle n'est justement pas quelque chose de séparé." (Berman, 1984, p. 289–90)

8 Original citation: "Ce rôle […] est tendanciellement constitutif de toute littérature, de toute philosophie et de tut science humaine." (Berman, 1984, p. 293)

9 Original citation: "[…] la traduction apparaît soit comme une transmission inapparente du sens, soit comme une activité suspecte d'injecter de l'«étrangeté» dans la langue. Dans les deux cas, elle est niée et occultée." (Berman, 1984, p. 300)

> "[…] the possibility of a traductology that would cover both the practical and the theoretical field and that would be developed on the basis of the experience of translation—more specifically, on the basis of its very nature as experience. Abstract theorists and empirical practitioners concur in the assertion that the experience of translation is not, should not and could not be theorizable. Now, this presupposition is a negation of the meaning of the act of translation: by definition, this act is a second and reflexive activity. Reflexivity is essential to it, and with it systematicity." (Berman & Heyvaert, 1992, p. 188)[10]

In his last essay, Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne, the scholar offered methodological guidelines to reach this goal. To him, a translation started with the act of reading: not only the text to be translated, but a myriad of parallel readings:

> "[…] the reading done by the translator is […] already a pre-translation, a reading done within the horizon of translation, and all the individuating characteristics of the text […] are discovered within the movement of the act of translating as before. It is in this movement that translation has its own autonomous criticisme. Most certainly, this criticisme cannot be simply based on the encounter between the translator and the text. It must turn to numerous parallel readings, other works by the same author, various studies about this author and about his times, and the like. […] Generally speaking, translating requires numerous and various readings. An ignorant translator—that is, one that does not read in this way—is a deficient translator. One translates with books.[1]

10 Original citation: "[…] la possibilité d'une traductologie couvrant à la fois un champ théorique et pratique, qui serait élaborée à partie de l'expérience de la traduction ; plus précisément, à partir de sa nature même d'expérience. Théoriciens abstraits et praticiens empiriques coïncident en ceci qu'ils affirment que l'expérience de la traduction n'est pas théorisable, ne doit et ne peut pas l'être. Or, cette présupposition est une négation du sens de l'acte de traduire : celui-ci, par définition, est une activité seconde et réflexive." (Berman, 1984, pp. 300–301)

[1] And not only with dictionaries." (Berman, trans. By F. Massardier-Kenney, 2009, p. 52)[11]

1.3 Reading, Interpreting and Translating — The Lonely Londoners

Trying to adopt Berman's vision to the project of translating The Lonely Londoners implied a close reading not only of the novel, but of other works by Selvon and the vast critical literature on his works. It also entailed studying Trinidadian dialect and culture, consulting archives on the Windrush generation, reading other English Caribbean fictions and their French translations. Reading and library work was necessary but hardly sufficient. Since one of Selvon's main source of inspiration was a vernacular language and a local culture, fieldwork in a more literal sense had to be undertaken. In other words, translating The Lonely Londoners required a trip back from London (where I lived at the time) to Trinidad, so as to retrace those influences and hopefully unveil the rich fabric, that is the linguistic and cultural interweaving, this novel was made of.

This work involving both reading and fieldwork allowed to highlight the many viewpoints from which The Lonely Londoners could be read. One could approach the novel as a piece of British literature written in a non-standard English with a Trinidadian flavour; but one could can also turn the telescope the other way round and see it as a novel in Trinidadian, as an instance of Caribbean literature, or as a piece of Creole literature. The novel is all of this: at once British, Trinidadian, Caribbean,

