

Literary Translation as a Nexus of Language Planning

Joanna L. Siegel

University of Pennsylvania

In recent years, the discipline of Translation Studies (TS) has moved toward producing research that takes greater account of the social and cultural contexts in which literary translations are produced (Bassnett, 2010). As a result, the writings of TS theorists are generating insights that are increasingly relevant to the concerns of sociolinguistics. In particular, their written speech—taken as sociolinguistic data itself—evinces discourses of language policy and planning (LPP) both overtly and covertly (Shohamy, 2006). This paper builds a framework to research these discourses, synthesizing theoretical and analytic contributions from both the TS and LPP literatures. It then examines four distinct case studies, to demonstrate the various ways that LPP activities and approaches have been manifested through literary translation and the secondary scholarship of TS. The overall aim of this paper is to initiate an ongoing conversation about literary and other forms of translation as pertinent objects of inquiry in LPP studies and sociolinguistics more generally.

Introduction

The challenges of literary translation as a textual and creative practice are well documented across various subdivisions of the humanities, most notably in the field of Translation Studies (TS) (see Venuti, 2012, for a collection of canonical texts). This body of literature historically tended to focus on texts themselves as objects of inquiry, seeking to answer literary questions about equivalence, literalness, poetic form, and other strategic aspects of reading and writing translations. To the extent that these inquiries take into account the cultural implications of such strategies, or the sociopolitical contexts of the source or target audiences, they constitute a form of micro-sociolinguistic documentation. In addition, TS research often contains latent sociolinguistic insights embedded in descriptions of specific texts and linguistic tokens, as well as metapragmatic theories about language and social actors.

In recent years, several scholars have pushed this field more explicitly around what has been called a social or cultural turn (Baer, 2011b; Bassnett, 2010; Gentzler, 2007; Tymoczko, 2000; Venuti, 1995), incorporating critical and postcolonial theory into an understanding of translation as discursive action, and at times as material political engagement.¹ This paper draws from that body of literature, building on its arguments about the situatedness of translations and translators, while also taking up these secondary texts as primary data—

¹ The most recent issue of *Translation and Interpreting Studies* (volume 7, issue 2), edited by Claudia V. Angelelli (2012), is a special issue on “the sociological turn” in the field that also showcases new scholarship in this vein.

the speech of translation scholars, who in this sampling are all translators themselves. Synthesizing these data will uncover how approaches to translation are constructed, performed, criticized or advocated in the construction of national literatures. These discourses in turn sketch the linguistic profile of ideal national subjects—an issue of great import to the field of language policy and planning (LPP) that emerges consistently across the TS literature. Consequently, my argument underscores the importance of wider sociolinguistic research on the role of literary translators as agents of language planning.

I begin by identifying the major types of LPP processes that emerge from translators' discourses and practices—namely prestige, discourse, corpus and status planning. In the second section, I examine the materials that translators work with: the nature of the texts and codes involved. Through the strategies they adopt to manipulate these materials, translators inevitably develop positions with respect to style, standardizing norms, the use of registers, and other phenomena at the intersection of the linguistic and the social. These positions may be overt or covert; the case studies in this paper (which I will introduce shortly) often demonstrate overt articulations of these positions. Analyzed through the lens of LPP research, it becomes clear that these choices can have substantial consequences, from language ideologies to language shift. Above all, the way that translators construct or project their intended audience as a public, creating or reinforcing one or more imagined communities (Anderson, 1983), is the key LPP impact of translation that this paper aims to illustrate.

In the third section, I move beyond texts to consider the actors within this field of LPP activities. I establish the notion of translators as political agents—not just as linguistic bureaucrats or creative artists—and situate them in the sociopolitical contexts in and into which they write. Literary critics, translation scholars, publishers and audiences comprise other important actors and communities in the field.

Finally, I illustrate four international cases that demonstrate the entanglement of texts and codes, actors, and LPP processes described in the previous sections. From these divergent cases, a picture will emerge of how translator-agents contribute in varied ways to the imagining of a national literature, and thus to an idealized national identity with a particular linguistic profile. At times, these projections are contested by other social agents, or in the terms of this argument, other LPP stakeholders. Although this process of national identity formation is not the invariable result of literary translating, it may occur even in cases where the nation in question is not a recognized state entity but rather an ethnic solidarity or minoritized group. In light of these considerations, two broader axes of LPP negotiations emerge across all four cases: how colonial power relations are enforced and/or resisted, and how the heteroglossic (multilingual, multi-register) practices of a linguistic landscape come to be represented.

In the process of positioning translators as political agents, it also becomes possible to see the varying stances taken by different social actors regarding the appropriate role of the translator-agent in the imagined public. In each case, I aim to articulate not only what literary translators do with respect to LPP processes, but also what they are expected to do by and for other LPP stakeholders.

Mapping an LPP Framework for Translation

To classify the kinds of LPP processes that are influenced by literary translation, I draw from Hornberger's (2006) "integrative LPP framework" (p. 27), and LoBianco's (2010) expansion on that framework. Hornberger (2006) synthesizes the existing typologies in the field, organizing these categories around two general approaches—*policy* planning and *cultivation* planning. Within each of these approaches, three different types of activities may take place: *status*, *acquisition*, and *corpus* planning (with numerous more specific activities falling under each activity type). For the cases analyzed in this paper, status and corpus planning activities emerge as salient; indeed, more research is needed on the potential uses of translation for language acquisition purposes (cf. Cook, 2010). LoBianco (2010), revisiting Hornberger's integrative framework, adds three more types of LPP activities: *usage*, *prestige*, and *discourse* planning. Prestige and discourse planning are the most relevant to the cases at hand. In sum, I will use the LPP activity types of status, corpus, prestige, and discourse planning as analytic categories to guide each case study.

Before examining these LPP activities in greater detail, I will comment briefly on the distinction between the policy and cultivation approaches under which they have previously been divided. Hornberger (2006) derives this distinction from Neustupný's (1974) early taxonomy. As Neustupný delineated, the policy approach "covers problems like selection of the national language, standardization, literacy, orthographies, problems of stratification of language (repertoire of code varieties), etc. The emphasis is on linguistic varieties and their distribution" (p. 39). Hornberger (2006) characterizes this as an emphasis on form, whereas the cultivation approach can be seen as emphasizing function. According to Neustupný, the cultivation approach "is characterized by interest in questions of correctness, efficiency, linguistic levels of fulfilling specialized functions, problems of style, constraints on communicative capacity, etc. . . . *Langue*, language code, remains the central focus, but *parole*, speaking, is also considered" (p. 39). In considering these two kinds of approaches, it is important to keep in mind LoBianco's (2010) disclaimer that "in practice these activities and approaches are often inseparable" (p. 146).

