

Introduction

Translation, Interpretation, and the Humanities

Lawrence Venuti

Teaching Translation Studies

Over the past half-century, translation studies has emerged decisively as an academic field around the world, and in recent years programs devoted to the teaching of translation have proliferated. Surveys indicate more than 350 programs worldwide (for a list periodically updated by the European Society for Translation Studies, see <http://www.est-translationstudies.org/resources/tti/tti.htm>). They offer a variety of certificates and degrees, undergraduate and graduate, emphasizing either practice or research or combining both, training not only professional translators but also scholar-teachers of translation and of foreign languages and literatures. The number of programs has risen not only with the expansion of the field but also with the steady increase of international organizations, the continual eruption of political and military conflicts, and the consequent displacement of mass populations, all of which create the urgent need for translators and interpreters. In multi- and bilingual cultures, meanwhile, translator training has long been a necessity insofar as translation is a fact of daily life.

The emergence of the field has coincided with the gradual development of a fairly standard curriculum for teaching translation studies, especially at the master's level, where students are trained to enter the job market as translators or to proceed to doctoral research and academic careers. In the current configuration, mandatory courses (i.e., term-long units or modules in a program) focus on theory and practice, joining the study of theoretical concepts and research methods with the acquisition of practical skills in translating and interpreting. The concepts tend to be derived from varieties of linguistics, from literary and cultural studies, and from sociology; the skills are often taught in relation to specific genres or text types (legal, medical, commercial, literary, and so forth) and according to language pairs (i.e., an assortment of source and translating languages that often reflect the location of the institution). Optional courses might provide instruction in more specialized areas, such as audiovisual translation and computer-assisted translation tools, and sometimes in other, related fields, such as literary history and international politics. The variety of course offerings, as a rule, depends on the expertise of the instructors who staff the program. Translation studies now consists of a recognizable body of knowledge that is codified in a curriculum

and presented in a significant number of widely adopted textbooks in various languages, although English remains the *lingua franca* in the field. Alongside this development, a scholarly literature on translation pedagogy has accumulated through research monographs, journals, and conference proceedings that explore different teaching methods.

Foremost among the aims of this book is to take stock of how translation studies is taught at the present time. It seeks to document a variety of programs, courses, and pedagogies situated in various kinds of institutions. In so doing, it seeks to display possibilities for curricular and pedagogical innovation in a field where a certain degree of consolidation has now occurred. It implicitly asks how the teaching of translation research and practice can improve—and how improvement can be measured—when the field, like every academic specialization, has achieved such stability as might resist change in order to maintain a viable institutional position.

Questions about improvement can be given different answers, no doubt, which might vary according to the methodological terms, cultural situations, and historical moments in which they are posed. Taking the translation market as the main criterion for the effectiveness of a program or course, developing pedagogies in accordance with changing market conditions and demands is likely to rank high in assessing teaching, and so it should, especially for genres and text types in pragmatic and technical fields where functionality is inextricably linked to economic value. Yet market-driven assessments of teaching limit or even preempt the sort of critical examination—whether of translation or of the market—that can stimulate other kinds of innovation and improvement. With the market as the main or sole standard of pedagogy, translation ultimately serves quantitative thinking that aims merely to reduce or overcome linguistic and cultural differences and thereby neglects the values, beliefs, and representations that constitute those differences and of which translation itself is the vehicle and support.

This book takes a rather unusual approach to questions of improvement by focusing on a place where the teaching of translation studies is undergoing a sophisticated yet markedly uneven development that has yet to solidify into a standard or model: North America, especially the United States. Here the field is beginning to grow, finally, after decades of being restricted to relatively few academic institutions. The chapters that follow show how instructors make use of translation research, textbooks, and pedagogies originating in places where the field is more consolidated. They also reveal the cross-fertilization from neighboring fields that at once enables and constrains the creation of programs and courses in translation studies. They offer an opportunity to learn from a situation characterized by extreme diversity, if not sheer disarray, fostering the experimentation and inventiveness that can occur when a field is at a rudimentary stage of growth. But they are also intended to advance translation pedagogies beyond this stage while elevating the status of translation studies as a distinct academic field. With these aims in mind, specific chapters document practices in such other countries as Canada, the United Kingdom, and Spain, where translation studies has achieved a firm institutional basis.