11 Original citation: "[…] la lecture du traducteur est […] déjà une pré-traduction, une lecture effectuée dans l'horizon de la traduction ; et tous les traits individuants de l'œuvre […] se découvrent autant dans le mouvement de traduire qu'avant. C'est en cela que celui-ci possède son « criticisme » propre, automne. Il est bien certain que ce « criticisme » ne saurait être purement et simplement fondé sur le face-à-face du traducteur et de l'œuvre. Il faut qu'il recoure à de multiples lectures collatérales, d'autres œuvres de l'auteur, d'ouvrages divers sur cet auteur, son époque, etc.[…] / D'une manière générale, traduire exige des lectures vastes et diversifiées. Un traducteur ignorant – qui ne traduit pas de la sorte – est un traducteur déficient. On traduit avec des livres. 1Et pas seulement avec des dictionnaires." (Berman, 1995, pp. 67–68)

Creole. Ultimately, as a novel on migration, on the encounter between the foreign and the domestic, The Lonely Londoners could also tell us something about language hospitality, to take up Paul Ricoeur's concept (1999), and hospitality full stop. Without stretching too far, it could also be read as a reflection on translation, at least as a novel carrying, underlyingly, its own vision and ethics of translation.

The whole process, moving from the text to the context and back to the text, in order to uncover multiple layers of interpretation and to find an appropriate translation strategy, also led to a comparison of English and French creoles: their respective history, their sociolinguistic status, and the way they are represented in contemporary Caribbean literatures (cf. Buzelin, 2002; cf. Buzelin & Winer, 2008). This comparison first highlighted formal and sociolinguistic differences between the two types of Creoles, some French Caribbean commentators going sometimes as far as claiming that there was no creole in the English-Caribbean, but only "broken English," an attitude which could be interpreted as a product of colonial history. Those differences also appeared in literary usages. Whereas English-Caribbean writers had used the vernacular as early as the 1950s, literary creolization had only started in the 1980s in the French Petites Antilles. While French Caribbean writers tended to mark and even emphasize the distance between French and Creole and were reluctant to create a Creolized French that might be interpreted as "broken French," English-Caribbean writers had no problem representing the interlanguage, what linguists called the "mesolect." This reluctance could also be interpreted as a legacy of the long history of derogatory, stereotyping and stigmatizing representations of French Creoles. But research also confirmed that beyond those differences, common grounds did exist at a deeper level, in the expressivity, the orality and the musicality of those languages[12].

With time, as the process went by, the idea of translating the novel in a morpho-syntactically non-standard French was abandoned and gave

12 Interestingly, the history of colonization and migration within the Caribbean had made French Creole one of the main vernacular languages of Trinidad in the 19th century and traces of it could be found in the current dialect.

way to another strategy that focused less on realism, less on a search for authenticity, and more on recreating, by other means, the expressivity, musicality and orality of Selvon's prose. Hence, for example, expressions existing both in French and in Creole, that a non-Creole-speaking reader would not necessarily see as Creole, but that a Creole-speaking reader might recognise, were favoured (cf. Buzelin, 2006). Although long passages of the translation were included in the thesis, this translation was never published in the whole. In that sense the research was partly a failure. Yet, the knowledge produced throughout the process was very much in tune with what Berman had described in his essay. It was by essence interdisciplinary, at the crossroad of (comparative) literature, sociolinguistic, cultural anthropology, Caribbean studies etc.[13] Another translator might have reached other conclusions, highlighted other aspects and created different connections, just like two literary critics commenting on the same book and two ethnographers doing fieldwork in the same location would be likely to produce different accounts.

This particular case confirmed that one of the virtues of translation, as a boundary interpretative, research and rewriting process, is its ability to unravel the many literary, linguistic and cultural ramifications of a text and the multiple connections that can be made with other literary, linguistic and cultural constituents. In that sense, it did not so much consist in finding an equivalent as in creating one, by favouring some connections rather than others.

