

INTERVIEW WITH MARY SNELL-HORNBY



MARY SNELL-HORNBY / GUSTAVO ALTHOFF¹ & ALICE LEAL²

Since 1989 Mary Snell-Hornby has been Professor of Translation Studies at the University of Vienna. She was a founding member of the European Society for Translation Studies (EST) and its first President (from 1992 to 1998), she was on the Executive Board of the European Society for Lexicography (EURALEX) from 1986 to 1992 and was President of the Vienna Language Society from 1992 to 1994. From 1997 to 2010 she was an Honorary Professor of the University of Warwick (UK). In May 2010 she was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of the University of Tampere (Finland) for her contribution to the discipline of Translation Studies.

Before her appointment in Vienna she worked in German and English Language and Literature, specializing in translation, contrastive semantics and lexicography. She has published widely in fields varying from Language Teaching, Literary Studies and Linguistics, but particularly in Translation Studies, and is a member of a number of advisory boards and the General Editor of the Series *Studien zur Translation* (Stauffenburg Verlag, Tübingen). She has worked as a visiting professor at many universities around Europe and other parts of the world, including Hong Kong, the Philippines, Thailand and Brazil (Fortaleza, UFSC Florianópolis).

In the present interview, the vast majority of the questions are focused on the interviewee's 2006 *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?*, as well as on some of the remarks made by José Lambert in his interview to *Scientia Traductionis* in 2010 (issue number 7). As ever, the main objective of the interviews carried out in the present journal is to reveal the interviewees' standpoint as far as Translation Studies is concerned, so as to help to build the history of the discipline through their voices, thus allowing Translation Studies to continually reassess and contemplate itself. In the case of

¹ Gustavo Althoff has a major in Social Sciences from Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC) and is a PhD candidate at the Postgraduate Translation Studies programme (Pós-Graduação em Estudos da Tradução - PGET) in the same institution. He is also the assistant editor of *Scientia Traductionis* and a researcher at Núcleo de Estudos do Pensamento Político (NEPP) at UFSC. His research interests include the theory and the history of translation, the translation of philosophical texts, and political theory.

² Alice Leal has recently concluded her PhD in Translation Studies (awaiting viva) at the University of Vienna, where she works as Temporary Lecturer in Portuguese and Translation Studies and coordinates the Department of Portuguese of the Centre for Translation Studies. She has an MA in Translation Studies from Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, and a BA in Portuguese and English from Universidade Federal do Paraná. Her main research interest is the intersection between postmodern thought and translation.

Mary Snell-Hornby, her point of view is clearly European, closely related to the predominantly Germanic pioneer branch of the discipline that broke with the equivalence paradigm – hence her choice of quotations in the interview.

SCIENTIA TRADUCTIONIS: We would like to start this interview by asking you about the history of Translation Studies (TS) from your perspective and role in it. We would like to focus on one particular institutional development in TS with which you had direct involvement, namely the creation of the European Society for Translation Studies (EST)³, of which you were one of the founders and first president, and whose inception took place in Vienna, Austria, in September 1992 during the “Translation Studies Congress”⁴. In your book *The Turns of Translation Studies*⁵ you situate the genesis of the EST against the backdrop of social changes that came about in Europe in 1989, symbolised by the Fall of the Berlin Wall (2006: 69-70). Could you elaborate a bit on the historical context and scholarly goals behind the EST? Additionally, what role has it played in helping to establish TS as an independent discipline?

SNELL-HORNBY: The founding of EST was the culmination of a ferment of activity that went back to the late 1970s and materialized in the form of publications and conferences (then not nearly as frequent as they are now) during the 1980s⁶. There were several groups of scholars working separately from each other, but basically with the same goal: to free Translation Studies from its subaltern status of being a mere branch of applied linguistics or comparative literature. Then in 1989 there came the Fall of the Berlin Wall, and this was precisely the time when I was appointed to the new Chair of Translation Studies (*Übersetzungswissenschaft*) at the Institute for Translator and Interpreter Training (as it was then called) in Vienna⁷, and until 1994 I was the Director of the Institute with the means and the infrastructure to organize academic events. It was an immensely exciting time, when people could meet who for decades had been separated or isolated by the Iron Curtain. I remember the pleasure we had in inviting the ambassadors of all the new democracies whose languages were represented at our Institute to my inaugural lecture in January 1990⁸. In this general spirit of optimism and euphoria, the Austrian government provided funds for travel to universities in these new democracies to promote the development of Translation Studies programmes, and this took me round Poland,

³ <http://www.est-translationstudies.org/>

⁴ The founding meeting of EST was held during the Translation Studies Congress “Translation Studies – An Interdiscipline”, in Vienna, Austria, from 9th to 12th September 1992. The proceedings of this Congress were published in the following volume: Snell-Hornby, Mary; Pöchhacker, Franz; and Kaindl, Klaus (eds). 1994. *Translation Studies. An Interdiscipline*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (Source: <http://www.est-translationstudies.org/congress.html>)

⁵ Snell-Hornby, Mary. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Benjamins Translation Library Vol. 66. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006. 205 pp. ISBN 90 272 1674 6.

⁶ See Reiß & Vermeer (1984), Holz-Mänttari (1984), Hermans (1985), Snell-Hornby (1986) and Bassnett & Lefevere (1990).

⁷ At the same time new Chairs of Translation Studies were created and appointments made in the Institutes in Innsbruck (Annemarie Schmid) and Graz (Erich Prunc).

⁸ This is reproduced in Snell-Hornby 2008: 33-48.

Lithuania, Hungary, Slovenia, the Czech Republic and Romania, where, again with funds from the Austrian government (the then Ambassador was a graduate of our Institute), we helped to recreate the Translation Programme in Bucharest that had been closed down years before by the Ceaușescu regime. In November 1991 we organized a “Mitteleuropäisches Symposium” for colleagues from the former Eastern bloc, we had regular meetings of German-speaking colleagues (the “Vienna Translation Summits”) and – given similar activities in Translation Studies in other European countries described by José Lambert in his interview with you – we then invited a much wider circle of scholars and students to an international “Translation Studies Congress” in September 1992. The idea of founding a European Society of Translation Studies was developed during the “Translation Summits”, and it actually went back to a similar organization, the European Association for Lexicography (Euralex), of which I was a founding member (in 1983) and later a member of the Executive Board. Euralex also provided a model for the first statutes of EST, where it is defined as an “international forum for individuals who are engaged in research and teaching in the field of translation and interpreting” aiming to promote research and further education for teachers in the field, to offer consulting services and facilitate contacts between the profession and training institutions (Article 2). The idea was to encourage the exchange of information and ideas through publications and meetings, to maintain contacts with relevant international bodies and institutions (Article 3) and to raise funds for academic awards (especially for young scholars), for events and scholarly meetings and so on. The development of Translation Studies as an independent discipline was due to the interplay of many factors, where EST has certainly played a part, especially within the English-speaking scientific community.