In the United States, the number of programs has traditionally been small, even if it has grown considerably, and their emphases have generally been divided between pragmatic and technical translation, on the one hand, and literary translation, on the other. The 1950s saw the creation of what is currently the Middlebury Institute for International Studies at Monterey, which developed a master's curriculum in translator training with a focus on pragmatic and technical texts as well as conference interpreting. In the 1960s, workshops in literary translation began to be offered in graduate creative writing programs at the University of Iowa, Columbia University, and elsewhere. In the 1970s, the Translation Research and Instruction Program was established at the State University of New York at Binghamton to offer graduate certificates in translation practice to supplement degrees in humanistic disciplines. In the 1980s, the Department of Modern Languages and the Institute for Applied Linguistics at Kent State University initiated a master's program in translation that trains students to become professional translators, again primarily of pragmatic and technical texts. These programs metamorphosed over the years as changes occurred in the translation market, in the field of translation studies, and in the institutions where the programs are housed. Today they remain among the main sites where translation research and practice can be studied in the United States.

Over the past two decades, they have been joined by various other developments that indicate the increasing academic presence of translation. Foreign-language departments continue to be deeply committed to the direct communicative method of language teaching, a pedagogy that has been extremely effective in producing students with native proficiency because, in part, it minimizes or excludes English-language translation. Yet recently these departments have created more opportunities to study translating and interpreting into and out of English, including programs on both the undergraduate and graduate levels designed to train students for careers as translators (e.g. the Department of Languages and Cultural Studies at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Rutgers University, and the Department of Romance Languages at Wake Forest University). Some programs in creative writing, both undergraduate and graduate, have broadened their traditional emphasis on poetry and fiction to offer not just translation workshops but seminars in translation topics; they have also begun to allow students to submit a book-length translation as a senior or master's thesis (e.g. Princeton University and Queens College in the City University of New York). Princeton has initiated a pioneering undergraduate program in translation and intercultural communication, in effect devising a model that is likely to be adopted at other institutions. In what is perhaps the most exciting trend, reflecting recent debates provoked by the revival of the notion of "world" literature, departments and programs of comparative literature have developed courses and certificates that allow students to explore the history of translation theory and practice, to translate literary texts, and to consider the problem of teaching foreign-language texts in translation (e.g. Colorado College, the University of Oregon, and Washington University in St. Louis).

Institutional Antinomies

These developments have brought with them complications for the institutional sites where they have occurred as well as for the profession of languages and literatures at large, since it is mainly in this profession that translation studies has emerged in the United States. The complications might be formulated as a set of antinomies that currently beset the establishment of the field there. I will mention three so as to sketch in a more detailed way the situation from which this book derives and into which it aims to intervene with greatest consequence.

First, *although the creation of translation courses and programs should be welcomed as a sign of progress, there has been a tendency to staff them with instructors, including senior faculty, who neither translate nor conduct research in translation.*

This tendency runs counter to what is perhaps the most hallowed principle defining the identity of the scholar-teacher: only instructors who are professionally current in a field, who are not only conversant with its trends and methods but conduct research in it and participate in its debates, should be assigned to teach courses in that field. The fact is that the faculty from various languages and literatures, periods and areas who are sometimes assigned courses in translation studies would never condone the assignment of courses in their specialties to teachers who lack a professional credential as well as currency in those specialties. To be sure, a faculty member's retooling in translation studies can lead to effective teaching, and one aim of this book is to encourage an immersion in translation theory and history as a productive way for faculty to develop courses and to improve pedagogical strategies. Yet in translation studies, as in any academic field, retooling cannot replace ongoing research and publication as a credential or qualification that underpins committed, innovative, and responsible teaching. The antinomy seems to point to a lingering attitude that may well be unconscious but that in any case needs to be abandoned if we truly acknowledge that translation studies can make a unique contribution to the study of languages, literatures, and cultures. I would describe that attitude as a reluctance to recognize translation studies as an academic field in its own right, with its own body of scholarship, its own debates, trends, and methods, its own traditions of theory and commentary, practice and pedagogy, its own conferences, journals, and presses with lists or series in the area.