1.4 Producing Knowledge through Translation — Some Early Examples

Beyond Berman's essays on translation (itself very much influenced by the German romantics) and the work done at McGill University (nourished by Berman's writings), this doctoral research was inspired by other experiential approaches in translation studies, such as Suzanne Jill Levine's essay The Subversive Scribe (1991), a special issue of TTR

13 As such it was disseminated in translation studies, comparative literature, Caribbean literary studies and linguistics.

proposing both a criticism of existing English and French translations and a new annotated French translation of Walter Benjamin's essay on translation (cf. Nouss ed., 1997). The same year saw the publication of Gender in Translation in which Luise von Flotow explained how, in women's studies, experiences in translation were central to the reflection on the relation between language, power and gender. The collective volume Translating Slavery (cf. Kadish & Massardier-Kenney, 1994) illustrates her point. Finally, in 2000 the translation journal Palimpsestes launched an issue on translating Caribbean literature with articles reflecting on this topic on the basis of collaborative translation projects (cf. Raguet-Bouvart & Bensimon, 2000).

It should be mentioned that, apart from those initiatives—and certainly others—the idea that the study of translation could be based on a reflexive practice of it was not unanimously shared at the time, when the discipline was striving for its recognition as a legitimate science. In fact, Berman's vision of traductology was in sharp contrast with the epistemology advocated by those who are today regarded as the founding fathers of translation studies, Gideon Toury and James Holmes. For them, TS defined itself as an empirical discipline aimed at describing phenomena in order to explain and predict them. Translation practice and criticism were only possible "extensions" of the field but in no way central nor even necessary (cf. Holmes, 1972; cf. Toury, 1995). Contrary to Berman's, the position those scholars advocated contributed to widening the gap between theory and practice, between a distanced approach to the study of translation and a more subjective (or reflexive) one.

Although understandable to some extent (as a strategy to ensure the discipline's controlled development and its recognition as legitimate scientific field) this empirical not to say positivist bias in early translation studies seems paradoxical given that the human and social sciences, around the same time, were moving in the opposite direction, undertaking the so-called "interpretative" and semiotic turn. In cultural anthropology, this turn was mostly associated with the work of Clifford Geertz who suggested approaching culture as a text, i.e., a web of signs to be interpreted: "The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the

shoulders of those to whom they properly belong." (Geertz, 1973, p. 452). In this line of thinking, the ethnographer would no longer seek causal or structural explanations but act rather as a translator, reading and interpreting a foreign manuscript: "Doing ethnography is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of') a manuscript—foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries, but written not in conventionalized graphs of sound, but in transient examples of shaped behaviour." (Geertz, 1973, p. 10) The body of work carried out at the crossroad of anthropology and translation studies in the nineties was another substantial source of inspiration leading to the idea that if translation was a subject of knowledge, as argued by Berman, this knowledge was in its very (reflexive) nature and in its mode of production (as a boundary work) comparable to that acquired in ethnographic research; the main difference being a directional one: the former approaches culture as a text, while the other approaches the foreign text as a web made of complex linguistic, cultural and textual ramifications to be unveiled.

2 Translation in Academia and Education Today

There is no denying that well before Berman, there existed a longstanding philological and hermeneutic tradition in translation. This tradition was reserved to sacred texts, philosophical ones, or simply those with a wide historical or cultural gap. As argued in the previous section, the emergence of traductology in the 1980s created a space for the experience of translation to become a source of knowledge in a more systematic way regardless of the type of text being translated. But this approach to the study of translation was rather marginal in the nineties. Is it less marginal today?

According to Lawrence Venuti, the answer is no contest a negative one. In a recent essay entitled contra-instrumentalism (2019), the scholar reaffirms the existence of two models of translation: a hermeneutic model that "conceives of translation as an interpretive act" (Venuti, 2019, p. 12) and an instrumentalist one that "conceives of trans-

lation as the reproduction of an invariant meaning" (Ibid.). He observes that the second still dominates, not only in the translation industry, but also in research and among translators. Venuti had already made this point in a previous monograph, Translation Changes Everything (2013), pointing some contradictions in translators' discourses:

> "Recently, translators have claimed that translation is de facto a form of scholarship, but [they] remain so deeply invested in a belletristic approach that they can't—some say they won't—provide a scholarly account of their translating. Merely to assert that translation is scholarship will not compel scholars to abandon romantic concepts of original authorship that have long been entrenched in the academy, and that have stigmatized translation as hackwork or restricted it to a derivative form of creative writing." (Venuti, 2013, p. 247).