ST: The “turns of our discipline” as identified in your book (2006) encompass theoretical, methodological, thematic and practical matters. In *The Turns* you appear to have included all trends or developments you deemed relevant. It seems to us that in the 1980s theoretical and methodological matters were at the forefront of the discipline, whereas in the 1990s and in the following decade practical topics – such as the pervasiveness of technology, the emergence of new fields and the effects of globalisation – came to the fore. So in this sense one might have the impression that in the past few decades theoretical developments have been somewhat more meagre or even non-existent. Has this really been the case? Or have there been conspicuous theoretical trends and developments, too?

SNELL-HORNBY: The development of new fields and “practical topics”, as you call them – I would rather call it the integration of theory and practice – was long overdue (such as the reform of totally outdated university curricula) and they were a natural result of the theoretical approaches formed during the 1980s, without which they would not have been possible. One example is audiovisual translation, which is now booming, but was already a topic in a student workshop at our “Central European Symposium” in 1991, as based on the then innovative functional approaches. I wouldn’t say that theoretical developments are nonexistent today – think of the sociological approaches taken over from Pierre Bourdieu for example – but they don’t seem as fruitful and exuberant as they

were in the 1980s, and I would agree that there has been a certain stagnation in recent years. It is also very unfortunate that people tend to concentrate on their own school of thought and ignore other approaches, especially if they are debated in other languages and other countries. This applies particularly to DTS, which is the orthodox approach in the English-speaking community, and as English now virtually dominates the discipline, writings in English often make no reference to what is going on elsewhere. One has the impression that people simply don't know about it. As a member of various scientific Advisory Boards I often have to point out that in the manuscripts I am asked to review really important work from other schools of thought or in languages other than English is completely ignored. This doesn't only apply to the functional approaches, but also to hermeneutics, for example, and to the work on deconstruction in Brazil. This was discussed by Alice Leal in her account of experiences as a CETRA scholar, and I absolutely agree with her.

ST: In your book (2006) you have a subchapter entitled “The globalization turn” (2006: 128 – 145) which is divided into three sections: “Technology and the translator”, “Translation and advertising” and “The Empire of English”. We nevertheless believe there is a somewhat recent academic development that could be added as a fourth element of such turn, namely the dissemination of graduate and PhD programmes in TS around the world and, more generally speaking, the intensification of networking and cooperation amongst scholars and universities in our field. Would you agree with that? In hindsight, how important have such scholarly developments been for the shaping of our (increasingly) international discipline?

SNELL-HORNBY: I would describe the three sections I discuss under the “globalization turn” as facets inside the discipline, whereas the development of PhD programmes is a completely different category outside the discipline and concerns the organization of research degrees. But here again, research at doctoral level existed long before the development of these programmes, and in Austria it was made possible by the creation of the three Chairs of Translation Studies. But then there was still the traditional Humboldtian principle of academic freedom, and students were completely free to choose their supervisor and their research topic. When I was appointed to the Chair in Vienna, I gave top priority to promoting research in translation and particularly in the then neglected field of interpreting studies, and with it to creating a new generation of scholars within the discipline. In my first doctoral seminar on November 8th 1989 there were two students: Franz Pöchhacker and Klaus Kaindl, both meanwhile recognized experts, the one in Interpreting and the other in Translation Studies. Meanwhile I have had doctoral students from all over the world, but as the Humboldtian principle also gives you the freedom to take as long as you like to complete the thesis and many students have jobs and families, they can take several years to complete their work (which of course is usually not advisable), and some disappear completely (one such doctoral student of mine is an interpreter from Brazil, by the way). But so far 23 students have completed their doctorate under my supervision, whereby the focus is on empirical research which encourages interdisciplinary cooperation and combines theory and professional practice. The topics vary from neurological processes in simultaneous interpreting, opera

translation, court interpreting, Sigmund Freud in French translation, the reception of Kafka in Iran, cultural problems involved in translating modern Syrian short stories into German, the conflict of theory and practice in film-dubbing and subtitling, translation in marketing and news agencies, feminist translation, stage translation, translators in exile – and so on, and there are several more to come. I have also supervised six post-doctoral candidates for their Habilitation, one of these was Christiane Nord. But all of this was outside any kind of programme and was based on individual supervision and discussion in the seminars, at first with a joint supervisor and often with interdisciplinary cooperation from outside – a method which at this level of research I found ideal. The global development of graduate and PhD programmes is reasonably new, I don't take part in them myself and I think it is too early to judge their success in shaping the discipline, though I have observed that some people who have taken part in such programmes finish their theses very quickly, and the quality often suffers. Of course the intensification of networking and international cooperation is a positive development with tremendous potential for the future, but we must see how it develops.

ST: *Scientia Traductionis* interviewed José Lambert from the K.U. Leuven⁹ in issue n.7¹⁰. One of the questions he was asked concerned the topic of key moments, or turning points, in our discipline. The first line of his answer reads as follows: “Well, this is, of course, a question like ‘write another book after Mary Snell-Hornby’s *The Turns of Translation Studies* (laughs)”. At any rate he accepted the challenge and provided his interesting collection of opinions. On the issue of TS and its place at university he stated the following: “(...) it is very clear that until this very day in universities TS tends to be located somewhere – sometimes in English Literature, sometimes in Comparative Literature, sometimes in Computer Linguistics, and etc. But the dominant dilemma is still simply, and still nowadays, either Linguistics or Literary Studies. I would say that when we started dealing with translation, for us this was indeed more or less unavoidable. Nowadays, I would say this is a fully outdated dilemma and I think this deserves to be treated as a turning point – I mean the redefinition of the position of research on translation in the university on the basis of, say, already established disciplines (...)”. In the Preface to your book (2006: ix) you say of your previous book – *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*¹¹ – that “up to mid-1980s, when the volume was compiled, the study of translation was still widely seen as a concern of either linguistics or literary studies, and my ‘integrated approach’ set out to overcome the divisions between them and to present Translation Studies as an independent discipline. The response to that volume indicates that it served its purpose.” In spite of this positive response to your book, more than two decades later the issue still seems to linger, as hinted at by Lambert. Why is this dispute between literary and linguistic approaches still present today? Are there any new an-

⁹ He is currently a visiting professor at UFSC (from 2010 to 2012).