Here a second, related antinomy appears: *Although in 2011 the Modern Language Association of America (MLA) adopted guidelines for evaluating translations in hiring and in reviews for tenure, promotion, and merit raises, a decision to dedicate one's research and scholarship to translation in any form continues to be tantamount to jeopardizing one's academic career.*

Scholars in classical and modern languages have long included translation as part of their work, but a stigma came to be attached to the practice during the twentieth century. As a result, the production of a translation *per se*, especially in the absence of commentary, has been considered ancillary to scholarship and finally inadequate. It is hardly surprising, then, that, in the United States, an expertise in translation studies is only beginning to be listed as a qualification for an

appointment in a department or program of English, a foreign language, or comparative literature. The rarity of such an advertisement became apparent in 2011, when the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Oregon took the unique step of advertising for “a tenure-track assistant professor in Translation Studies” to teach courses and to develop programs where translation theory, history, and practice are central. A related indication of the professional stigma that still attaches to translation is the paucity of doctoral dissertations that take as their object of study not the work of a canonical author, not a theme, genre, practice, or medium that has achieved professional recognition, but rather the work of a translator or a body of translations, especially those produced by translators who are not canonical authors.

In many departments of languages and literatures, students are discouraged from studying translation merely by the curriculum. Courses in translation studies are not widely or frequently offered, although the increasing appeal of such courses to both undergraduate and graduate students is demonstrated by current enrollments in departments and programs that routinely offer them. To take one striking example, the undergraduate course titled “Introduction to Translation Studies,” an elective offered in the Comparative Literature Program at Barnard College, has been attracting over 100 students from the Barnard and Columbia communities every fall since 2012. Nonetheless, a trawl through United States college and university websites indicates that only about 25 percent of the more than 180 schools currently offering comparative literature in some form include translation studies in their course inventories. This figure seems quite low for a field that could not exist without the extensive use of translations, especially on the undergraduate level. The situation seems not to have significantly changed since 2005, when a report on the undergraduate curriculum in comparative literature showed that 76.2 percent of the forty schools responding required courses on world literature in translation, but only 14.3 percent required courses in translation theory and practice (Association of Departments and Programs of Comparative Literature 2006: 181).

The two antinomies I have described suggest that the profession of languages and literatures lacks a consensus as to the very nature of translation, that competing ideas of what it is and does contribute to its continuing marginality by provoking an uncertainty about its value. Prevalent notions of translatability conceive of translation as a one-to-one correspondence with the source text, reducing it to a process of mechanical substitution. Prevalent notions of untranslatability conceive of translation as an inevitable loss of source-text features, reducing it to a representation that is incomplete, distorted, inauthentic. Today, translatability rests on concepts of equivalence, often formulated on the basis of discourse analysis, systemic-functional linguistics, and pragmatics, leading to the development and application of compensatory translation strategies, whereas untranslatability rests on concepts of indeterminacy, often formulated on the basis of poststructuralist theories of language and textuality, leading to the identification and interrogation of mistranslations (for an example of the former, see Baker 2011; for the latter, see Cassin 2004).

Both notions constitute implicit arguments against thinking of translation as scholarship or as art, as a kind of writing that should be valued for its learning or its creativity, or that might be learned and creative at the same time. Yet both notions, despite the dichotomy they seem to represent, actually assume the same model or paradigm of translation, what I shall call the instrumental model, in which translation is seen as the reproduction or transfer of an invariant that is contained in or caused by the source text, whether its form, its meaning, or its effect. Hence either translation can be easily done or it can never be done: these views are inversions of one another. Jacques Derrida's now famous paradox—"nothing is translatable; nothing is untranslatable"—encapsulates the instrumental model of translation, although without decisively breaking with it (Derrida 1999: 178).

