constraints which shape standard translation practices in a given culture – is introduced and developed (Toury 1995 is a continuation of this work). Hermans's (1985a) collection of largely descriptive essays by a variety of scholars is another important expression of this approach, contributing in particular the notion of translation as the manipulation of literature. In a later work (1999), Hermans observes that the polysystem approach is able to accommodate a 'range of traditionally neglected texts' that permit translation to be located within the broader context of cultural history (1999: 118). However, in the same work, he discusses a number of limitations to polysystem theory (ibid.: 118–19). First, he highlights the danger of depersonalization. Ultimately text-based, the approach does not concern itself with individuals, groups or institutions, revealing an unwillingness to engage with the underlying causes of the phenomena that are of interest to it. Hermans also characterizes the 'primary versus secondary' opposition as a 'self-fulfilling prophecy' because, unlike the other oppositions, it may not be deduced from statements deriving from within the system that forms the object of study but is imposed retrospectively by the researcher. Finally, he points out that real-life case studies reveal phenomena that are too 'ambivalent, hybrid, unstable, mobile, overlapping and collapsed' for polysystem's binary logic.

Polysystem theory has provided the theoretical framework for numerous case studies focusing on different kinds of translation activity within a wide range of linguistic, cultural and historical contexts. These include the representation of Ireland in Finnish realist drama (Aaltonen 1996); British New Wave film adaptation, screenwriting and dialogue (Remael 2000); Malraux in English translation (Fawcett 2001); French Existentialism in post-World War II Jewish-American literature (Codde 2003); the translation of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* into German and Japanese (von Schwerin-High 2004); and translated children's books (Thomson 2005).

Polysystem theory as articulated by Even-Zohar and other scholars is not a complete, watertight package but rather a point of departure for further work. As long as it is viewed as such, it is likely to continue to give rise to fruitful investigation, of both a theoretical and a descriptive nature. Although it remains very much 'work in progress', open to further modification and refinement, the contribution of polysystem theory to our understanding of the nature and role of translation has been significant and highly influential.

See also:
DESCRIPTIVE VS. COMMITTED APPROACHES; LITERARY TRANSLATION; MODELS; NORMS; PSEUDOTRANSLATION; REWRITING.

Further reading
Even-Zohar 1978a, 1978b; Holmes *et al*. 1978; Toury 1980a; Lefevere 1983b; Hermans 1985a; Even-Zohar 1990; Gentzler 1993; Hermans 1995, 1999; Toury 1995.

MARK SHUTTLEWORTH

Postcolonial approaches

Translation is increasingly being investigated as a cultural artefact that is deeply entrenched in the historical reality of its production. POLYSYSTEM theory and Descriptive Translation Studies (see DESCRIPTIVE VS. COMMITTED APPROACHES) have directed scholarly attention to studying translation within the target culture, but as a product of intercultural transfer, translation also signals the relationship between the cultures it traverses. Since cultures rarely, if ever, meet on equal terms, a postcolonial approach to translation inevitably poses the crucial but long-neglected question of how blatant power differentials, particularly in the age of European colonialism, have influenced the practice of translation. A second, crucial question of interest to postcolonial theorists concerns how translation might contribute to exposing, challenging and decolonizing the legacy of colonialism and various forms of neo-colonialism in a postcolonial era.

Translation served colonial powers in many ways. To start with, translation is a form of intelligence gathering. The natives can be conquered with brutal military force and coercion, but colonial rule must be sustained

through persuasion and knowledge of the other. The fact that the East/Rest was turned into a formidable province of European learning during the period of European colonialism clearly attests to the complicity between power and knowledge (Said 1978). As a primary means of making sense of Europe's Other, translation took pride of place in nineteenth-century Orientalism, with translated knowledge informing the colonial project of ruling and transforming the colonized in the interests of the colonizers.

Translation from and into dominated/dominating cultures

Translation **from dominated cultures** not only informs and empowers the colonizers but also serves to interpellate the colonized into colonial subjects (Niranjana 1992). As a form of representation, translation constructs a whole set of orientalist images of dominated cultures, images which come to function as 'realities' for both dominant and dominated peoples. This is accomplished through various means:

(a) *The choice of translation materials*. Texts which help create a desired image of the colonized or confirm prevalent orientalist images are more readily translated and circulated. Sengupta (1995: 162) notes that Indian texts translated by English orientalists, most notably William Jones, 'were either religious or spiritual, saturated with mysticism, or portrayed a simple and natural state of existence that was radically different from the metropolitan self of the target culture'. Jacquemond (1992: 150–51) similarly points out that *The Arabian Nights*, which has been translated numerous times into French throughout the last two decades, 'has undoubtedly been the main literary source of French representations of the Arab world, in both their negative (the "barbarian" Orient) and positive (the "magical" Orient) dimensions'.