Although Neustupný (1974) asserts that "acceptance of one of the approaches frequently excludes the other approach" (pp. 39-40), policy and cultivation can be seen to coalesce in the realm of literary translation—whether LPP efforts are conscious or not. Neustupný distinguishes: "While the policy approach appeals to administration, the cultivation approach addresses the public in general, and intellectuals in particular" (p. 39). Indeed, members of official language academies (Choudhuri, 1997) as well as literary critics, language activists, and other translators (Baer, 2011b; Gupta, 1998; Jaffe, 1999a) have participated in shaping ideologies and discourses about how translators should translate and how translations should be understood in a social context. Policy and cultivation approaches coexist and interact freely in this field of LPP processes, because translation is both a decentralized field of activity, but also a strategy that can be appropriated by institutions or advocated by more consolidated communities of practice.

Prestige Planning

According to LoBianco (2010),

prestige planning focuses on aesthetic or intellectual regard of a linguistic code. Many of today's major languages have benefited from prestige planning by poets, philosophers and religious figures. Esteem is conferred on a language in proportion to the quality and extent of its important works of literature. (p. 148)

LoBianco provides the illustrative anecdote of Dante Alighieri's choice to compose the *Divine Comedy* in his Italian vernacular, as opposed to the Latin that was strict convention at the time for literary texts and epic poems. In 1305, Alighieri even wrote a tract, *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, that advocated writing in the vernacular to establish national unity and independence—a rather explicit (and typical) example of LPP discourse linking literature to national subjecthood. Although the *Divine Comedy* was significant for its publication in the original, not in translation, Dante's discursive action paralleled many instances in the future, around the world, in which choices to translate literature into (or out of) a minority vernacular amounted to a palpable political statement (Choudhuri, 1997; Jaffe, 1999a; Tymoczko, 2000).

As LoBianco (2010) notes, prestige planning can occur both to reinforce dominant norms of what is elite or prestigious, as well as to cultivate “transgressive kinds of prestige [that] confer cultural capital, the material and symbolic resources valued by particular communities” (p. 148). Indeed, all of the cases detailed in this paper are rooted in cultural contexts of political conflict or upheaval, in which established notions of prestige are contested and renegotiated. Given the high social value attached to literature, translators hold a considerable power to influence prestige planning. Works of canonical literature often serve as defining emblems of a national or ethnolinguistic culture, and the very existence of a written literature in a language has a strong bearing on how speakers of that language are understood by others, for better or for worse.

Discourse Planning

LoBianco (2010) briefly touches on the element of discourse planning, including it almost liminally in his framework. However, it is an extremely salient and valuable unit of analysis in the field of translation-as-LPP. This “distinctive, and controversial, category of LP relates to the links between discourse and ideology,” and in particular it deals with “how individuals deploy persuasive talk or writing to modify or reinforce worldview and attitudes” (p. 149). A key example of discourse planning is the extensive training in rhetoric in the educational systems of ancient Greece and Rome. Its inclusion in the field of LPP research is controversial perhaps because it opens up too vague a scope for analysis. However, it arises in a very specific sense when translation is taken up as a site of LPP processes: the circulation of social, political, and ideological discourses across and between speech communities that is made possible through translation.

Among the manifestations of discourse planning that LoBianco outlines, an important one for this paper is when “political movements and parties engage in

persuasion on policy and political philosophy” (p. 149). In an even more specific sense, these political discourses are relevant to LPP research when they work to shape language ideologies, defining implicitly or explicitly the linguistic varieties that an ideal national subject should read and produce. This occurs implicitly in the choices within literature-in-translation, as well as both implicitly and explicitly in the speech and writing of translators, as will be analyzed in the case studies.

Corpus-Status Planning

Keeping in mind the complex dynamic system in LPP, LoBianco (2010) describes prestige planning in conjunction with both corpus and status planning, all of which literary publishing can engage with one fell swoop: “Noted works help standardize the language (corpus) and gain admiration for it (status)” (p. 148). In general, LPP research on corpus and status planning—often with an eye toward standardization and/or modernization—has focused on what one might call *first-degree literatures*, or the development of a primary body of written texts in a language which, up to that point, existed solely in oral usage. These projects of graphitization are necessarily linked to orthography development. Key studies of such projects (López, 1997; González Ventura, 1997; Souza, 2005) have emphasized the importance that those involved—stakeholders and researchers alike—remain rooted in and fully aware of the local cultural contexts of concern. Given that writing is “a means through which a society represents itself to itself” (Souza, 2005, p. 86), and that all modalities are symbolically charged and socially situated (Kress, 1997), texts that are mobilized for corpus standardization also operate in more sociopolitical dimensions of status planning. Likewise translations, as a particular type of textual modality, can affect corpus standardization in a straightforward way through their usage of language, but they can also alter the translated text with respect to the official status of the language(s) involved, as well as influence the status of the original source text and its cultural or political meanings.

As Ferguson (1968) observes, “there are various paths to standardization and a number of sociolinguistic variables to be investigated in connection with the different paths” (p. 32). Among the four recurrent features of standardization he outlines in the context of Europe since the Renaissance, the last two apply to the cases of translation-as-LPP (within and outside of Western Europe) that I explore below: “(3) One writer or a small number of writers served as acknowledged models for literary use of the standardizing language. (4) The standardizing language served as a symbol of either religious or national identity” (p. 32). Rather than focusing on the specific linguistic features of translations that contribute to standardization, I will instead trace language ideologies about translations and translators, as well as discourses that connect national identities to particular language varieties and literatures. However, there is clearly a need for further empirical research on the influence of translations at this level—which exemplifies both of Neustupný’s (1974) extremes: the macroscopic concerns of the policy approach and the public/intellectual stylizing of cultivation.

I will now review a few key issues that arise in and around the actual practice of literary translation, which intersect with sociolinguistics generally and the concerns of LPP in particular. In the following section, I consider translators as

professionals, as social actors and in particular as LPP stakeholders. I will then delve into the four focal case studies.

The Practice of Translation: Working with Texts and Codes

The ideologies, expectations, and possibilities of literary translation depend on underlying assumptions—or explicit theories—about what translating does with language. Indeed, it might be said that the very notion of translation is an ideology itself, insofar as it assumes that semantic transfer with some degree of equivalence is in fact possible. Alternate terms such as adaptation, interpretation, transduction, and transcreation exist, but remain highly marked to describe what we currently call the translation of literature, in spite of the long-standing contestation of the notion of a fluent or equivalent translation (Jaffe, 1999a; Jakobson, 1959). Likewise, sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists have amply documented the degree of transformation that occurs through recontextualization (Bauman & Briggs, 1990), given the context-dependence of meaning in human communications.