The result, in his view, is that we still "lack a discourse about translating that can foster and sustain […] a translation culture" (Ibid). His dark diagnosis bears some truth, particularly in the context from and for which it is made—the United States. We can find echoes of it in other publications (see for example Bennett 2019). But his statement also aims to be polemical, and therefore deliberately lacks nuance. If much more needs to be done to encourage a reflexive practice of translation, some signs do suggest that things have changed, not always for the worst, over the past 20 years.

2.1 Studying Translation: The "Viewpoint of the Agent"

As early as 1995, Simeoni had written an article calling for an approach to the study of translation that would take the agent in practice as its reference point. This scholar recognised Toury's contribution as a seminal one, but didn't share his positivism and behaviouristic definition of translation norms. Taking for granted that a discipline cannot define itself by its object only, he suggested an epistemological ground at the

crossroad of reflexive sociology and a linguistics of utterances (or a linguistique de l'énonciation) a study of language focusing on speaking subjects in action. Favouring reflexivity (from translation scholars and translators) and inclusivity (by bringing back linguistics in translation studies), this epistemology paved the way for a theory of the practice of translation. Integrating, in my view, the best of translation studies (as defined by Toury) and traductology (as defined by Berman), this proposal allowed to overcome the opposition between theory and practice, empiricism and hermeneutics. It allowed us to make translation not only an object but also, as Berman claimed, a source of knowledge, of a hybrid and interdisciplinary kind.

The aforementioned article was visionary as agency became a key issue and a buzz word in translation studies in the following years. The statistics that can be drawn from John Benjamin's Translation Studies Bibliography are revealing, with a rise from eight entries for this concept before 2000, to 81 entries on the following decade (2000–2009) and 272 for the following one (2010–2019) (see Appendix 1). These are absolute rather than relative figures, but they are indicative somehow. Meanwhile, methodologies based on the study of translators' archives or interviews with professionals have become common place. Likewise, conducting research involving the practice of translation has become more accepted today, without the work in question being categorised as belonging solely to the realms of creative writing or action research.

2.2 Interdisciplinary Exchanges and the Boom in Studies on Science in Translation

What also changed for the past 30 years is translation studies relation to other fields of the human and social sciences. As a young discipline, TS has borrowed a lot, but it seems that interdisciplinary exchanges in both directions have become more widespread, although a certain imbalance surely still exists. In other words, not only is translation (even translation proper) given more consideration in the social sciences, as a productive concept and as an object of study, but researchers in related fields seem to engage more often with the literature produced in TS. This trend is

perceivable not only with established disciplines, but also in more recent ones such as women and cultural studies, communication, book studies, adaptation and many others. The volume Border Crossings. Translation Studies and other disciplines published in 2016 tend to corroborate this idea.

Emblematic of this opening is also the boom in studies on translating science, as suggested by the sudden increase in publications on this issue. Interestingly, there was no entry for the keyword "translating science" in the Translation Studies Bibliography before 2000, but the past twenty years have seen the publication of several monographs and special issues in this topic in TS and beyond[14]. From the English translations of Freud's concepts to the French translation of Darwin's, many studies have shown, for a long time, how translation can transform, and in worse cases betray, a theory. Less widespread is the idea, developed by anthropologist and translation scholar Joshua Price (2008) and exemplified in those recent publications, that translation can contribute to clarifying and elaborating concepts and, as such, can nurture the "original" concept[15]. This highlights not only how translating changes, but also what can be gained in the process. Here again, original and translation are not conceived in opposition, in an either/or logic, but as closely intertwined,