This kind of thinking reveals a third antinomy: *Although George Steiner's widely read book After Babel (1975a) propagated the very different model of translation as an interpretive act, although this model has long been assumed in the German and French traditions of hermeneutics as well as in poststructuralism and therefore can be said to belong to the current critical orthodoxy in literary and cultural studies, the instrumental model of translation remains so entrenched in academic institutions that a hermeneutic approach has yet to be developed and widely applied in all its conceptual and practical ramifications.*

This antinomy can be glimpsed in various academic practices that are widespread enough to be considered routine, if they have not simply become conventional. Research monographs that display formidable theoretical and critical self-awareness quote from and comment on translations without any recognition of their status as translations, let alone an acknowledgement that the translation has inscribed an interpretation in the source text that might support or be consistent with the interpretation advanced in the monograph. Translators' names are omitted from bibliographies that otherwise provide the requisite data about works cited. Reviews of translated scholarship similarly make no mention of the translation or restrict any mention to an assessment of its readability or accuracy—yet without any recognition that the translation has interpreted the source text so as to affect the reviewer's comprehension and evaluation of it. Such practices all make the instrumentalist assumption that translation can and should reproduce a stable form and meaning inherent in the source text without hindrance or without the interposition of any difference worth remarking. For these scholarly intents and purposes, the translation is effectively the source text.

We can agree that a translation is capable of maintaining a semantic correspondence to the source text, even that it can approximate the formal features characteristic of that text, so that summaries of plots and arguments, accounts of characters and conceptual terms, analyses of style, figure, and discourse may all be intelligibly and convincingly grounded on the textual evidence presented by the translation. Nevertheless, a text is a complex linguistic and cultural artifact that supports meanings, values, and functions specific to its originary situation. Not only is any text much more than the correspondences and approximations established by a translation, but they can never preempt the decisive transformation entailed by rewriting a text in a different language for circulation in a

different culture. The transformation can be viewed as decisive, however, only if we assume that translation is an interpretive act whereby the translated text comes to support meanings, values, and functions specific to the receiving situation.

If scholarly research has not yet been able to free itself from a deep-seated instrumentalism in understanding and using translations, we might wonder how this model has affected teaching. Consider the MLA series, *Approaches to Teaching World Literature*. The MLA's rigorous guidelines and evaluative procedures ensure that each volume reflects professional norms as embodied in prevalent teaching practices: the process begins with a membership-wide call for papers and a survey of instructors who specialize in the specific author, genre, or period addressed in the volume, while the essays themselves offer diverse accounts of courses and pedagogies, sampling a broad spectrum of classroom practices and experiences. There can be no doubt about the enormous usefulness of these volumes as guides to teaching; those that are recent or updated can also serve as helpful indicators of current research trends. The series as a whole displays considerable sophistication, mirroring developments in literary theory and criticism that have informed the profession since the mid-1980s, when the books began to appear.

Yet since almost half of them, roughly forty thus far, are dedicated to the teaching of non-Anglophone texts, we must wonder whether these volumes are addressed solely to instructors who can work with the foreign languages in which the texts were originally written. For the comments on English translations *as translations* are limited to assessments of their accuracy in communicating the foreign-language text and placed in an introductory section; when a translation is quoted in the essays, it is generally presented without comment and therefore assumed to be an untroubled communication of the foreign-language text. In both instances, the formal and semantic features of that text, including its tropes and styles, plots and genres, narrators and characters, discourses and themes, are treated as invariants that are either transferred intact or misrepresented by the translation. The volumes rarely include essays that consider the teaching of English translations as texts that are relatively autonomous from the foreign-language texts they translate precisely because translations inscribe interpretations that necessarily transform their source texts (the omission was noticed in Venuti 1998: 91–2). These interpretations deserve to be articulated and studied in the receiving contexts in which they were produced, especially since they inevitably inflect the teaching of translations in Anglophone classrooms. But they will become intelligible only if we abandon instrumentalism and adopt a hermeneutic model in our understanding of translation.

Recent volumes in the series, reflecting the emergence of translation studies in the profession, have begun to include essays that address the challenge of teaching English-language translations. In Wail Hassan and Susan Muaddi Darraj's *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Naguib Mahfouz* (2012), for instance, Maysa Abou-Youssef Hayward's chapter, "Teaching Mahfouz: Style in Translation," discusses how she engages Anglophone students in an illuminating analysis of Trevor Le Gassick's 1975 version of Mahfouz's novel, *Midaq Alley* (1947). Focusing

on formal features such as style and register, narrative point of view and dialogue, Hayward locates points where Le Gassick's translation both approximates and shifts away from the Arabic text, although she does not treat the translation dismissively. On the contrary, she acknowledges that the structural differences between Arabic and English as well as different linguistic and cultural norms make the translation no more than one possible interpretation of Mahfouz's novel. "An effective translation," she observes, "like Trevor Le Gassick's, highlights key elements of the original and interprets as well as transmits the text" (Hayward 2012: 130). Hence in the classroom she turns the approximations and shifts to account, using them to teach United States-based students about the novel and the translation, about Arabic and English, and about Egyptian culture and their own.