Whenever translation is naturalized as a straightforward form of communicative performance (Bauman, 2001), a language ideology emerges regarding the function of literary translators (or lack thereof) in semiotic processes. Irvine and Gal (2000) define language ideologies as “the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them” (p. 35). In this case, the understanding is that linguistic varieties, in all of their difference, can find equivalence at the Saussurian level of *langue* or language code, and be reshaped unproblematically from source text into translated text at the level of *parole* or usage. This belief produces one of the language ideological processes outlined by Irvine & Gal: *erasure*, in this case the erasure of the translator as an active, sentient, even invasive participant in the semiotic process. More specifically, erasure can be understood as “a process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or get explained away” (p. 38). The minimization or erasure of the persons, activities, and sociolinguistic phenomena involved in translation takes material shape on the covers and title pages of translated publications, where the translator’s name is generally listed in a proportionally much smaller typeface or not listed at all. In the discursive landscape surrounding literature in translation, this erasure pervades in the seeming transparency of a translated text—schools teach Homer, not Lattimore, Fitzgerald or Fagles.

This process of erasure extends one crucial step further: if the translator is invisible, then the influence the translator has in representing the linguistic variations present in the source text is also invisible. There is an unspoken rule in the literary market that translators should target the imagined standard dialect of the intended audience (Venuti, 2000), thereby contributing to corpus standardization. This point opens up one of the most important “facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme” of fluent (i.e., invisible) translation: linguistic variation is the rule of communication, not the exception. Translators constantly make subjective (or agentive) interpretations and choices regarding the linguistic varieties in source and target languages and cultures. In other words, at the core of the translation ideology I am describing there often lies a monolingualist essentialization, which

features with special prominence in the last of the four case studies. Jaffe (1999a) identifies the same norm and bias in political projects of LPP, such as the language revitalization activism she observed in Corsica: “When language plays a key role in the legitimation of political boundaries, it is not language as communicative practice that is invoked, but language as bounded, pure, autonomous code” (p. 40).

In the Corsican case, which I review in greater depth below, such normative discourses police the purity of Corsican literature rather than of Corsican language per se, through attacks on the decision to translate from the high (French) variety into the low (Corsican) variety in the politically charged diglossic context of the island. In this case, language activists actually reversed the language ideology of the erased translator, foregrounding the translator-as-agent; ironically, they did so through applying the same basic monoglossic essentialization to literature rather than languages.

However, in the absence of such policing, forms of di- or heteroglossic variation in source texts often undergo their own erasure through translation (Baer, 2011b). Sometimes, rather than flattening out variation, translators will cope with this challenge of the trade by severely transforming varieties from their originally situated meanings and power relations through the use of cultural analogies (e.g., substituting the dialect of the American South to represent a rural dialect in China). Most mainstream translators make these choices, often invisibly, in order to produce a translated text containing fluent, standard, or otherwise unmarked usage according to the target audience. Given that such regional variations are subject to drastic transmutation, the subtler situational variations of register and politeness are the stuff of constant negotiation and creative maneuvering by literary translators—even as their meanings in the source text remain deeply dependent on cultural context.

The Stakeholders of Translation: Translators, Communities, Critics, and Audiences

One can only delve so deep into the nature of text and code in literary translation before bumping up against its human and social dimensions. Having acknowledged the involvement of the translator in the social meanings of translations, it is also important to recognize that the norms and expectations surrounding that involvement can vary cross-culturally. Toury (1978) provides a thorough analysis of those norms which is not without its problematic assertions (a critique of which lies outside the scope of this paper; see Tymoczko, 2000). He does, however, articulate the useful observation that

Being a translator cannot be reduced to the mere generation of utterances which would be considered “translations” within any of these disciplines [linguistics, text-linguistics, contrastive textology or pragmatics]. Translation activities should rather be regarded as having cultural significance. Consequently, “translatorship” amounts first and foremost to being able to *play a social role*, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community...in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. (p. 206)

Even when this social role is made invisible in most interactions surrounding translated texts, there is a social role being played—it is merely that of one whose

orchestrating efforts are seamless, like the ideal hostess who never breaks a sweat. I will elaborate on several identifiable variations in these roles (or ideals) in the contexts analyzed below.

Tymoczko (2000) acknowledges that because “meaning in a text is overdetermined” (p. 24), translations are always partial. Engaging in her own translatorly act of verbal permutation, she equates this *partiality* to the inevitably *partisan* role of the translator, who must always *participate* in “choices selecting aspects or parts of a text to transpose and emphasize. Such choices in turn serve to create representations of their source texts, representations that are also partial” (p. 24). Another way of understanding this formulation of the social role of the translator is to situate translated texts as the reported speech of their translators. Jakobson (1959) identifies certain approaches to translation, namely those that rely on paraphrase, as “reported speech” (p. 139); in his sense, idiomatic expressions are replaced wholesale by seeming equivalents from the target language, and therefore the social role of the translator is naturalized or made invisible, as in the metaphor of the ideal hostess. Conversely, Tymoczko (2000) asserts that she is “primarily concerned with translation as a sort of speech act: translation that rouses, inspires, witnesses, mobilizes, incites to rebellion, and so forth. The subject then, is translation that has illocutionary and perlocutionary dimensions” (p. 26). In this case, the equivalent to modals, *verba dicendi*, and other linguistic devices employed in shaping reported speech through retelling must be *denaturalized*, to underscore the partisan nature of managing translation’s partiality. It is from this perspective, or rather within this selective scope of literary translations, that the translator emerges as an active agent in various interconnected LPP processes—particularly in the development of transgressive prestige and the planning of discourse.

Along with a political stance, the translator discursively constructs an intended audience through these partisan choices. In a sense, this marshalling of a community, real or imagined, is a speech act in itself. This is the crucial process at stake in the present paper, where it applies to the formation of a national consciousness through shaping the linguistic norms and language ideologies of the polity. In her analysis of mass-mediated discourses more generally, Spitulnik (1997) invokes Anderson’s (1983) notion of the imagined community, arguing that “the mass mediation of large-scale societies requires that some *experience* of belonging and mutuality be generated as well” (Spitulnik, 1997, p. 95, emphasis in original)—in other words, merely sharing exposure to the mass media, simultaneously, frequently, and with common reference points is not adequate in the formation of community. Given that language and subjectivity/identity are so tightly bound, literary translation holds the potential to generate this kind of transcendent experience by producing an imagined audience out of an existing speech community. This act is particularly powerful when that community has been minoritized or oppressed through forms of linguistic domination, such as diglossia or exclusionary language policy and planning.

Likewise, it is important to note that translators themselves can come to form communities of practice, referred to as translation movements in the TS literature (Gentzler, 2007; Tymoczko, 2000). These constellations of social actors join together under a shared metadiscourse of their role as translators, whether that role prioritizes creativity over political dependencies (as I explore below in the Corsican case or in Nabokov’s view) or whether it firmly politicizes the act

of translation (as in Tymoczko's analysis of Irish translators and in the stances of two translation scholars from India compared below). Often these translators' discourses must interact with the expectations of literary critics or language activists in the media landscape, who may support or contest their formulations of translation as a social action and translators as inhabitants of a social role.