14 Some of these titles include the monograph by Scott Montgomery entitled Science in translation (2000); a special issue of Les Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales on the "international circulation of ideas" with an opening article by Pierre Bourdieu; in 2011 a special issue of The Translator on Translating Science (2011); a special issue of Annals of Sciences on Translating and Translations in the History of Science (2016); two collective volumes: Circulation of Academic Thought: Rethinking Translation in the Academic Field edited by Rafael Y. Schögle (2019) and Translation in Knowledge, Knowledge in Translation Edited by Rocío G. Sumillera, Jan Surman and Katharina Kühn (2020).

15 Price's argument finds a nice illustration in the volume 'On ne naît pas femme on le devient', the life a sentence (cf. Mann & Ferrari, 2017), an interdisciplinary initiative involving translators and philosophers reflecting on the multiple interpretations of Simone de Beauvoir's writings by analyzing their translation in several languages including English, German, Croatian and Finnish.

enriching one another, something that brings us back to this notion of translation as métissage.

2.3 Emphasising Agency — Situatedness and Inclusivity in (Translation) Education

Moving to the field of translation training, the present configuration is a complex but interesting one. Technological advances have fostered new textual materialities and new translation tools favouring collaborative forms of writing and translation, making translators as well as the translation process more visible. Yet some of those technologies may also reinforce the myth of translation as a mechanical and instantaneous transfer of information, this very instrumental view of translation Venuti denounces. As Michael Cronin (2013) notes, if trade, translation and technologies have always intertwined, there is something both fascinating and frightening about the current configuration. Translation programmes in higher education must at once train translators for the market (a market that is rapidly changing and showing worrying trends). This means that they have to be technologically intensive, but they also have to provide other types of tools that will empower translators beyond the needs of the market.

The "sociological eye" (cf. Simeoni, 2007), emphasising the situatedness of translation, which has emerged in the mid-nineties in translation studies, seems to have also made its way in translation education. There is little doubt that no instructor today would adopt a strictly formal approach nor define translation quality in linguistic terms only, without considering why, for whom, in what context a translation is done and without asking Am I the right person to do the job? The literature produced for the past twenty years in translation studies (or traductology) provides a rich corpus from which examples can be found to increase students' awareness and reflexivity. Also, the enhanced visibility of translation and translators in the public sphere makes things easier for instructors. From the debates over the choice of the right person to translate the poem delivered by Amanda Gorman on Joe Biden's investiture, to the public outrage caused by the poor subtitles offered by Netflix, or

the social commentaries triggered by interpreters who expressed their emotions while interpreting Ukrainian president Zelenski, these recent translation events can foster discussions on translation as a situated, linguistic, social and ethical act, provided they are properly analysed, beyond the polemics. An inspiring example is the course entitled "Translation and Interpreting Ethics and Standards of Practice" of the University of Massachusetts where the final project entails the production, in small teams, of a critical analysis of a "real-life" translation ethical dilemma. One of the teams of the Winter 2022 semester chose to work on Goggles' decision to request their translators no longer use the word "war" to refer to the crisis in Ukraine and rather refer to it as an "extraordinary circumstance"[16]. The case was an occasion to address the many implications of this request, both at micro and macro levels.

Two recent books also illustrate quite well this change of paradigm from a formal approach to translation training focusing on linguistic parameters only to a more situated and reflexive one also acknowledging the translator's social role and embeddedness. First, the Handbook for Interpreters in Asylum Procedures (2017), which states and emphasises straight away, in its front cover, the fact that neutrality in interpreting is a fiction—we could add, maybe a necessary fiction, but still one. The second book authored by Cristiano A. Mazzei and Laurence Jay-Rayon entitled The Routledge Guide to Teaching Translation and Interpreting Online (2022) explores how the online teaching environment, which also reminds, as the authors note, today's translating environment, can increase accessibility as well as linguistic, cultural, gender and socioeconomic diversity in translation classrooms. Relating education, society and technology, this textbook paves the way for more inclusive and more reflexive approach to translation education, which may be one of the

16 The course designer, Laurence Jay-Rayon Ibrahim Aibo, and the two students, Alvaro Cepeda an LaRon Esau, were invited to present their project in the Podcast Brand the Interpreter hosted by Mireya Pérez. This edition entitled An Extraordinary Circumstance: A Translator's Ethical Dilemma can be watched at h ttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-fO611gvs9E

conditions for the development of a "translation culture" at a broader level.