¹⁰ Lambert, José. Interview with José Lambert. *Scientia Traductionis*, Florianópolis, n. 7, p. 207-234, July 2010. The interview was carried out by Gustavo Althoff and Lilian Fleuri.

¹¹ Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988/1995). *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

More info: http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_bookview.cgi?bookid=Z%2038

gles to it and/or a new historical context that may justify its continuance? In the background of such a dispute, is the issue of the independence of TS still at stake?

SNELL-HORNBY: José Lambert is one of the great pioneers of Translation Studies – against the background of Comparative Literature. My own background is quite different: I started out with a first degree in German Language and Literature and a second degree on Austrian dramatic satire, both from St. Andrews. During the 1960s I gave translation classes at the English Seminar of the University of Munich (and published two books for students – the second, *German-English Prose Translation* (Snell 1972), sold for over thirty years) and at the same time translated documentary film texts for Inter Nationes in Bonn on subjects varying from Beethoven's diaries to Siemens telecommunications. So my approach to translation was from the outset basically practical and culture-bound – but even then I would have greatly profited from the theoretical insights I gained much later. My two other degrees were from Zurich and were submitted in the English Department, one was the Habilitation on contrastive semantics, which was located within the linguistics section, the other was the Swiss doctorate¹², the thesis was published in 1988 as *Translation Studies – An Integrated Approach*, and was officially assigned to the literature section, resulting in a rather unpleasant debate between the professors concerned. A subject called "Translation Studies" did not exist at Zurich University, and I attempted to integrate the then separate disciplines of Linguistics and Literary Studies along with the two rival departments of English and German Studies, as well as theory and practice (as you will see from the Appendix, which consists of translations from my own workshop). But that was in the 1980s. From today's perspective and from my viewpoint, I would not agree that this is now the dominant issue, though it seems to be in the English-speaking community. The reason is that what you and José call "TS" (Translation Studies) I would call "TW" (*Translationswissenschaft*). In the former you may be right in pointing out that the dispute between literary and linguistic approaches is still with us. But *Translationswissenschaft* is a discipline that covers both translation and interpreting, in theory, practice, training and research, and it includes all aspects of specialized translation (LSP) and some aspects of terminology, audiovisual and literary translation as well as conference interpreting, media interpreting, court and dialogue interpreting - all of this being independent of the languages involved (at our Centre we have 14 working languages). And of course it interacts as an interdiscipline with the other fields concerned (law, sociology, psychology and so forth). Our "Zentrum für Translationswissenschaft" in Vienna officially has the status of a Faculty, and the problem with us is rather one of university power politics and the conflict between progressive and conservative teaching methods (especially those concerning theory and practice) than the dispute between linguistics and literary studies. Meanwhile other faculties and disciplines have recognized the potential of TW, and in these times of meagre funding they are only too willing to claim possession of their share of the booty – such as literary translation in the separate languages of the traditional Humanities. So the issue of the independence of TW is certainly still at stake – but

¹² For the background of this rather odd situation – due to the incompatibility in naming some British and German-speaking degrees - see Snell-Hornby 2008: 25.

the dispute is not between literary studies and linguistics, but rather between the discipline of TW and the traditional arts departments. In Tampere, for example, where Justa Holz-Mänttari developed her theory of translatorial action and which once boasted an independent “Institute of Translation Studies”, Translation Studies has now been reduced to part of an institution called the “School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies” – and that only in name. In fact it has been reclaimed as a mere aspect of modern languages. And in Warwick the once illustrious Centre for Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies was closed down in 2009 as “unsustainable” – and aspects of translation are now distributed among other departments.

ST: On a similar subject, Lambert pointed out that TS and research on translation are not necessarily the same thing (2010: 216). In the same vein, he stated that translation theory does not equate to TS (2010: 217). Can you clarify to our readers what in your view distinguishes theories and research developed *within* TS from theories and research on translation carried out *outside* the boundaries of our discipline? Taking into consideration that TS is widely seen as an interdiscipline, borrowing concepts, tools and approaches from Sociology, History, Linguistics, Literary Studies, and so on, what features constitute its distinguishing scholarly identity as a discipline?

SNELL-HORNBY: Here I agree with José, and the differentiation applies both to TS and TW, though the borderlines are of course fuzzy. DTS, the skopos theory and translatorial action were all developed within the discipline and with the express intention of shaping the profile of a new discipline. But language teachers also use translation (whether rightly or wrongly is not the issue here) in their research on language, and the reception studies in literature also use translated texts, but I would call neither of these approaches “Translation Studies”. José refers to the Göttingen scholars for example (I was “Visiting Linguist” at their research centre in 1986-87), but these were scholars appointed to work in literary studies, American, British, Polish, French etc., and they analyzed and compared the translations of their own classics into German, from the perspective of their own discipline. They called themselves “Übersetzungsforscher” (researchers in translation) rather than “Übersetzungswissenschaftler” (translation scholars) and were otherwise literary scholars in the traditional sense. This by no means diminishes the quality and the value of their research, but it was carried out from a difference perspective – though the borderline is of course fuzzy. As to the features constituting the “distinguishing scholarly identity” of TW as a discipline: this is difficult to put in a sentence, especially as regards the relationship to neighbouring disciplines. However, the difference between TW and linguistics for example is that in linguistics the object of research is language in all its aspects; in TW language is a tool – or an instrument – used in order to fulfil a specific purpose that lies outside language. It centres round the transfer of a message across barriers of culture and/or language. An everyday example might be the text-type “Instructions for Use”: for the linguist the terminology and syntax are the object of study, whereas the translator concentrates on creating a text in another language, culture and possibly legal system that makes the user understand how to use the gadget concerned, quite independent-

ly of the grammar structures of the source language. The scholarly identity of translation and interpreting lies in the special form of communication and transfer – cultural transfer through language – and the aim of translation and interpreting is successful communication by means of language.