Four Case Studies of Translation-as-LPP

In the sections that follow, I will analyze the entanglements of texts, persons, and sociopolitical contexts in which literary translation has generated or contributed to LPP processes. The objects of my analysis are both these entanglements themselves and the ways that scholars have discussed them in secondary literature. In the first case, the scholar is a sociolinguist; the other three draw on the commentaries of TS scholars who are also translators themselves. The analysis of each case will necessarily adapt to the contours of the situation, which can look quite different across the spans of space and time that will be covered. However, all four cases evince most or all of the four LPP activity types described above. In addition, I follow two (often interrelated) analytic axes across each case: the negotiation of power relations—be they colonialist, imperialist, or minority-majority in nature—through stance-taking in and around translation; and the representation of linguistic variation, or lack thereof, within translations and in discourses about translation. These two dimensions are the basis of this paper's core argument: that the practice of and circulating discourses about literary translation can drive important forces of language policy and planning, and merit closer scrutiny.

Creative politics: Translating *Knock* from French to Corsican

Monolingualist language ideologies can serve to erase the role of translators, as discussed above. At the same time, this kind of ideology can fuel a critique of translators for their interference in the presumed purity of a national literature, given that they inject that body of literature with source texts from presumed outsiders. The stakes of this ideological conflict are especially high when the body of literary works in that language is relatively small, trying to establish itself, and therefore considered fragile and in need of protection. Dorian (1994) documents many LPP cases in which "incompatible conservatisms can separate educated revitalizers, interested in historicity, from remaining speakers interested in locally authentic idiomaticity" (p. 471). In the case of translators in Corsica, one locally authentic identity was a hybrid experience of both French and Corsican literature; another, rooted in the language activism on the island, had a strong political and personal stake in gatekeeping the nascent body of Corsican literature from invasion by the oppressor, the French language and its literature (Jaffe, 1999a).

In this case study, my aim is not to argue for or against one side of the debate that arose between translators and language activists; rather it is to highlight how the nature of this debate exhibits both analytic dimensions of translation-as-LPP mentioned above: the negotiation of power relations between a minority political interest and the majority seat of state power (particularly among language activists), and the representation of heteroglossia in Corsica, both within a translated text and in debates about the status and domain of the French language in Corsican society.

Alexandra Jaffe (1999a) has undergone decades of ethnographic research on the island of Corsica, an island off the coast of France that remains under French control but maintains a state of diglossia between the legally official French language and the vernacular of Corsican. As monolingualist French language policies have eased and a language revitalization movement has emerged in the name of Corsican nationalism, a budding literature in Corsican has appeared in recent decades. Although Corsican is widely spoken across the island, at the time of Jaffe's research the only readers of written Corsican consisted of the highly educated intelligentsia associated with Corsican language activism. Virtually all residents of the island can read in French, which is the medium of instruction in Corsican schools, with some exceptions where it is accompanied by Corsican in bilingual programs, as Jaffe has documented elsewhere (Jaffe, 1999b).

While Jaffe was conducting her fieldwork, an event of literary translation shook up the popular media and pervaded the political discourse surrounding the language revitalization movement. Ghjuvan Ghjaseppiu Franchi, a Corsican author and translator, published a translation of the French novel *Knock*, originally written by Jules Romains. In subsequent interviews, Franchi stated that he selected *Knock* for its commonplace nature; it was a story of the everyday, commonly taught in French secondary schools (Jaffe, 1999a). However, in the context of language revitalization politics, Franchi's literary actions were received and reinscribed as political sabotage, injecting the oppressor's culture into the nascent, and therefore fragile, body of Corsican literature. It was believed that "translation contributed to the corpus of written documents in Corsican, but it did not contribute to the goal of establishing an independent Corsican literary tradition" (Jaffe, 1999a, p. 42).

While critics railed against Franchi's choice, many translators came out in support of it as the free exercise of creative license. While political dimensions are often erased from understandings of translated texts, so too is the creative role of the translator. Underlying this debate were two different sets of assumptions about the relationship between an original text and the translation of it, namely, whether the translation can stand as an autonomous text with its own identity. And on the explicit level, the debate was inextricably tied up in the minority-majority power relations on the island, which are often characterized as colonialist in nature if not legal status. Several translators interviewed in local newspapers and magazines contributed to the notion that "relentless insistence on cultural representativity and fidelity to the exclusion of any other form of expression was in itself evidence of a 'colonized' mentality" (Jaffe, 1999a, p. 57), offering a sort of counter-politics to the purist stance of the language activists. In their experience, it could not be denied that Corsican-ness involved a cultural hybridity that included elements of French culture, especially in recontextualized formations on the island (as exemplified by a Corsican *Knock*).

An important aspect of this particular novel is its deliberate use of regional (mainland) French dialects in the development of character, plot, and setting. In Franchi's translation, these variations are transposed into regional variations of Corsican that serve (in his view) as rough social equivalents. However, this act of dialectal relocation or *domestication* (as it is described in TS) was not undertaken as a deception to provide a more naturalized or fluent read for the target audience; given that all readers of Corsican are readers of French (even while all speakers of Corsican are not readers of Corsican), Franchi worked under the guarantee that

his readers would have simultaneous access to both contexts being signified in the original and source texts. As Jaffe notes, “the meaning of the author’s use of Corsican dialects was sharpened and focused by its relationship with the French work; a similar strategy in an original Corsican work might not have had the same resonances” (Jaffe, 1999a, p. 49). The Corsican readership was able to enjoy the literary deployment of bivalency, interference, multiplicity of identity, and simultaneity in the contact zone outlined by Woolard (1999)—the various semiotic functions often simplified into the reduced term *code-switching*. Moreover, they did so at a more heightened level of complexity than a French readership would find with the original or, as Jaffe points out, than a Corsican readership would encounter had *Knock* been written in Corsican.

Echoing the conclusions of Blom & Gumperz (1972) regarding meaning-making in code-switching practices, these forms of signification must be understood in highly particular local contexts. The literary fruits of Franchi’s work could not be scaled-up or reproduced through translations into other linguistic contexts. In that sense, an argument could be made for Franchi’s contribution to the Corsican literary canon—which in itself is a blow to the hegemony of French language and culture on the island of Corsica. But these subtleties did not withstand his critics’ discourses in effect: “The mere presence of French in the ghost of the original overshadowed the political implications of the translators’ craft” (Jaffe, 1999a, pp. 61-62). In this case, the translator chose to represent the range of linguistic variation within spoken Corsican, rather than enforcing a standardized variety across the text as is common in translations (Venuti, 1995). His decision to translate a French novel also reflected what he and his translator-supporters saw as the heteroglossic hybridity of the linguistic landscape in Corsica. Conversely, the critiques of his choices represented an identification with an imagined linguistic landscape in which the presence of French was a threat to be resisted and minimized.