3 Conclusion

The emergence of an academic field dedicated to translation has created a space whereby the experience of translation, beyond the philological tradition, could become a source of knowledge, a hybrid form of knowledge in the sense that it unfolds at the crossroad of languages, cultures and disciplines. Like any other social/academic field, this one is dynamic, involving exchanges, translations but also resistance to translation. This is why "translation studies" and "traductology" are far from being perfect equivalents. In a contribution to the volume Circulation of Academic Thought, Karen Bennett argues that despite the considerable attenuation of the positivism shown by the founders of Translation Studies, the dominant paradigm remains empirical rather than hermeneutics. "The result is a relentless drift toward an epistemological monoculture" (Bennett, 2019, p. 34). Although this observation about the predominance of empirical approaches in TS is well founded, a number of signs point toward the development of a more reflexive and interpretative approach to the practice, the study and the teaching of translation, be it literary or not. And this is surely one of the necessary conditions for allowing translation, in the restricted as well as the broader sense, to generate a hybrid form of knowledge, across boundaries. As Simeoni (2007, p. 26) aptly put it:

> "It would seem that there is something about translation itself that must have been unsettling for the disciplines [maybe because it] is not an ordinary object, certainly not one that is easy to 'objectify' […] Translation is also a cognitive 'operator,' a mechanism which provides access to the social worldview. […] Proper translation […] is never simply a replica. An appropriate dose of 'friction,' in the sense of being neither too aggressive nor too ignorant of the other, is inevitable, giving rise to mutual misunderstandings as an ingenious solution to or-

> dinary, yet potentially, devastating, disagreements in social life. This, of course, is an uncertain path."

The difficulty to circumscribe translation and therefore to objectify it is partly what has made it 'unsettling' for the discipline. The practice of translation always operates at the boundaries. Hence, it involves tension, frictions, negotiations possible understandings and disagreements. This is what makes it suspect and partly unpredictable—hence the desire to control it. But all those qualifiers highlight precisely what makes it so valuable and productive, as long as we accept to take the risks of following this 'uncertain path.'"

References

Bennett, K. (2019). Between paradigms: a critical-rhetorical approach to the study of academic translation. In R. Schögler (Ed.), *Circulation of academic thought: Rethinking methods in the study of scientific translation* (pp. 31–54). Bern: Peter Lang.

Berman, A. (1992). *The Experience of the Foreign. Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. English Translation by S. Heyvaert. New York: SUNY Press. [Original title: L'épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique. 1984, Paris: Gallimard.]

Berman, A. (2009). *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne.* English Translation by Françoise Massardier-Kenney. Kent: Kent University Press. [Original title: *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne.* 1995, Paris: Gallimard].

Buzelin, H. (2002). Creolizing Narratives across Languages: Selvon and Chamoiseau. *Canadian Literature,* 175, 67–92.

Buzelin, H. (2004). La traductologie, l'ethnographie et la production des connaissances, *Meta,* 49(4), 729–746.

Buzelin, H. (2005). *Sur le terrain de la traduction*. Toronto: Éditions du GREF.

Buzelin, H. (2006). Traduire l'hybridité littéraire. Réflexions à partir du roman de Samuel Selvon. *The Lonely Londoners*, 18(1), 91–119.