ST: As you construct your narrative in the *Turns*, you pay homage to the contributions of Czech historian and translator Jiří Levý¹³ (2006: 21-23). In ST n.7 Lambert stated that in the 1960s Levý's book¹⁴ was the work that first integrated the developments in Literary Studies and Linguistics into the study of translation (2010: 217). You point out that Levý's book not only had that merit but that it also "succeeded in bridging the gap between theory and practice", "introduced the aim of the translation as a decisive factor" and addressed the topic of the reader's role in the reception of translated literary work. The following quote of yours (2006: 23) summarises his importance as a translation theorist: "His exuberant pioneer spirit is all the more remarkable, as is the fact that his innovative ideas have in essence neither been refuted nor become outdated over the last forty years, many have on the contrary been confirmed, in Radnitzky's phrase, as part of the 'raw program' of the future discipline of Translation Studies." That statement is a powerful one as it bestows the highest praises upon the work of the theoretician. Can you give us more details on the importance and far-reaching power of Levý's contribution? If we may direct your answer slightly, can one say that he was the first contemporary thinker to bridge the gap between theory and practice in our field? What specific contributions of his made him bridge that gap? Which particular ideas of his have not been refuted but confirmed? If his contributions and ideas were pioneering and stood the test of time, in your view why is he not more prominently debated, cited and quoted? Has the time come for his work to be translated into other languages? Finally, can you tell us something about the reception of his work in the former Czechoslovakia and in German-speaking countries?

SNELL-HORNBY: José Lambert has also praised Levý as a pioneer in literary translation studies who was far ahead of his time. Whether he was the first contemporary thinker to bridge the gap between theory and practice is difficult to say. Don't forget that Levý's book was published in the 1960s, during the Cold War, when work in countries east of the Iron Curtain was often either suppressed or politically motivated, and a lot of it did not penetrate to the West. With that in mind we should also remember the work done in other fields of translation during the 1960s in Leipzig, particularly by Otto Kade, conference interpreter, teacher and theorist, whose definitions and work in communication theory are still valid today, though he is hardly mentioned in English writings on TS. As for Levý, I can say that the main ideas and theoretical concepts confirmed by later scholars are those on stage translation and the translation of lyric poetry. He is known in the German-speaking countries mainly through the

¹³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ji%C5%99%C3%AD_Lev%C3%BD

¹⁴ Levý, Jiří (1969). *Die Literarische Übersetzung: Theorie einer Kunstgattung*. Athenäum, Frankfurt (translated by Walter Schamschula). The book was first published in 1963, in Czech, under the title *Umění překlady* (The Art of Translation).

translation of his book by Walter Schamschula (*Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung*), though the quality of the translation has been severely criticized by scholars familiar with the Czech version. Of course he would have been given more scholarly attention if this book had been translated into English, but even his seminal essay of 1967 "Translation as a Decision Process" (included in Venuti's *Translation Studies Reader*), though written in English, has not been given the attention it would deserve. That was a fate suffered by various scholars during the Cold War, and it is the time and circumstances of writing – not the content – that make the book dated from the viewpoint of today's globalized world. So I think any English translation would have to be edited and annotated.

ST: In Lambert' view (2010: 217) the publication of your book (1988/1995) was a turning point in TS because "it was extremely influential! It was one of the first times that references to the tradition of Translation Studies and translation theory were systematically selected not only from Linguistics but also from the more literary background. And there was one common name used: Translation Studies. And here the use of the label developed by Holmes¹⁵ was extremely influential." First, as for the subject of integration, is there a common theme and preoccupation between what you looked to do in your book and what Levý¹⁶ sought to do in his a couple of decades earlier? Were you inspired by his pioneering integration of approaches? Secondly, how important was it for our discipline to have a common and well-accepted name? How did the coining of that name – in English! – relate to the (international) establishment of the discipline? Incidentally, do the various names used in different linguistic and national communities to refer to the discipline that has translation as its subject – Translation Studies, *Traductologie*, *Translationwissenschaft* or *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, *Traductología*, etc – bear any consequence on what the corresponding scholarly communities do and what their goals are?

SNELL-HORNBY: I have already given you the background of this book, which was written as a monograph with the entirely pragmatic aim of gaining a Swiss doctor's title in order to qualify for an Austrian professorship. I had to write it under extreme time pressure and no one was more surprised than myself when it was firstly accepted by Benjamins and secondly turned out to be so successful. There are in fact a number of gaps and weaknesses, one being the neglect of the work by James Holmes – rightly criticized by Gideon Toury – simply because I was unaware of it. (The collection of Holmes's essays *Translated* edited by Raymond van den Broeck appeared posthumously in 1988, after my *Integrated Approach* was written.) I did hear James Holmes give his absolutely brilliant lecture "The State of Two Arts; Literary Translation and Translation Studies in the West Today" at the FIT Congress in Vienna in 1984, and I noted his term "Translation Studies". However, the real inspiration for my approach came

¹⁵ James Stratton Holmes was an American poet and scholar who, starting in 1964, taught at the Institute of Literature at the University of Amsterdam. He played an important role in the history of TS, having written the "program" of the discipline, so to speak, in the article: "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" (1972/1988) – In: James S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 67–80.

¹⁶ Refer to footnote 8 above.

from the combination of working in the English Department in Zürich with Ernst Leisi (who was a pioneer in combining theory and practice in linguistics) and working in the field of *Übersetzungswissenschaft* in Heidelberg from 1981-1983, where I met the colleagues who contributed to my anthology published in 1986 *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integration von Theorie und Praxis*, especially Hans Vermeer, Fritz Paepcke, Paul Kußmaul and Justa Holz-Mänttari, and also Mia Vannerem, who I met in Antwerp and was very impressed by her practical application of scenes-and-frames semantics in translation classes. Those are the scholars who mainly inspired my book. And I do indeed think the name of the discipline extremely important: James Holmes explained in 1972 why he preferred *Translation Studies* to *Translatology*, which he rightly found too abstract, but his concept did not include Interpreting Studies and he concentrated on literary translation, and that has in fact continued until today. I have explained above that *Translationswissenschaft* is the generic term for both translation and interpreting studies, but for some reason it was not popular with a number of German colleagues who still prefer the far clumsier term “Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft”. In the 1960s Otto Kade discussed why, although he introduced the term *Translation* to cover both translation and interpreting, he could not at that time envisage a discipline called *Translationswissenschaft* (I discuss this in *The Turns* pp. 27-28), which was established during the 1980s, and until then *Übersetzungswissenschaft* was used as an umbrella term implicitly including interpreting studies (which only really developed from the 1990s onwards, hence the term *Übersetzungswissenschaft* for the three new Chairs in Austria). I find it regrettable that the issue is so confusing, and that TS and TW do not mean the same thing. We really need some clear, well-defined and internationally compatible terms to name our discipline and its varying aspects.