Franchi’s conception of the hybrid linguistic identities of his audience members conflicted with the political stance of most of them; among readers of Corsican, the majority were language activists, as that was generally the cause of attaining such a literacy outside of formal schooling. Franchi achieved the unlikely result of actually *shrinking* the possible audience of a text by translating into Corsican; as mentioned, all readers of Corsican are readers of French but not vice versa. Robinson (1997) argues that an important test of a translation’s political effectiveness is its ability to reach mass audiences, because a translation that merely aims to shift its readers’ attitudes is much harder to assess or otherwise pin down. But regardless of the relatively small numerical scope of impact that came from Franchi’s work, Jaffe argues that “it was through staking a claim to artistic freedom that Corsican translators proposed their most radical re-working of concepts of linguistic power” (Jaffe, 1999a, p. 57).

From an LPP perspective, several types of language planning activities were being deployed, both by translators and by language activists. Planning for the prestige of Corsican language was closely tied to planning for its status as a literary language. Translators largely believed that the Corsican literary canon would be strengthened by embracing an imagined Corsican national identity of cosmopolitan hybridity with French, whereas language activists felt this embrace as a reproduction of colonialist power relations. In addition, Franchi’s decision to convey the linguistic variation in *Knock* through analogous registers and regional varieties in Corsican

inscribed these linguistic forms in the corpus of the language. Finally, the different discourses circulating in the public debate over Franchi's work contributed to discourse planning with respect to ideologies about the effects of translation on LPP goals. Whereas language activists engaged in planning for a discourse of purity and anti-French solidarity, translators advocated for a discourse of hybridity to drive the formation of an imagined Corsican-speaking and -reading public.

I will now turn to the Irish context, where literary translation invoked similar discourses and ideologies but in a very different configuration, by aligning *with* the nationalist politics of resistance, and by converting texts from the minority language into the language of the oppressive regime. I will also focus more heavily on the discourses by and about translators as forms of LPP.

Political creativity: Translating Irish Nationalism into Existence

Maria Tymoczko has spent much of her career mining the history of translation and translators in the Irish liberation movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. She dedicates a book-length study to this analysis (1999), but here I have chosen to draw upon an article (2000) in which she uses her area of historical expertise as a jumping-off point to consider the obligations and metadiscourses of translation scholars—which translation contexts scholars should attend to, and how she thinks they should analyze and critique translations. Although Jaffe (1999a) gently champions the “non-equivalent adaptation philosophy” (p. 52) that Franchi employed, she abstains from advocating a political agenda of translation. She is also not a translator herself. Tymoczko (2000), however, takes an explicitly activist stance: “The translation history of early Irish literature into English parallels the decolonization of Ireland, and it stands as a prototype of translation as an activist enterprise with tangible geopolitical results” (p. 30). Rather than championing a purist, monolingual acquisition of the Irish language at the community level, political activists undertook a concerted project of translation to reunite Irish subjects with the heroic myths and epics originally written by their ancestors in a language that many could no longer read. The “incompatible conservatism” of purist language activists and speakers of local (i.e. non-standard) varieties of Irish would arise later on once independence was achieved, as Dorian (1994) notes, but in Tymoczko's historical telling, it first took a translation movement to make real political change.

It is important to note that these translator-activists prized their political aims over creative or literary subtlety, in contrast to Franchi. Characters like Cú Chulainn, the bawdy and gnarled antihero of the Ulster Cycle, are sanitized into more acceptable national icons:

Gone are the lice, the grotesque distortion, the woman's backside, the dereliction of duty, the prodigal death. Though Cú Chulainn's supernatural birth is retained, the hero himself is decorous and noble, fighting against all odds, and he dies in a scenario that nationalists saw as reminiscent of the Christian crucifixion. (Tymoczko, 2000, p. 29)

These partisan choices probably reach beyond the inevitable partiality faced by all translators; Tymoczko identifies them as evidence of a willingness to sacrifice other

demands—including the demands of dominant European translation ideologies that urge equivalence—in the name of a political cause. She also traces their unintended outcomes: “The translations were instrumental in replacing colonial stereotypes of the Irish with new valorized images, but it is also clear in retrospect that those images helped to construct the stifling social mores of post-independence Ireland” (pp. 42-43). What is most significant in the case of the Irish translation movement is that it clearly predated, fueled, and perhaps even catalyzed a genuine geopolitical shift; translators did much of the work of forcing an engaged readership-cum-nation into existence through manipulative textual choices. Tymoczko goes on to include this kind of discursive action—taking partisan liberties with equivalence—as a requirement for effective political engagement through translation.

Such an approach to translation directly reflects the ways that translators negotiate colonialist power relations through their work with language. It also reflects a stance toward heteroglossia in which speaking and reading English is accepted as a local reality, rather than seen a threat to the imagined Irish national identity. The prestige and status of the Irish language was indirectly being planned for through the promotion of literature translated into the English language; this approach created widespread access to the content of the texts, but maintained an ideology much like that of the language activists in Corsica, that a translation is not autonomous but stands in for the original source text and all of the identitarian politics that come with it.

Tymoczko’s secondary analysis, if read as her own primary speech, evinces the construction of her own role as an agent in the field of translation-as-LPP. It takes shape as a form of discourse planning, not only for Ireland but for all stakeholders in TS, in attempting to regulate the political ideologies that accompany the language practices of translators and TS scholars. Just as she is concerned only with translators that perform the speech act of political engagement through their work (cited above), she asserts the obligation of TS *researchers* to focus on this type of translator and translation context as a matter of conscience. One might term this their (and her) social role, as translators of literary history into the academic consciousness. She spends a significant portion of the article critiquing some of her forebears and contemporaries for not taking the field more fully around the social turn toward what she considers genuine engagement.

She especially targets Lawrence Venuti, a controversial figure in the TS ambit. Venuti is known for having imported postcolonial theory into TS, and for generating a copious terminology of concepts such as *resistant* or *foreignizing* translation and *textual violence* (Venuti, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2012). Tymoczko (2000) argues that Venuti’s work is analytically inconsistent and that his taxonomy lacks empirical rigor. She ties this critique to the cause of strengthening the community of practice of TS scholars, essentially policing the community for quality and political commitment. She is thereby constructing her own intended academic audience and transnational solidarities, much in the way that Irish translators projected an English-reading but English-resisting Irish public through their partisan translations. Note how Tymoczko’s (2000) personal voice as a discursive agent surfaces in the following:

When we perceive resistance to colonialism encoded in translations of early Irish literature as leading to engagement between Ireland and Brit-

ain, then the translation movement investigated in my work must be understood as having contributed notably to shaping the world all of us live in today. It was a translation practice that changed the world, a form of engagement as much as a form of writing. (p. 28)

She makes “her work... notably” relevant to all possible readerships, imagining the widest possible intended audience. Held up against the particular criticism she levels at her fellow translator-scholar Venuti—namely that his work dwells in the realm of theorizing, without the theoretical or empirical punch to make a material impact on people’s lived realities—this statement can also be seen to position TS itself as, ideally, a form of engaging in language policy and planning as much as a form of writing.