(b) *The orientalist paradigm of translation*. Canonical texts from dominated cultures often appear in imposing scholarly translations, which are painfully and pedantically literal and loaded with an awesome exegetical and critical apparatuses. Such scholarly translations reinforce the image of the 'orient' as stagnant, mysterious, strange, and esoteric, of interest to and penetrable only with the help of a handful of orientalist 'experts' (Jacquemond 1992: 149). Indeed, in spite of their meticulous care and apparent servitude to the words of dominated-language texts, orientalist translators often pose as authoritative interpreters and judges of things oriental. Science, rationality and Christian 'truths' could all be rallied to deconstruct, denigrate, or desacralize the canons of other cultures. The refusal to see non-Western cultures on their own terms is manifested either in the translation proper or in the critical apparatus: orientalist translators may feel constrained to represent native views in the main body of the translation, but they are seldom shy of turning the paratextual space – prefaces, introductions, notes, appendixes, and so forth – into a colonizing space where cultural differences are interpreted as signs of the inferiority of non-Western cultures (Wang Hui 2007).

Translations produced in this orientalist or philological tradition, identified by Tymoczko as 'the norm for translating the native texts of minority and non-Western cultures' (1999a: 269), have the potential of 'constructing a posture of esthetic … and … cultural imperialism' because through them 'the literature of other cultures is reduced to non-literature and segments of world literature come to be represented by non-literature', leading to 'the sort of judgment about non-Western literatures epitomized in Macaulay's infamous remarks that he had not found an Orientalist "who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native culture of India and Arabia".' (ibid.).

(c) *Fluent, domesticating translations*. In the popular tradition of translating non-Western cultures, translators often domesticate foreign texts to suit Western values, paradigms and poetics. According to Venuti (1995a), fluent, domesticating translations create the illusion of invisible translators and transparent representations, which

helps to conceal their imperialistic, ethnocentric reduction of cultural difference.

If translations from dominated cultures construct an image of non-Western cultures as inferior, creating a need and justification for Western civilizing missions, translations **from dominant cultures**, much larger in quantity than those from dominated cultures, serve the very purpose of intellectual colonization. The gross trade imbalance in translation between dominant and dominated cultures, as documented by Jacquemond (1992: 139) and Venuti (1992: 5–6, 1995a: 12–17), clearly reflects the dynamics of cultural hegemony and dependency.

In contrast with the orientalist representation of dominated-language texts as esoteric and strange, texts from dominant cultures often appear in readable versions as embodying universal truths and values. In the initial contact with dominant cultures, dominated societies tend to naturalize foreign literary production, a tendency interpreted by Jacquemond (1992: 142) as a sign of cultural independence. As political and economic domination deepens, however, the cultural confidence of dominated societies wanes, and translation becomes a primary tool of modernization, or rather Westernization, viewed as a means of strengthening the domestic culture. During this period of intense cultural and linguistic colonization, Western texts tend to be translated more accurately, with their cultural and linguistic specificities foregrounded to serve as a powerful model and stimulation for 'stagnant' native languages and cultures.

Strategies of resistance and decolonization

Translation is not solely a channel of colonization; it can also be a site of active resistance to colonial and neocolonial powers. A number of studies that approached translation from a postcolonial perspective have revealed traces of resistance inscribed in translations undertaken in colonial contexts and proposed ways of putting translation at the service of decolonization.

Rafael (1988) argues that a series of playful mistranslations of the Spanish Christian missionaries' more 'prestigious' languages helped the Tagalogs in the Philippines to negotiate the terms of their conversion under Spanish rule. The examples he provides demonstrate that translation is never a site where one language-culture can claim complete victory over the other. Rather, it is a 'space of hybridity' where 'newness enters the world', 'newness' which undermines the 'purity' of the dominant language-culture (Bhabha 1994b).