A Humanistic Practice

The hermeneutic model of translation underlies the contributions to the present volume. Here translation is understood as an interpretive act that varies the form, meaning, and effect of the source text according to the intelligibilities and interests of the translating culture. The variation is inevitable, driven in the first place by the structural differences between languages and by the differences in values, beliefs, and representations between cultures. Translation works by detaching the source text from the set of contexts—linguistic and cultural, institutional and social—that constitute it as a signifying process and by building another set of contexts that constitute the translated text so as to permit it to signify in another language and culture. The process involves, on the one hand, a loss of intricate relations between source-language features and source-culture contexts and, on the other hand, a gain of comparable relations between translating-language features and translating-culture contexts. These two movements are simultaneous, and although they are related, usually motivated by a mimetic impulse on the translator's part, they result in the inscription of an interpretation in the source text that answers to the receiving situation.

The translator inscribes an interpretation by applying a category that mediates between the source language and culture and the translating language and culture, a method of transforming the source text into the translation. This category consists of interpretants, which may be either formal or thematic (my use of the term "interpretant" develops Umberto Eco's commentary on Charles Peirce's semiotics: see 1976a; Eco 1976b: 69–71; 1979: chap. 7). Formal interpretants include a concept of equivalence, such as a semantic correspondence based on dictionary definitions (in other words, a lexicographical equivalence), or a concept of style, a distinctive lexicon and syntax related to a genre or discourse. Thematic interpretants are codes: they might include specific values, beliefs and representations; a discourse in the sense of a relatively coherent body of concepts, problems, and arguments; or a particular interpretation of the source text that has been articulated independently in commentary. Interpretants are fundamentally intertextual, rooted primarily in the receiving situation even if in some cases they may incorporate source cultural materials. It is the translator's application of interpretants

that recontextualizes the source text, replacing source intertextual relations with a receiving intertext, with relations to the translating language and culture which are built into the translation.

The hermeneutic model can be seen as offering an account of the translation process that is both comprehensive and incisive. In displaying the interpretive force of the translator's verbal choices, it aims to expose the various determinations that make possible a translation by focusing the attention of both translator and reader on the application of interpretants in a particular cultural situation at a particular historical moment. At once a conceptual category and an analytical tool, the interpretant lays bare not only the diverse conditions that figure in the production of a translation, of its formal and thematic features, but their relations to the hierarchy of cultural values and social institutions in the receiving situation where the translation both originates and circulates.

Hence the notion of translation as an interpretive act must not be viewed as licensing an arbitrary or indiscriminate treatment of the source text. Not only does the hermeneutic model allow for the translator's application of varying concepts of equivalence, but the range and selection of interpretants are both enabled and constrained by the situation in which the translation is produced, by the hierarchical arrangement of linguistic usage, literary forms, cultural values, and social positions in that situation. Moreover, a translation is an interpretive act regardless of the genre or text type of the source text. Whether the translator is working with pragmatic, technical, or humanistic texts, a museum brochure, a scientific article, or a novel, verbal choices constitute interpretive moves made through the application of formal and thematic interpretants. The interpretants applied in translating a scientific article would include a lexicographical equivalence that combines the current standard dialect of the translating language with the standardized terminology used in the particular scientific field that gave rise to the source text. The translator's choices are enabled and constrained by the text type as well as by the function that the source text is designed to serve, but they nonetheless inscribe an interpretation that might differ with a change of genre or function, such as when a technical text is incorporated into a novel.