The following case will further develop this discussion of the expectations of translators and TS scholars regarding their own social role and political obligations. I focus primarily on these meta-discourses, but they will be instantiated with some specific examples of translators and their textual practices.

Mounting Resistance through Harmony: Two voices from India

In the cases of Corsica and Ireland, the described translation events took place before or without the establishment of a nation-state. When a recognized geopolitical formation does come into existence, under conditions of contested or oppressive language politics, the imagining of an intended audience for translations does very real (not only figurative, or aspirational) work in nation-building through prestige, discourse, corpus and status planning. This is the case in post-independence India, where the dominance of the Anglophone colonizer left its mark in the form of an indigenized Indian English dialect. Meanwhile new—perhaps post- or neo-colonial, certainly nationalist—forms of linguistic hegemony have arisen through what has been called the three language solution, in which Hindi, English, and the regional variety that may be a person’s first language are recognized as the ideal linguistic repertoire. In practice, this policy has resulted in the enforcement of Hindi as the language of wider communication and the subordination of Indian English to varieties less marked in the United Kingdom and United States (Choudhuri, 1997; Gupta, 1998). Among these linguistic power dynamics exists a remarkable degree of linguistic variation and multilingualism.

In such a domain, translator and scholar Choudhuri (1997) argues, the status quo of TS is ill-adapted, even in its politicized or radicalized incarnations: “The major difference between translation practices in the West and translation practices in India is that in the West translation is considered a complicated linguistic and literary act, while in India it is an inevitable way of life” (p. 442). In fact, Choudhuri advocates explicitly for a de-colonization of TS itself—explicitly engaging with the contestation of colonialist power relations, and doing so through the representation of India’s heteroglossia.

To understand him as a social and political agent, it is important to situate him in the institution whence he writes: Sahitya Akademi in New Delhi, the official language academy of India. His positionality, as both an administrator and a creative practitioner of translation, demonstrates the blurring of the policy and cultivation approaches in this context. LoBianco (2010) stipulates in his description

of prestige planning that “the isolated work of individuals is sometimes organized within official academies created to support literature production for individual languages” (p. 148), as is the case with Sahitya Akademi. A key piece of Choudhuri’s political agenda for translation, and one of his main goals for the Akademi, is to level out the hierarchy of languages that has persisted even after independence due to the official recognition of only 18 out of the hundreds or thousands languages present in India. From his perspective (within an official LPP apparatus), such top-down status planning will result in a kind of harmony in plurality—which, in itself, will stand as a defiant form of resistance to the West, where linguistic plurality is perceived as a problem or aberration (Choudhuri, 1997).

This symbolic resistance operates on the one hand to contest an external threat—the former colonizer—and on the other hand to re-write the national literature—a form of corpus-status planning that reconfigures the linguistic profile of the ideal national subject. Choudhuri’s goal is to sway from a monolingualist neocolonialism toward what he sees as a more Indian functional pluralism, for which he advocates an agenda of increased direct translation among Indian linguistic varieties. From within the Akademi, he has been privy to the economies and bureaucracies of official translation practices, in which Hindi and English serve as proxy languages that mediate the creation of print materials, such as textbooks, in regional linguistic varieties. Citing examples of translational innovations that contribute to his aims, he mentions:

The use of different *upbhasas* (wrongly called dialects)... or the creation of a new language by Dalit writers or the use of tribal languages in multilingual contexts. These are the languages of the ‘in-between,’ which occupy a space ‘in between’ and challenge conventional notions of translation, seeking to decolonize themselves from two oppressors: the Western ex-colonizer who naively boasts of their existence, and also the traditional ‘national’ cultures, which short-sightedly deny their importance. (pp. 442-443)

Choudhuri conceives of translation as a form of social and political *interdependence*, hence the undesirability of imbalanced linguistic exchanges between the language of the oppressor and the language of the liberated. If Indian language policies could produce an equal footing for all of its languages, then theoretically, a genuine interdependence might be achieved out of *intersignification* through translation among them, a sort of textual materializing of the multilingual reality of India. This is not unlike the stance of translators in Corsica who argued for intersignification between French and Corsican as a social good, putting the languages on the same plane. In Choudhuri’s estimation, interdependence plus intersignification will equal *independence*—a geopolitical urgency placed on the shoulders of not only translators but also government policymakers.

Conversely, Gupta (1998) takes on the residual linguistic hierarchies in India by situating the responsibility for independence squarely on the shoulders of translators alone. His work exhibits a similar LPP activity type—corpus-status planning with additional prestige goals—in a different practical manifestation. It is also a form of discourse planning, in the spirit of Tymoczko, but also of Venuti: Gupta calls for genuine forms of resistant translation to achieve the goal of sociopolitical and cultural independence. Rather than focusing on *code selection* as a measure of a translator’s resistance—as does Choudhuri in advocating translations among

Indian minoritized languages—Gupta instead foregrounds the *identity* of the translator as the key element in battling linguistic inequality. (It is worth noting here that he is himself a translator of Bengali and Hindi into English.) Gupta addresses the murky and polyvalent word, *identity*, without commotion: “here I would define the translator’s identity as constituted simply by nationality and first language” (p. 172). In Gupta’s view, a Bengali translator of Tagore is inherently different from a British one. Either is capable of producing a *colonized* translation, by which he means relying on poetical clichés and archaisms that domesticize and naturalize the Bengali poet into British literary traditions. However, part of his project of resistant translation requires de-centering the ideology that privileges the native speaker as the authoritative producer of the translated text (recall that Gupta translates from Bengali, his mother tongue, into English, a language acquired later in his life).

Gupta’s notion of resistant translation is built on the framework of linguistic inequality coined by Talal Asad (1986) in his chapter in *Writing Culture*, the seminal collection of ethnographic reflections on text and writing published at a time of major transitions in cultural and linguistic anthropology. Gupta assigns each of Asad’s three levels of inequality to corresponding degrees of translational resistance: *political* inequality, whereby the translator’s identity serves as resistance; *surface* inequality, whereby corpus features such as lexicon, “sonics” (Gupta, 1998, p. 174) and syntax can be transfigured to push the translation toward a nonstandard literary tradition; and *deep* inequality, which Gupta characterizes as the “differences in the internal workings” (p. 174) of a language. These might be seen through a LPP lens as forms of status, corpus, and discourse planning, respectively. Gupta does not elaborate very much on the nature of the third level of inequality / resistance, deep inequality, but he defers to Gayatri Spivak’s triumvirate of rhetoric, logic, and silence as deep features of language; “the particular interactions among these various attributes of language that differ from one language to another, which cannot easily be reproduced by translation” (p. 174), are therefore the central features that must somehow be retained into English by *deeply* resistant translators.