ST: In the Introduction to your book (2006: 2) you reproduce a fascinating account by Hans Vermeer on the progress of a science: “The topos of paradigms and progress was taken up by Hans Vermeer in his keynote lecture at the Translation Studies Congress in Vienna in 1992 with reference to the history of translation theory which, he felt, showed little progress: ‘But what is progress? It is not a well-defined term in science. I can think of 3 types of ‘progress’: the straightforward leap to a new idea or point of view, the extreme case which Kuhn (1970) called a paradigmatic change; the ‘peripatetic’ spiral, which after many repetitions gets more or less away from its starting point; and ultimately the perfect circle, which undoubtedly is a movement, a going-on, peripatetically, but only to lead back to the very same question. (And it is hardly consoling to note that there are several circles side by side which differ in their respective starting points and therefore in their points of arrival.) There also seems to be a fourth type of progress. I mean the one which looks like a zigzagging spiral, advancing so to speak by leaps and bounds but at the same time going round in a circle, wasting a lot of breath and energy in fruitless repetitions, but ultimately managing to come to a conclusion some distance away from its starting point. (1994: 3–4).” As you close subchapter 5.2, entitled “New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?” you argue that whether innovations in TS “lie on the spectrum between ‘new paradigm’ and ‘shifting viewpoint’ or what

type of progress they represent in Vermeer's zigzags and spirals is a judgment that probably varies with the interests and convictions of the individual reader or translation scholar." Therefore, as a translation scholar how would you classify the main turns in TS in relation to Vermeer's four kinds of progress? In what category would the integration of approaches by Levý and later by you fit? Additionally, which of those four kinds have you come to find more prevalent in the history of TS?

SNELL-HORNBY: As Vermeer pointed out, "progress" is not a well-defined term in science, and his "3 types of 'progress'" are images, hence are open to interpretation, shifts and associations that vary with the viewpoint of the scholar, and as such they cannot really be objectively classified. However, I would say that the developments of the 1980s do indeed deserve to be called paradigmatic changes, as I describe in my book, whereby the emphasis shifts to the target text, culture and readership, and the fixation on equivalence, which in 1986 (and 1988) I discuss in detail and describe as an illusion, was challenged. Since then there have indeed been a number of "peripatetic spirals", particularly where scholars are unaware of what has been written in other languages, and the same conclusions are reached as those presented years beforehand. André Lefevere's observation is still valid, that "like many emerging disciplines, translation studies suffers from at least two childhood diseases: one is that of always reinventing the wheel, and the other, concomitant with the first, is that of not reading what other people have written. (...) Add to this, that many books on translation still claim, with predictable regularity, to be the first to address whatever it is they address, They are aided and abetted in this by the third childhood disease besetting translation studies, namely that of ignoring its own history" (1993:229). I think that might describe the "peripatetic spiral", which seems to be most prevalent in Translation Studies. (One must however point out that so much is written and published nowadays that it is virtually impossible to keep up with it all.) However, an interesting development is that of the "perfect circle", which I allude to in *The Turns* (Ch. 5.1) with the title "The U-turns – back to square one", and that refers to tendencies which remind me very much of Chomsky's Transformational Generative Grammar in the 1960s (which George Steiner so eloquently dismantled in the 1970s), including the fixation on universals and the overwhelming dominance of English. All this does not mean of course that no new work has been done or new ideas have been developed. On the contrary, I recognize quite a number of innovative approaches, in particular in the field of dialogue interpreting, which is still underrated and underfunded, and in this day and age of migration is in desperate need of further attention and promotion. As to the integration of approaches you mention: Jirí Levý was a real pioneer in immensely difficult times, and I would not like to put my name on a par with his. However, the very concept of "integration" involves the use of ideas that have already been expressed and does not imply real progress. The innovative aspect lies in putting together ideas and approaches (and hopefully reaching new conclusions) hitherto considered incompatible.

ST: The term "Manipulation School" is used to designate a group of scholars with a background in Literary Studies who played an important role in

the establishment of TS as a discipline¹⁷. As one of those who were a part of the school, Lambert's view on its name (2010: 217) is that "this is the name that a few people have used". He recounts that "'Manipulation School' was even used in a book published in 1985 by Theo Hermans¹⁸¹⁹ – although Hermans (...) told me one day that it was a little bit of a kind of a joke. (...) In the 1970s, and even in the 1980s, when discussing Toury and other people, we never used the word 'manipulation'. So this is a label that has sold well." In an interview to Daniel Simeoni²⁰, Gideon Toury²¹, another prominent member of the so-called Manipulation School, gave his take on the subject with some detachment: "I don't think there ever was a Manipulation School – not in the sense of a *school* – it was just a group of people who found two common denominators: (a) it was about a group of people of about the same age who liked to be with one another and to talk. And (b) what we had in common was displeasure with the existing situation and a general direction of thinking about how to change it. But it never crystallized into a school. And I think that it's a direction which sometimes prevents us from seeing what actually happened. Because we are all falling into the same category and people think that everybody does exactly the same thing... and thinks about the same things in the same way. So, let's not talk about a Manipulation School." In your book (2006: 48) you tell your version of the story about how that name came to be, claiming that it was created during a particularly lively discussion after the presentation of a paper in a conference in Göttingen in 1987. Now the questions. Is Lambert's revelation of the jokey use of the word "manipulation" by Hermans a good reason not to understand it as the most representative label, or concept, associated to what those scholars were trying to do? And what of Toury's outcry for not talking of what they did and accomplished as a "school" due to the misleading homogenisation of thought that it might engender? Despite Toury's concerns, is there a good reason to do so?

SNELL-HORNBY: Of course the name "Manipulation School" is a label (with a certain degree of irony), and it is one that has "sold" very well indeed. That is why I am rather surprised that the group of scholars who are seen to belong to it are not happy with it, but they seem to object to the term "school" rather than "Manipulation". Gideon Toury describes them as a "a group of people" which "never crystallized into a school", because he thinks that a "school" puts people into the same category and that they do the same thing and think in the same way. Here again of course, it depends on how you define *school*. If you look it up in the *Collins English Dictionary* you will find the definition "a group of ar-

¹⁷ Their contributions to our field are dealt with in the interviewee's book of 2006 in the subchapter 2.1 called "Descriptive Translation Studies: The 'Manipulation School' revisited".