The hermeneutic model brings the awareness that no text is ever available in some unmediated form. A text is indistinguishable from the prior interpretive act that Derrida calls an "inscription": "the written origin: traced and henceforth *inscribed in* a system, in a figure which it no longer governs" (Derrida 1978: 115; his italics). The source text is always already mediated, whether read in the source language or translated into a receiving language, and that mediation consists of an interpretation that is itself determined by a network of signification beyond the control and often the awareness of author and translator, whether in the source or the receiving culture. The source text can never be viewed as strictly original, then, because the inescapable inscription "brings[s] the origin or a priori principles in relation to what exceeds them" (Gasché 1986: 161). By the same token, no translation can be described, explained, or evaluated without an inscription, the interposition of interpretants that serve as analytical tools and evaluative principles. Thus any analysis or evaluation of a translation that proceeds simply

on the basis of a comparison to the source text conceals, in effect, a crucial third category: a prior inscription or application of interpretants that makes possible and limits the analysis or evaluation.

This point shows that the hermeneutic model can avoid the mystification that results from the instrumentalism assumed by any theory, commentary, or evaluation that imagines translation as the unmediated reproduction or transfer of an invariant. The instrumental model renders a translation invisible by assuming that it can and should reproduce the source text. Yet this model also renders invisible the necessary application of interpretants, which include a particular reading of the source text that fixes its form and meaning as well as a particular concept of equivalence that depends on that reading to determine whether a translation contains linguistic errors or is free of them. For the fact remains that a noticeable or material shift from the source text—an omission or insertion of words and phrases, for example, or a change in verb tense or mood—cannot in itself be considered an error: it can be branded an error only according to a concept of equivalence applied by the evaluator, but it may well be treated as equivalent according to another such concept. A shift, moreover, might have been deliberate on the translator's part, intended as an interpretive move. It will, in any case, have an interpretive force for the reader who does not have access to the source text, and so it cannot be simply dismissed as erroneous. What particularly recommends the hermeneutic model, then, is the critical self-consciousness that it requires of the reader of translations as well as the translator, the awareness of the unavoidable mediation or inscription through the application of interpretants that intervene between the source text and the translation as well as between the translation and the uses to which it is put.

In arguing for the idea of translation as an interpretive act, I also aim to evoke the origins of translation pedagogy in antiquity. Translation as a form of interpretation was central to humanistic education in ancient Rome, what Cicero called “the study of the humanities and of literature” (Zetzel 2009: 174; “*studiis humanitatis ac litterarum*”: Clark 1911: 2) in his defense of the Greek poet Archias (62 BCE). Roman education was bilingual; students were taught Greek as well as Latin, and translation exercises were routinely performed in the two main subjects: grammar, which focused on language, poetry, and pronunciation, and rhetoric, which focused on invention, style, organization, memory, and delivery—that is, the skills of the orator (McElduff 2013: 21–2, 116–17). In his later commentary on the ideal orator (46 BCE), Cicero famously linked different kinds of translation to the teachers of each subject: the grammarian, whom he called an “*interpres*,” translated closely, describing and explaining a poetic text word by word and line by line (Kaster 1988: 12), whereas the orator translated freely, even paraphrastically, so as to invent a compelling Latin text that displaced but was nonetheless based on a typically Greek source (Copeland 1991: 30; McElduff 2013: 111–15). Although commentators like Cicero and Quintilian reserved the term “*interpretatio*” for the grammarian's translation, every kind of Roman translation constituted an interpretation inscribed through interpretants—even though their commentary was mired in instrumentalism (Venuti 2012a). These commentators valued the

orator's translations over the grammarian's because they found that the latter's interpretations reflected a limited education and hence possessed "insufficient intellectual imagination" to achieve the orator's goal of manipulating the source text in order to fashion his own voice (McElduff 2013: 109).