Tymoczko's (1999a) sympathetic and nuanced analysis of early Irish literature in English translation reveals how different metonymic aspects of Irish hero tales have been suppressed, foregrounded or transformed by Irish translators at different historical moments to advance anti-colonial, nationalist agendas. Her analysis suggests that resistant translations can employ a wide range of STRATEGIES to undermine the colonizer and empower the colonized, and that sweeping dismissal of domesticating or assimilationist strategies is therefore historically naive.

Perhaps more fundamental than the choice of translation strategy in a specific text is the ethical issue of helping translators adopt an anti-colonial stance in their interaction with other cultures (see ETHICS). Postcolonial approaches recognize that translation is never neutral, that it is a site of intense ideological and discursive negotiation (see IDEOLOGY). For translators to promote a genuine respect for alterity, they need first of all to decolonize their own minds, to dislodge traces of colonialist ideologies, and to recognize the basic right to equality of all languages and cultures (see MINORITY).

Scholars who adopt a post-structuralist stance tend to valorize foreignizing translation strategies. As a leading discourse which has informed a significant number of postcolonial studies of translation, post-structuralism (including DECONSTRUCTION) has initiated a radical reconsideration of many concepts which underwrite traditional theorization of translation, concepts such as the originality of the source text (which relegates translation to servitude); the idea of a stable meaning waiting to be decoded from one language and encoded into another, and the image of a transcendental translator unconstrained by the sociocultural conditions of his or her time. A keen awareness of the power of language in constructing, rather than reflecting, meaning and reality has led to a shift in attention, from the transcendental signified to 'the chain of signifiers, to syntactic processes,

to discursive structures, to the incidence of language mechanisms on thought and reality formation' (Lewis 1985: 42). Venuti advocates foreignizing translation as a means of resisting 'ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism' and promoting 'democratic geopolitical relations' (1995a: 20). Niranjana follows Walter Benjamin in advancing extreme literalism as the preferred mode of translation, opting for a type of interlinear, word-for-word translation which 'provides a literal rendering of the syntax', 'lovingly and in detail incorporates the original's mode of signification', and 'holds back from communicating' (1992: 155). Spivak similarly argues that the task of the translator is 'to surrender herself to the linguistic rhetoricity of the original text' (1992b: 189), a task that 'holds the agency of the translator and the demands of her imagined or actual audience at bay' (ibid.: 181) and confines the translator, most of the time, to the position of 'literalist surrender' (ibid.: 190). Over the years, the call for adopting foreignizing translations has thus become closely associated with postcolonial translation discourse, but its effectiveness and theoretical underpinnings remain open to question for many scholars (Robinson 1997a: 107–13; Dharwadker 1999; Tymoczko 2000a, among others).

Because the ultimate goal of 'decolonized' and 'decolonizing' translation is to understand other cultures on their own terms, the concept of 'thick translation', developed by Appiah (1993) and applied by a number of scholars (Wolf 2003; Hermans 2003; Cheung 2004/2007; Sturge 2006), has naturally proved appealing. Thick translation 'seeks to locate a text (i.e. the translation) in a rich cultural and linguistic context in order to promote, in the target language culture, a fuller understanding and a deeper respect of the culture of the Other' (Cheung 2004/2007: 3). In thick translation, an attempt is made to go beyond translating an individual text; the aim is to activate much of the tradition behind the text through a process of layered contextualization.

Postcolonial translation is mainly concerned with preserving the alterity of dominated languages and cultures. When it comes to the translation of dominant-language texts, the task of the postcolonial translator is often reformulated as one of resisting neocolonial linguistic and cultural hegemony. Jacquemond (1992: 156) maintains that in the postcolonial moment translation should be situated within the framework of an 'Occidentalism', that is, western intellectual production should be sifted, appropriated and naturalized in the service of dominated languages/cultures. In Brazil, a similar postcolonial poetics of translation has become known metaphorically as 'cannibalism': cannibalistic practices value creative translation of foreign texts on local terms, so that foreign nourishment can be absorbed and combined with one's own for greater vitality (Vieira 1999).

Strengths and limitations

During the past two decades, postcolonial studies of translation have redefined our understanding of translation, particularly its relation to power, ideology and empire building. In addition to exposing the shameful history of exploiting translation to justify and maintain colonial dominance, postcolonial studies of translation have also been instrumental in exploring various ways of putting translation at the service of anti-colonial and decolonizing agendas. Nevertheless, postcolonial studies of translation are not without their limitations.