¹⁸ Hermans, Theo (org). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.

¹⁹ The book was composed of a collection of essays by several authors, most of whom were associated to the so-called "Manipulation School" such as Gideon Toury, José Lambert, Hendrik van Gorp, Susan Bassnett (-McGuire), André Lefevere, amongst others.

²⁰ The interview was originally published in the book "Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury" and is republished in this very issue of *Scientia Traductionis*, in English and in a Brazilian Portuguese translation by Rodrigo Borges de Faveri.

²¹ <http://www.tau.ac.il/~toury/>

tists, writers etc. linked by the same style, teachers, or aims”, which of course is something quite different and does not imply the homogenization that Toury sees in it. Oddly enough, the members of the so-called “Leipzig School” (Neubert, Kade, Jäger, Wotjak etc.) also objected to being called a school, though as such they achieved international fame and respect. Personally, nothing would give me more pleasure (thinking of the renowned Vienna schools of medicine in the 19th century) than the development of a Vienna School of *Translationswissenschaft*, linked by an interdisciplinary, holistic, functional approach combining theory and practice, as well as promoting linguistic and cultural diversity – and the “group of people” who would qualify to belong to it through first-class research, numerous publications and excellent teaching is actually very large – although most of this work is published in German and often goes unnoticed by the English-speaking TS community.

ST: In the abovementioned subchapter of *The Turns*, “The Empire of English”, you comment on the ever growing dominance of English in TS – the monolingual approach witnessed in congresses and publications serving as the main example of such dominance. The problem with that, you claim, is that “(...) unlike congresses in, for example, medicine or physics, language in Translation Studies is not merely a neutral means of communication but also part of the problem under discussion” (2006: 144). Leal (2010) gives account that to you “the dominance by DTS, and the lack of interest in the German functional approach, for instance, has a lot to do with the languages in which they were written, namely English and German respectively”, an opinion whose implication is that the reception of theoretical trends and ideas is highly dependent on the language in which they are written. Indeed, the use of a common language might have a beneficial side to it, as one could argue, for example, that the insularity of Levý’s work may greatly be attributed to the fact that it was written in Czech and translated solely into German. Had it been translated into English, the *lingua franca* of our times, chances are his work could have exerted a stronger influence in the discussions on (the study of) translation worldwide. Taking those points of view into consideration and bearing in mind that the choice of language in scholarly settings has a political element to it, in your opinion what are the likely causes for this homogenisation of language usage in TS? Analogously, what would be the hindrances for the adoption of a more linguistically diverse environment in TS? However much we understand that your outcry against “the empire of English” entails more critical thinking and awareness about the subject than actual practical measures, may we ask you what concrete steps could be taken so that we can simultaneously enjoy the benefits of linguistic diversity and profit from the advantages of using a common language for communication? As regards the widening of the visibility of ideas in TS (particularly of those not originally written in English), might interconnected translation projects amongst translation training institutions, graduate programs in TS, universities and publishing houses not be a possible solution?

SNELL-HORNBY: This connects up with your last question, and I am answering it as someone who lives and works in a multilingual environment, every day hear-

ing students and staff chatting and conversing in various languages, Polish, Hungarian, Czech, Spanish, Rumanian, Italian, Russian - and even Portuguese. One might imagine that translators and those interested in translation and interpreting would naturally be interested in learning and using foreign languages, and indeed that is the case with many of the students and staff at our Centre, and linguistic diversity is after all part of the European identity. What you describe as the “homogenisation of language usage in TS” is, I think, partly due to the fact you have mentioned that work published in English has a much wider circulation, partly due to policy (some international publishers insist on work being written in English), partly to inertia. The globalized world, including academe, communicates in (International) English, and “TS” follows suit. This makes sense when it reduces work and expense, which is why we decided in 1992 to make English the official language of EST – otherwise every single official document would have to be circulated in all the official languages, making the already onerous work-load of organizing Newsletters, Congresses etc. virtually impossible to manage. But this does not mean that English has to be the sole language for conference papers, lectures and academic discussion, which is now virtually the case even when there are several “official” conference languages. I gave some suggestions for solutions at the EST Congress in Ljubljana in 2007 (Snell-Hornby 2010: 100-101): above all passive multilingualism, quotes presented in their original language (where necessary with an English translation), using technical aids like PowerPoint for an English version of papers presented in other languages, the introduction of bridge languages, etc. It is basically a matter of attitude: speakers of so-called “small” languages inevitably need a command of foreign languages to be able to communicate internationally, whereas native speakers of English can afford to remain monolingual or to limit themselves to one foreign language. Similarly, Departments of English round the world offer “Translation Studies” as part of their programme, so that “TS” is invariably connected with English (and indeed one major UK/US publisher includes it under its “English Language and Linguistics” section). One solution lies of course in the translation of major works into other languages, as has happened with the Spanish translations of the works of Reiß and Vermeer, and in Spain the functional approach is therefore quite well known. The joint projects and programmes you mention would also help – if people were allowed to communicate in their own language and if learning several foreign languages became the norm for the translation scholar.

ST: Susan Bassnett dealt with the subject of translation metaphors in her book *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*²², in which she asserted that studying metaphors is an important part of TS. Here is a passage of hers on that subject: “[C]lusters of metaphors used by translators reflect their thinking about the role and status of translation in their own time. Predictable metaphors relating to rhetoric in general include following in footsteps, changing clothing, discovering treasure or alchemical transfer, and these metaphors also show a certain degree of ambiguity towards the source text, with the status of the text in its source system being significant in determining the attitude and strategies of the translator as well as the

²² Bassnett, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

right of the target culture to possess it" (1993: 146)²³. Whether source-based or not, metaphors on translation abound. Here is a small collection of a few metaphors collected from our readings: a) "the translator as a servant"; b) Augusto de Campos' "translation as the transfusion of blood, a devouring of the source text, a transmutation process, an act of vampirisation"; c) Arrojo's "translation as palimpsest"; d) Antoine Berman's "*au-berge du lointain*"; e) Paul Ricoeur's "linguistic hospitality"; and f) translation as a "game of chess" instead of as a "mirror image", in the view of Hungarian author and translator Miklós Szentkuthy regarding the translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses*²⁴. Do you agree with Bassnett on the importance of studying metaphors? What heuristic or descriptive role do metaphors play in TS? Which metaphors appear to have had a more perennial descriptive or explanatory power in our field? Finally, can you comment on the metaphors cited by Bassnett and by us and explore how they might relate to each other?