Referring to Spivak not only as a TS theorist but also as an occasional translator of Bengali poetry, Gupta (1998) remarks on her efforts to produce deeply resistant translations through the inclusion of highly non-standard, marked, or otherwise difficult to read linguistic and literary devices. He suggests that the awkwardness of her resistant translations may actually hinder their political effectiveness. At the same time, he asks rhetorically whether such awkwardness may in fact epitomize resistance. It remains to be seen, even by Gupta himself, whether this agenda for resistant translation as LPP will stand up to the criteria of geopolitical impact enforced by other stakeholders such as Tymoczko (2000) or Robinson (1997). However, Gupta does establish very clearly what he sees as the social role of the translator-as-LPP-agent.

As for his imagined audience, and thereby the imagined national subject, Gupta (1998) acknowledges the massive market within India for English-language texts about India. He sees the production of such texts through translation as

a meaningful assertion of nationhood, a post-independence nationalism that seeks to shake the status of the West as the prime source of knowledge through literature. Translation is now more than an economic activity: it is national awareness; it is the creation of a national literature. (p. 176)

Importantly, Gupta (1998) does not advocate that translators mine their mother tongues for great epics and otherwise high forms of literature to bring into Indian English, as the Irish did to galvanize their movement. In fact, he positions the conventional binary between high and low art as a norm of the West. Instead, he points to the wide swath in the “middle of fiction that deals with everyday life in a simple, realistic manner” (p. 177) as a prominent genre in Bengali literary production. He even admits to the pragmatic convenience that perhaps what are considered the great works of literature are in fact more difficult to translate given their innovations and complexities. From a political perspective, the “more minor and shorter-lived works do no less” (p. 178) to give people their sense of national identity than the canonized novels, epics, poems and plays. Gupta coins this sort of identity of the everyday as *synchronic nationalism*. As an LPP approach, it resonates strongly with Franchi’s choice of *Knock* as a rather mundane work in translation; however, Franchi would have conformed more fully to Gupta’s ideal translatorly role had he taken the Corsican equivalent of *Knock* and provided a rendering of it in French with a localized Corsican inflection—an activity of corpus-status planning that transforms the language of power through contact with the minoritized language. It would have amounted to another approach in the political project of constructing an imagined community of minoritized speakers who have re-appropriated the language of the oppressor for their own literary (and ideological) aims.

Finally, I will turn to a case that foregrounds the corpus planning aspects of the practice translation, but that nevertheless reinforces the interconnectedness of all four LPP activity types in the production of imagined publics and ideal national-linguistic subjects. This case also demonstrates how secondary commentaries about specific texts and translation practices perform discourse planning about the role of the translator in larger social processes in general, and as an LPP stakeholder in particular.

Foreign Words: (De)constructing Linguistic Foreignness through Translation

Brian James Baer (2011b) is one of the cadre of emerging TS scholars looking more closely at social and political contexts of translation, with a focus on Eastern Europe. Echoing the language ideology of the invisible translator described at the beginning of this paper, Baer notes that

because of the traditional focus in Translation Studies on the relationship between a single ‘unified’ source language and a single ‘unified’ target language, it is perhaps no surprise that the treatment of foreign words, that is, non-source language words contained in source texts, has been largely ignored. (p. 129)

Baer’s stance here echoes Tymoczko’s (2000) discursive work toward regulating TS’s domains of interest. Baer (2011b) goes about recuperating our awareness of the translation of foreign words within his area of expertise, focusing on seminal works of Pushkin and Tolstoy, to demonstrate how translations of these works have actively shaped the target audience’s perception of linguistic identity in Russian imperial society. In this case, Baer’s work is contesting the erasure

of linguistic variation, which serves as an important index of imperialist power relations in these works of literature. Likewise, the representation of Russian royals as essentially monolingual in many existing translations is being taken to task given the deeply heteroglossic reality of that demographic historically. Baer advocates a kind of retroactive corpus planning that would inscribe this variation in the historic memory of imperial Russia, and assign a new status to the so-called foreign languages spoken frequently by Pushkin's and Tolstoy's characters.

For example, it is not common knowledge that in Tolstoy's original text, the first paragraph of *War & Peace* (1869) is written almost entirely in French; this is because the majority of translators into English have failed to mark this code choice except perhaps with a few French borrowings on the lexical level. One significant exception comes from recent translators Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, who have systematically provided fresh translations of the Russian literary canon over the last few decades; these versions, often cited as the newly authoritative editions (Remnick, 2007), more accurately reflect the diverse linguistic profile of Russianness that Tolstoy and others deliberately illustrate in their novels. Pevear and Volokhonsky retain all of the French in *War & Peace* (Tolstoy, 2007/1869), although their text cannot perform the incredible corpus-inverting feat of the original, which arrives at the first Russian word in the text several sentences in and must deliver it not only in another linguistic variety, but in the seemingly alien Cyrillic orthography. Such was the heteroglossic state of the imperial Russian aristocracy; some historians argue that some nobles were more comfortable speaking in French than in Russian—which posed a complex political dilemma when Napoleon stepped in as the grave enemy of the state (Baer, 2011b). These social actors, and the novelists that captured them, engaged in what Gal (1988) calls “the political economy of code choice”: how multilinguals use language(s) to “construct and display multiple identities, to understand their historic position, and to respond to relations of domination between groups” (p. 247).

Through tracing the treatment of foreign words in Russian translations, attending not only to code choice but also to orthography, italics, and other forms of markedness and unmarkedness, Baer (2011b) illustrates how foreignness has been constructed by both the original authors and the translators from various temporal and geographic contexts—a survey of LPP activities by various stakeholders. He concludes that in the original texts one finds “not a binary opposition of Russian and French, of native and foreign, but rather an opposition between nationalism and cosmopolitanism” (p. 142). Through the aggregation of translations he surveys, such inlaid ideologies of foreignness can shift and re-situate themselves across historical contexts in the service of national identity. Baer assures his readers, “Tolstoy was no Russian nationalist” (p. 141), and yet his works have functioned centrally in the production of a Russian national literature and therefore a Russian national imaginary. Perhaps as that canon of literature gets reconfigured through translation and thereby reconstrued abroad, the imagined linguistic profile of the Russian imperial subject will shift toward a more heteroglossic reflection of history.

A Tale of Two Cities—Jakobson and Nabokov Imagining Russia in Exile

I will conclude this inquiry with a telling anecdote that also begins in Russia and travels abroad, about two beloved figures in the field of TS. Roman Jakobson

(who was also a major figure in the Prague School of LPP studies) and Vladimir Nabokov were born within three years of one another (1896 and 1899, respectively). They went on to become two of the most prominent translation theorists of the twentieth century, both writing at the height of their careers in exile in the United States. The substance of their theories of translation differed unsubstantially: both believed in the fundamental non-equivalence of the source and target texts, but neither was thwarted by this fact (see Venuti, 2012, for indicative samples of their theoretical writing). Jakobson (1959) countered this untranslatability by allowing for “creative transposition” and *paronomasia* (p. 143), or phonetic wordplay similar to punning (a practice strongly associated with Nabokovian literary style), while Nabokov (1955) encouraged translators to compensate for semiotic losses with “copious footnotes.”² No profound contradictions can be found between their substantial writings on translation; however, they came to be great rivals in their public and personal lives as translator-agents. The fallout occurred during an attempted collaboration between the two men on the translation of an obscure Russian epic poem, from which Nabokov angrily withdrew midway. The project was never completed.