Translation remained extremely important to humanistic study in later periods even as the very nature and function of the humanities underwent redefinition. Today, despite the marginal position occupied by the study and practice of translation in academic institutions, humanistic disciplines from anthropology, literature, and history to philosophy, religion, and sociology could not conduct their research and teaching without translated texts and various kinds of translation, whether the conventional, interlingual variety or the cultural, intralingual translating that we all do when we interpret and teach. Translation is in fact basic to human cognition, active in the pursuit of intelligibility and in the negotiation of linguistic and cultural differences. It can facilitate or obstruct communication, sometimes both simultaneously. Yet insofar as issues of cosmopolitanism, globalization, and transnationalism have become persistent themes in humanistic study, the urgency to recognize translation as a key practice of intercultural communication has never been greater. Cicero defended the Greek-born Archais against the charge that he was not a Roman citizen, not simply by citing Archais' long residence in Rome, but by appealing to the jury's investment in "all the areas of learning that contribute to our humanity" (Zetzel 2009: 174; "omnes artes quae ad humanitatem pertinent": Clark 1911: 1)—although Cicero's argument finally stoked their chauvinism by pointing to the propagandistic value of poetry, and his notion of humanity applied only to the Roman elite. Still, might not translation be studied and practiced in ways that advocate a democratic humanism, cognizant of differences in languages and cultures without devolving into questionable notions of untranslatability and the impossibility of translation? Might not humanistic translation be rethought as a qualification for a yet-to-emerge form of global citizenship which recognizes but resists the asymmetries that structure international relations, whether cultural or political, economic or legal, military or ideological?

The chapters gathered in this book bring these questions into the classroom by demonstrating how the instructor's assumption of a hermeneutic model can guide the teaching of translation practice and research. Although kinds of translation might be distinguished broadly as humanistic, pragmatic, or technical according to the fields in which it is performed, translation is regarded throughout as a fundamentally humanistic activity because it is a form of interpretation.

In the nine chapters that describe courses devoted to translation practice (chapters six to fourteen), translation is not taught as the reproduction of a source invariant which then becomes the absolute standard by which student work is evaluated. Instead students learn that the interpretation offered by a translation can vary with clients and institutions, disciplinary debates and cultural developments, even while establishing a semantic correspondence and a stylistic approximation to the source text, so that their work can be evaluated only in relation to a set of changing conditions. Students apply concepts of equivalence and discursive strategies as they are linked to genres or text types, moving from word to text as

the unit of translation, figuring in features like tone, register, and style in connection with the function that the translation is intended to serve and the audience for which it is produced. The teaching proceeds, in other words, from formal interpretants that focus on language and textuality to thematic interpretants that focus on differences between the source and receiving cultures as they in turn affect the translator's verbal choices and interpretive moves. Chapters thirteen and fourteen in particular describe courses in which students begin by analyzing the discursive strategies in literary translations in relation to translation theory and critical commentary on an author's work or on a literary tradition, including issues of gender and sexuality, diaspora, cultural minority, and postcoloniality. The teaching explores how such thematic interpretants can inform equivalence and strategy, not only in professional translations but in the students' own translations for the course.

In the ten chapters that describe courses in translation research (chapters fifteen to twenty-four), the spectrum of formal and thematic factors expands to encompass basic practices such as how to read and teach translations as translated texts, various media that include the audiovisual and the digital as well as the linguistic, and a diverse and timely group of cultural and social issues such as world literature, bilingualism, disciplinary divisions, immigration, and human rights. Students learn about the centrality of translation practices to their own cultures, whether they examine translations and translation theories, conduct research in humanistic disciplines and current events, or participate in community service. In every case, they confront and implement the interpretive act that is translation.

The Project

The approach I have taken in editing this volume is methodological rather than linguistic or national. Although the chapters cover a wide range of source languages, kinds of translation, and cultural traditions, the overall aim is to describe the teaching of translation research and practice so as to help initiate or improve it. Written translation is emphasized over interpreting (or oral translation), which might more effectively be covered separately, given the different conditions under which interpreters work. The focus also falls squarely on translation into English. Apart from the merely practical consideration that more than one translating language could not be treated thoroughly in a single book, this decision acknowledges not only the location of most of the contributors, the United States, where English remains the main language of instruction in tertiary institutions, but also the fact that English has become the *lingua franca* of the international community of translation scholars.

The decision carries pedagogical implications too. It assumes not that effective translation can be performed only into the translator's mother tongue but rather that learning to translate into a second language has been a form of foreign-language instruction, not necessarily translator training, and these two tasks should be sharply distinguished—regardless of the fact that no translation can occur without prior or even ongoing instruction in a foreign language. Most

importantly, a translator must have a broad and deep familiarity with linguistic patterns, literary traditions, and cultural values in the receiving situation, not just in the culture where the source text originates. Hence the focus on English allows the chapters to build an informed and nuanced sense of the factors that play into Anglophone translation.