If postcolonial approaches to translation were born out of 'anthropology, ethnography and colonial history' (Robinson 1997a: 1), they have been slow and reluctant to cut their umbilical cord. The four major theorists discussed in Robinson's (1997a) survey of the field are postcolonial scholars who 'find little in the field (of translation studies) to hold their interest' (ibid.: 2). What allows Robinson to bring them together and present them as part of the translation studies landscape is a common interest they share in using the term 'translation' metaphorically for a variety of colonial transactions: for Asad (1986), anthropological representation of cultures is a form of 'translation'; for Rafael (1988), Christian conversion is an act of 'translation'; Cheyfitz (1991) applies the term 'translation' to the introduction of the European concept of property right in order to lawfully dispossess American Indians; and Niranjana (1992) similarly treats the Orientalist interpellation of the Indians into colonial subjects as an act of 'translation'. When colonialism itself is seen as a huge 'translation' project,

as an attempt to 'translate' other cultures into Europe's servile copies, research that has no more than a tangential relation to interlingual translation can easily be incorporated into the field. This is why many essays which might more properly belong to 'postcolonial studies' have found their way into volumes of collected essays on 'postcolonial translation studies'.

In line with this all-embracing, metaphorical use of 'translation', the concept of CULTURAL TRANSLATION has also become popular; Robinson (1997a: 43) defines 'cultural translation' as the process 'not of translating specific cultural texts but of consolidating a wide variety of cultural discourses into a target text that in some sense has no "original", no source text'. This development threatens to undermine the specificity of translation studies by expanding it to include practically all forms of representation and discourses. In addition, it introduces a certain level of confusion and overgeneralization into some discussions of translation. For example, in critiquing William Jones's deployment of translation in constructing the 'Hindu' subjects of the empire, Niranjana deems it unnecessary to interrogate his actual translations against 'the so-called originals' (1992: 13). Instead, she proposes 'to examine the "outwork" of Jones's translations – the prefaces, the annual discourses to the Asiatic society, his charges to the Grand Jury at Calcutta, his letters, and his "Oriental" poems' (ibid.). Niranjana's dismissal of 'the so-called original' is informed by a post-structuralist concept of textuality. But translation *per se* – not 'cultural translation' in its broad, metaphorical sense – presupposes the existence of a source text. To reveal the instability of the source text is one thing (here one needs to be mindful of the cultural imperialism potent within a radically deconstructive stance towards third world texts, particularly their sacred canons); to dismiss the relevance of comparative textual study is quite another. Without in-depth textual case studies to reveal the manifold ways in which colonialist ideologies have shaped, and taken shape in, actual translations, postcolonial studies of translation cannot address the core questions posed from within the discipline. Failure to address these questions adequately cast doubt on the legitimacy of postcolonial approaches' claim to a central position in translation studies

See also:
CULTURAL TRANSLATION; DECONSTRUCTION; ETHICS; GLOBALIZATION; IDEOLOGY; MINORITY; STRATEGIES .

Further reading:
Rafael 1988; Niranjana 1992; Spivak 1992b; Venuti 1992; Sengupta 1995; Venuti 1995a; Robinson 1997a; Bassnett and Trivedi 1999; Tymoczko 1999a; Simon and St-Pierre 2000; Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002; Cheung 2004/2007; Branchadell and West 2005.

WANG HUI

Pragmatics

In 1955 at Harvard, psychologists were buzzing with excitement about the lectures being given by Noam Chomsky on his theory of Transformational Generative Grammar. In the same year, also at Harvard, the British philosopher John Austin was to deliver the prestigious William James lectures and present what was to have an equally strong impact on a wide range of disciplines. This was a new perspective which was to radically reshape our view of language and the way it operates. Since then, the domain of pragmatic inquiry has emerged as a discipline in its own right, attending to such matters as 'the study of the purposes for which sentences are used, of the real world conditions under which a sentence may be appropriately used as an utterance' (Stalnaker 1972: 380).

Speech acts

Speech acts are those we perform when, for example, we make a complaint or a request, apologize or pay someone a compliment. The pragmatic analysis of speech acts sees all utterances in terms of the dual function of 'stating' and 'doing things', of having a 'sense' and a 'force'. An utterance, in this view, has:

(a) a **sense** or reference to specific events, persons or objects;
(b) a **force** which may override literal sense and thus relay added effects such as