Buzelin, H. (2007). Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge. English Translation by Paul St-Pierre. In. P. St-Pierre & P. C. Kar (Eds.), *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations* (pp. 39–56). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Buzelin H. & L. Winer. (2008). Literary Representations of Creole Languages: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives from the Caribbean. In J. Singler & S. Kouwenberg (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies* (pp. 637–665), London, Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chapdelaine A. & G. Lane-Mercier (Eds.) (1994). *Traduire les sociolectes*. Special Issue of *TTR*, 7(2).

Chapdelaine A. & G. Lane-Mercier (Eds.) (2001). *Faulkner: Une expérience de retraduction*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Cronin, M. (2013). *Translation in the Digital Age*. London & New York: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Holmes, J. [1972]1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kadish, D. & F. Massardier-Kenney (Eds.). (1994). *Translating Slavery: gender and race in French women's writing: 1783–1823*. Kent (Ohio) & London: Kent State University Press.

Lane-Mercier, G. (1997). Translating the Untranslatable. *Target*, 9(1), 43–68.

Lavoie, J. (1994). Problèmes de traduction du vernaculaire noir américain : le cas de *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. *TTR*, 7(2), 115–145.

Lavoie, J. (1997). Le français créolisé comme option de traduction du vernaculaire noir américain. *Présence francophone*, 51, 117–138.

Lavoie, J. (2002). *Mark Twain et la parole noire*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Levine, S. J. (1991). *The Subversive Scribe: Translating Latin American Fiction*. Saint Paul (Minn.): Graywolf Press.

Mann, B. & M. Ferrari (Eds.) (2017). *On ne naît pas femme, on le devient: the life of a sentence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mazzei C. & L. Jay-Rayon Aibo. (2022). *The Routledge Guide to Teaching Translation and Interpreting Online.* London & New York: Routledge.

Nouss, A. (Ed.) (1997). *L'Essai sur la traduction de Walter Benjamin. Traductions critiques/Walter Benjamin's Essay on Translation. Critical translations. TTR*, 10(2).

Nouss, A. (Ed.) (2007). Translation and Métissage. In P. St-Pierre & P. C. Kar (Eds.), *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations* (pp. 245–252). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Price, J. (2008). Translating social science Good versus bad utopianism. *Target*, 20(2), 348–364.

Raguet-Bouvart, C. & P. Bensimon (Eds.). (2000). *Traduire la littérature des Caraïbes.* Special issue of *Palimpsestes*, 12.

Ricoeur, P. (1999). Le Paradigme de la traduction. *Esprit*, 253(6), 8–19.

Selvon, S. 1991 [© 1956]. *The lonely Londoners*. Toronto: TSAR publications.

Simeoni, D. (1995). Translating and Studying Translation: the View from the Agent. *Meta*, 40(3), 445–460

Simeoni, D. (2007). Translation and society: The emergence of a concep tual relationship. In St-Pierre, P. and P. C. Kar (Eds.), In Translatio n. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations (pp. 13–26). Amsterda m/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

St-Pierre, P. & P. C. Kar (Eds). (2005). In *Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations.* Delhi, Pencraft International. New edition published in 2007 in the "Benjamins Translation Library" n° 71, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

United Nations Refugee Agency (Eds.) (2017). *Handbook for Interpreters in Asylum Procedures.* Designed by A. Bergunde, S. Pöllabauer and I. Topolovec. Vienna: UNHCR Austria.

Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice.* Milton Park: Abingdon, Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2019). *Contra instrumentalism: a translation polemic.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Von Flotow, L. (1997). *Translation and gender: translating in the "Era of feminism"*. Manchester/Ottawa: St Jerome/Ottawa University Press.

Appendix—Entries in the Translation Studies Bibliography by Keywords

	Agency	Agents	Habitus
-1979	1	1	0
1980-1999	7	12	4
2000-2009	81	93	35
2010-2014	137	94	58
2015-2019	135	103	32
2020-2021	71	50	22