The kinds of translation discussed here include pragmatic and technical as well as humanistic texts, emphasizing literature but also encompassing drama, film, and such other disciplines in the human sciences as anthropology, history, philosophy, and sociology. The first section contains descriptions of existing and in some cases long-standing translation programs, both undergraduate and graduate, offering degrees or certificates. Curricula and courses designed to train translators are distinguished from those designed to train translation scholars. In the second and third sections, a broad gamut of courses is considered, including translation workshops, surveys of translation theory and commentary, historical approaches to translations from particular languages and cultures, and thematic investigations relating to current trends and debates in literary and cultural studies. Course descriptions outline syllabi, discuss pedagogical strategies, and explain activities and assignments. The fourth section contains chapters in which scholarship on pedagogies of translation practice as well as various types of translation textbooks are submitted to critical discussion.

The institutional sites of the programs and courses are extremely varied, including translator training programs, creative writing programs, departments of foreign languages and literatures, and departments and programs of comparative literature. I sought to maintain coherence amid such variety by insuring that the contributors framed their chapters so as to respond to certain basic questions:

- Does the program or course have any eligibility requirements or prerequisites? How do students' linguistic backgrounds or preparation affect the learning outcomes?
- How is translation defined or conceived in the program or course? Are different kinds of translation taught? Is translation distinguished from adaptation and other kinds of second-order practices?
- What requirements, whether a sequence of courses or a set of readings and assignments, have been developed to realize the conception of translation underpinning the program or course?
- How does the institutional site shape the curriculum, course, and pedagogy?
- What impact does the program or course have on students' careers as they continue in the academic institution and after they graduate? Do students pursue other, related degrees? Do they work in the translation industry? Do they publish translation research or translations?

As a result of the answers provided to these questions, the chapters can be seen as presenting exemplary models that can be replicated or adapted in other institutions.

Although each of the sections is devoted to a particular topic related to teaching, the chapters they contain offer many points of intersection that not only

highlight the differences among the descriptions but also increase their usefulness in developing programs and courses. The courses in translation practice and research described in the second and third sections might be regarded as supplements to the program descriptions in the first section, courses that might conceivably be taught in those programs, thus broadening or enhancing their offerings. The course inventory for the MFA in literary translation (chapter four), for example, could well include the translation workshops in poetry, in poetry and prose, and in drama (chapters nine, ten, and eleven). Similarly, the graduate certificate in translation studies (chapter two), especially since it is housed in a department of comparative literature, could conceivably offer research-oriented courses that focus on world literature, postcolonial translation, and bilingual authorship (chapters nineteen, twenty-one, and twenty-two). These sorts of connections are more explicit in the case of the two chapters written by faculty at Kent State University: an account of their master's program in translator training is further developed by a discussion of a course on translating text types that is regularly taught in the program (chapters three and seven).

Another useful point of intersection emerges from the comments on which course materials are assigned and how they are employed in class discussions and activities. The same textbooks and readings might be put to different uses, theoretical, historical, or practical, depending on the course and program as well as the department or field. The very notion of what constitutes translation theory is redefined in the movement between sections. The assigned readings include not only practice-oriented commentary with a basis in linguistics or in professional experience, typified by the so-called craft essay, but also philosophically oriented commentary that encompasses such other discourses as literary theory, psychoanalysis, and poststructuralism. And just as the instructor new to the field can profit from the chapters on translating particular genres and text types, so can any instructor profit from the chapters that show how to address the translated status of a translation in the classroom.

The project of describing current practices in teaching translation studies, although designed primarily to advance them, enables this volume to perform a number of other functions. It can help faculty learn about traditions of translation theory and commentary as well as recent developments in translation research. It outlines and illustrates various kinds of pedagogies to teach translation theory, history, and practice. It presents a body of knowledge and experience that can be useful not only in devising translation-oriented programs and courses but also in conducting job searches to staff them. Ultimately, it demonstrates the scholarly integrity of translation studies as well as the necessity for translators, teachers of translation, and teachers of translated texts to be deeply immersed in the field.