Upon closer scrutiny, Baer (2011a) identifies crucial details about each of these figures as social actors that may have contributed to the lamination of their political and theoretical stances. Nabokov was the child of the St. Petersburg aristocracy, the old guard of the pre-revolution nobility, born physically and culturally closer to Western Europe. He was raised bilingual in English and Russian, learning French not long after; after going into exile in Europe and later the United States, he never returned to the country of his birth. Conversely, Jakobson was born of the Moscow elite, and became a polyglot by studying at Moscow University. Although the political tumult of the revolution also forced his relocation, in this case to Prague in 1920, he was able to return to the USSR several times before his death. In other words, Nabokov and Jakobson were positioned as very different social and political agents with respect to their imagined national identity, and this difference was visibly exacerbated by such seemingly non-literary forces as the Cold War. Nonetheless, their ideological battleground took shape through translation theorizing, underscoring the interconnectedness of literary translation and politics.

It is important to acknowledge, as several of the texts discussed in this paper have, that not all translators take up the role of political, and specifically LPP, agents. Foucault (1964) describes two possible modes of translation: in the first, “something (meaning, aesthetic value) must remain identical, and it is given passage into another language... ‘from like to same’,” while in the second, the translator must “hurl one language against another... use the translated language to derail the translating language” (p. 21). In sites where political conflict is accompanied by linguistic oppression, the latter approach may become an invaluable tool in liberation struggles through the activities of prestige, discourse, and corpus-status planning. This is true largely due to the transformative power of translations to conjure up imagined publics. As Jaffe (1999a) asserts: “Translation does not just reflect static relations of social power; it is a forum in which linguistic

² “I want translations with copious footnotes, footnotes reaching up like skyscrapers to the top of this or that page so as to leave only the gleam of one textual line between commentary and eternity” (Nabokov, 1955, p. 127).

and social authority is discursively constituted” (p. 49). As we have seen, the various approaches toward achieving this discursively formed authority can vary significantly across contexts—in regards to the actors, the means, and the nature of the authoritative social body being imagined. Therefore, it is important to utilize the tools of sociolinguistic and LPP analysis to see translation as more than a neutral textual process, shifting our focus into sociopolitical space-time by recognizing the negotiations of power and landscapes of heteroglossia traversed by these texts. That is where humans can be seen doing the influential work they do through text-as-action, with real impacts for other human actors.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Siwon Lee for perennially incisive and thoughtful editing. I would also like to thank Alexandra Jaffe for taking the time to provide valuable insights on this work. Both of your perspectives helped me transform early drafts into a much more viable paper. Any flaws that remain are mine alone. Finally, sincere thanks are due to my inspiring co-editor and admired colleague, Catrice Barrett.

Joanna L. Siegel is pursuing a joint PhD in Educational Linguistics and Anthropology. Her research focuses on the intersections of multilingualism with mass media, popular culture, and the arts. She welcomes questions and comments about her work at josi@gse.upenn.edu.

References

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2012). The sociological turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies [Special issue]. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 7(2).
- Asad, T. (1986). The concept of cultural translation in British social anthropology. In J. Clifford, & G. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 141-164). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Baer, B. J. (2011a). Translation theory and cold war politics: Roman Jakobson and Vladimir Nabokov in 1950s America. In B. J. Baer (Ed.), *Contexts, subtexts, and pretexts*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Baer, B. J. (2011b). Translating foreign words in imperial Russian literature: the experience of the foreign and the sociology of language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 207, 127-151.
- Bassnett, S. (2010). Domesticating the Other: English and translation. In J. Maybin, & J. Swann (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English language studies* (pp. 271-281). London, UK: Routledge.
- Bauman, R. (2001). Verbal art as performance. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 165-188). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59-88.
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Ed.), *Directions in*

- sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-438). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Choudhuri, I. N. (1997). The Plurality of languages and literature in translation: The post-colonial context. *Meta:Journal des Traducteurs*, 42(2), 439-443.
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dorian, N. (1994). Purism vs. compromise in language revitalization and language revival. *Language in Society*, 23(3), 479-494.
- Ferguson, C. (1968). Language development. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Language problems of developing nations*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Foucault, M. (1964). Les Mots qui saignent. *L'Express*, 29 August, 21.
- Gal, S. (1988). The political economy of code choice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp. 245-264). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Genzler, E. (Ed.) (2007). *Translation and identity in the Americas: New directions in translation theory*. London, UK: Routledge.
- González Ventura, J. L. (1997). Experiences in the development of a writing system for Nuu Savi. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom-up* (pp. 158-169). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gupta, P. (1998). Post- or neo-colonial translation? Linguistic inequality and translator's resistance. *Translation and Literature*, 7(2), 170-193.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 24-41). New York, NY: Blackwell Publishing.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35-84). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Jaffe, A. (1999a). Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 39-67). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. (1999b). *Ideologies in action: Language politics in Corsica*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader, Second edition* (pp. 138-143). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (1997). *Before writing: Rethinking paths to literacy*. London, UK: Routledge.
- López, L. E. (1997). To Guaranize: a verb actively conjugated by the Bolivian Guaranis. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom-up* (pp. 321-353). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- LoBianco, J. (2010). Language policy and planning. In N. Hornberger, & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education: New perspectives* (pp. 143-176). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nabokov, V. (1955). Problems of translation: *Onegin* in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader, Second edition* (pp. 115-127). London, UK: Routledge.
- Neustupný, J. V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 37-48). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Remnick, D. (2005, November 7). The translation wars. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/11/07/051107fa_fact_remnick?currentPage=1
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and empire: Postcolonial theories explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Souza, L. M. de (2005). The ecology of writing among the Kashinawá: Indigenous multimodality in Brazil. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice* (pp. 73-98). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spitulnik, D. (1997). The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 6(2), 161-187.
- Tolstoy, L. (1869). *Война и миръ*. Moscow, Russia: Russkii Vestnik.
- Tolstoy, L. (2007). *War and peace*. (L. Volokhonsky, & R. Pevear, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1869.)
- Toury, G. (1978). The nature and role of norms in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader, Second edition* (pp. 205-218). London, UK: Routledge.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999). *Translation in a postcolonial context: Early Irish literature in English translation*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tymoczko, M. (2000). Translation and political engagement: Activism, social change, and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts. *The Translator*, 6(1), 23-47.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2000). Translation, community, utopia. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader, Second edition* (pp. 482-502). London, UK: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (Ed.) (2012). *The translation studies reader, Third edition*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Woolard, K. (1999). Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 3-29.