SNELL-HORNBY: The list of metaphors used to describe translation and the translator is long, and the practice of using such images in this way is age-old. Often a translation is seen as a mere copy or mirror of the original, and the translator is a servile figure, usually female (the "belles infidèles" are probably the best-known example). For this reason among others, such metaphors are severely criticized by modern scholars (especially those working in gender-based Translation Studies), and because their scientific value is highly questionable, metaphors are not a tool to be recommended for argumentation in the academic debate, and so I am not willing to comment on those listed by Bassnett.

The phenomenon of metaphor itself and the problems it involves in translation is of course quite a different matter, and a field I find absolutely fascinating – there is a whole section on it in *Translation Studies – An Integrated Approach* (1988: 56-64). That is why I would agree with Susan Bassnett that it is important to study metaphors in Translation Studies – but not because they can be used as metalanguage to illuminate the nature of translation itself. Metaphors are by nature multidimensional and culture-specific, and they can present translators with considerable problems – I discussed these in a lecture I gave in 1987 called "The unfamiliar image: Metaphor as a problem in translation" based on the image "cloak and dagger" (see Snell-Hornby 1996: 116-126), and I noted that innovative metaphors in literature are often less problematic than lexicalized ones like the above, due to the set associations they evoke which are very often unfamiliar in the target language and culture. And it is because they are culture-specific that metaphors tend to be problematic when they are intended to function as metalanguage, as is often the case in English academic discourse: being culture-specific and dependent on association they defy the precise definition needed for scholarly terminology. The ensuing metalinguistic confusion is not limited to Translation Studies, but it is one of the reasons why

²³ The interviewers' attention to this subject was brought up by a B. J. Epstein's post in her blog, "Brave New Words". The post can be accessed here: <http://brave-new-words.blogspot.com/2008/12/more-metaphors-for-translationtranslato.html>. Many of the references as well as the quote used in the question are Epstein's selections. She is a lecturer in Literature and Translation at the University of East Anglia, UK.

²⁴ Szentkuthy, Miklós. 'Miért újra *Ulysses*?' [Why *Ulysses* again?], in *Nagyvilág* (February 1968), 274-79.

words are used in different ways and scholars do not always understand what other scholars are talking about (see Snell-Hornby 2007).

ST: In the *Turns* (2006: 125-126; 156-158) you have a rather sceptical outlook on the relationship between Corpus Linguistics (CL) and TS, as you seem to doubt the fruitfulness of such a relationship. We would like to reassess your stance on this subject by asking you a few questions divided in two parts. Part 1 – You remark that Jeremy Munday²⁵ treated the issue of CL as an “interface for interdisciplinary co-operation” and that he referred to it as a methodology (2006: 156 & 158). You affirm that “the use of parallel texts as a translation aid is undisputed” (2006: 125) and concede that corpora enable the researcher to compute things like “the frequency of certain terms, type-token ratio and lexical density” (2006: 126). You also make reference to Mona Baker’s²⁶ intent of finding patterns extant in translated texts in contrast to patterns found in texts produced “in relative freedom from an individual script” (1995: 233), a goal that, according to her, can be achieved through the use of CL. Finally, you reproduce a passage by Dorothy Kenny (1998: 53) in which she mentioned the novelty of using CL in TS proceeding top down, that is, trying to find evidence to support abstract hypothesis (e.g.: the existence of “translation universals”) in a movement that would go against the tradition in Linguistics of making generalisations from concrete facts. So these remarks lead us to the following questions: 1) In the context of TS, can CL not be viewed at least as a useful tool to organise complex data and provide information that might be relevant not only as a translation aid but also in scholarly research of different sorts? 2) Would you not agree that a great part of the issue Baker wants to tackle depends on having well-defined concepts, convincing models and a theory that accounts for what linguistic patterning means in translation and in non-translation phenomena? In other words, if there are problems in her proposal, are those problems not more theoretical than methodological? 3) Is proceeding from the top to the bottom in empirical research always alien to scholarly work and counterproductive as suggested by your citation of Kenny? Part 2 – Lambert says (2010: 219) that the emergence of CL²⁷ should be considered a decisive and absolutely key moment in TS: “(...) when CL has been integrated into research on translation what happened was in fact that the idea of research became linked with the idea of translation theory and theories once and for all as an unavoidable principle. (...) It also shows that people who represent these other approaches from, say, previous years, cannot ignore from now on the contribution of CL as one of the arguments for a systematic approach to translation”. Would you corroborate his view on the connection between theoretical work and (empirical) research as an “unavoidable principle”? Furthermore, contrary to the thesis proposed by the Belgian professor, is CL a methodological tool that previous approaches in TS can do without?

²⁵ http://www.leeds.ac.uk/spanport/staff/jeremy_munday.htm

²⁶ <http://www.monabaker.com/>

²⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus_linguistics & <http://www.corpus-linguistics.de/>

SNELL-HORNBY: Corpus Linguistics goes back to lexicography, where it was invaluable for creating new modern dictionaries like the *Collins English Dictionary*, which was one result of the COBUILD²⁸ project in the 1980s. I think that Jeremy Munday is right in referring to it as a methodology and not a discipline, it is a methodology heavily based on quantification and I think more suitable for lexicology and lexicography – or other branches of linguistics – than for Translation Studies. One of the problems is the concept of translation it depends on: when is a translation – or a “translated text” – not a translation? What about postcolonial hybrid texts or even “original” texts written by non native-speakers (as is the case especially with English in international organizations)? And many texts which have not been consciously translated are not produced “in relative freedom from an individual script” (Baker 1995: 233), but are bound by terminology, text-type conventions and other constraints, particularly in the case of technical and specialized texts. The “patterning which is specific to translated texts” (Baker 1995: 234) in my opinion rather refers to literal trans-coding and is otherwise as illusive as the concept of equivalence. The concept of the parallel text which I describe as an invaluable translation aid existed before corpus linguistics was introduced in Translation Studies (see Snell-Hornby 1988: 88-89), and I see it as a tool for the translator, particularly for highly conventionalized, non-literary texts, rather than one for organizing data. Corpus linguistics seems to me to have more potential for large-scale statistics and multilingual language technology than as a tool for the individual translator. Of course we need well-defined concepts (and a compatible metalanguage, as I have just pointed out) as well as convincing models (the latter do exist), but this applies to any discipline and is not the prerogative of corpus linguistics. I agree with José Lambert that theoretical work needs empirical research, but I think we find more methodological tools in sociology (such as methods for conducting surveys and interviews, as was the case with several of the doctoral theses I have supervised) than in corpus linguistics. Of course, other translation scholars are free to use the methods they think best, but personally (and I say this as someone who used to work in linguistics) I find other approaches more productive for Translation Studies.

ST: We would like to inquire about the relationship between poststructuralist thought and TS and ask you more or less the same question we asked Lambert in his interview to ST (2010, n.7). First, let us provide some minimum context to the question. In your book (2006: 60-63) you devote subchapter 2.4 – “Deconstruction, or the ‘cannibalistic’ approach” – to the introduction of the main notions of such a strand of thought, represented by Rosemary Arrojo’s writings²⁹. You point out that such an approach arose in parallel to similar developments by Vermeer and Holz-Mänttari³⁰ in Europe. Despite this convergence of minds over twenty years ago, there still seems to be a certain resistance, or aloofness, to so-called deconstructionist

²⁸ This is an acronym for COLLINS Birmingham University International Language Database. The COBUILD corpus was later developed into the Bank of English.

²⁹ Relevant bibliography: a) Arrojo, Rosemary. *Oficina de Tradução: A Teoria na Prática*. 3ª edição. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1997; b) Arrojo, Rosemary. *Tradução, Desconstrução e Psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Imago, 1993.

³⁰ For more on her work, please refer to some of her publications in TEXTconTEXT (http://www.fb06.uni-mainz.de/textcontext/tct_ak.htm).

contributions. According to Leal's experience as a CETRA student (2010), European scholars acknowledge the existence of poststructuralist or deconstructionist thought in translation and TS – proposed not only by Rosemary Arrojo, but also by such figures as Brazilian poet, essayist and translator Haroldo de Campos³¹, as well as by the main figure of Deconstruction, Jacques Derrida³² himself – but say that they do not feel much influenced by it, or that they do not always quite understand what it means to TS. During the conference³³ that followed CETRA's Summer School in 2009³⁴, "Anthony Pym spoke about this issue (i.e. the lack of interest in Deconstruction by TS in Europe) as a 'historical conflict' and as a 'main problem' with which 'we' will have to deal at some point" (2010: 205). Do you agree with Pym?

SNELL-HORNBY: Just as corpus linguistics goes back to lexicography, I would say that poststructuralist thought or deconstruction are derived from a blend of literary theory and philosophy of language. And as I have already pointed out, my concept of Translation Studies goes beyond these two disciplines. And incidentally it was Hans Vermeer, and not myself, who pointed out (in his Introduction to Michaela Wolf's volume on Translation Studies in Brazil, 1997: 7) that there were parallels between his own and Holz-Mänttari's theories and Arrojo's "cannibalistic" approach. (Vermeer's main working language as a professional translator and interpreter was Portuguese, and his then research assistant, Margret Ammann was a Brazilian, born in São Paulo.) But he points out too that there is a difference of emphasis: Vermeer's skopos theory is a general theory of translation, Holz-Mänttari concentrates mainly on the translation of pragmatic texts, while Rosemary Arrojo's approach focusses on literary translation. What they have in common is their rejection of the concepts of equivalence or the "logocentric" fixation and their prospective concept of translation focussing on the target text. It is quite true that TS scholars in Europe are only vaguely aware of Deconstruction and its role in translation theory – and this criticism applies to myself as well – but I think this deficit is due simply to a lack of awareness, and there is a definite need for some information here. I agree with Pym that such ignorance is a problem for Translation Studies – but one which largely concerns literary translation.

ST: In the Introduction to your book (2006) you inform the reader that its chapters will "set out to offer a critical assessment of the discipline of

³¹ Relevant bibliography: a) Campos, H. 1970. "Da Tradução como Criação e como Crítica". *Metalinguagem*. Petrópolis: Vozes. [21-38]; b) Campos, H. 1984. "Tradução, Ideologia e História". Simon, Iuma Maria (org.) *Território da Tradução*, revista *Remate de Males*. Campinas: IEL. [239-47]; c) Campos, H. 1987. "Da Transcrição: Poética e Semiótica da Operação Tradutora". Oliveira, A. C.; Santaella, L.(Orgs.) *Semiótica da literatura*. São Paulo: EDUC, 1987. [53-74].

³² Relevant bibliography: a) Derrida, Jacques. 2004. What is a "Relevant" Translation. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by L. Venuti, 423-446. New York: Routledge. First published 2001. *Critical Inquiry*, 16: 174-200.

³³ "The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies". This event took place at the K.U. Leuven between the 28th and 29th August 2009, and was organised as an international conference in honour of the twentieth anniversary of CETRA and *Target* (1989-2009). For more information on the event, please check: <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/anniversary/index.html>.

³⁴ <http://cetra.mikt.net/forum/read.php?4,1047>

Translation Studies over the last twenty years, not in the form of a general introduction, but by sketching a profile, highlighting what can now be assessed as groundbreaking contributions leading to new paradigms” (2006: 3). In subchapter 4.3, entitled “Venuti’s foreignization: a new paradigm?”, you critically appraise Venuti’s re-conceptualisation of Schleiermacher’s translation maxim as crystallised in the latter’s famous dictum, presented in English by André Lefevere (1977): “Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him”. In this subchapter the concept of “paradigm” clearly refers to a “translation paradigm”, i.e. to a practical recommendation on how to translate, but not to a “Translations Studies paradigm”. Thus, what relationships may exist between a “translation paradigm” and paradigms in TS? Similarly, in what ways can Venuti’s “translation paradigm” be interpreted as a possible paradigm in TS?

SNELL-HORNBY: Venuti’s concepts of “foreignization” and “domestication” are a “cannibalized” form of Schleiermacher’s maxim for the translator from his famous Academy lecture of 1813, whereby he was referring to the translation of literary works from Classical Antiquity. In those days there was no field of scholarship known as Translation Studies, and Schleiermacher was to my knowledge the first person to deplore the lack of a theory of translation based on solid foundations (“people have only presented fragments” – *The Turns* 2006: 6) and to call for a discipline of “Uebersetzungswissenschaft” (cf. 2006: 6-7). So at that time there could be no “Translation Studies paradigm”. Venuti, as an American intellectual of today, converts Schleiermacher’s maxim into two abstract concepts applicable for the modern American market, and as such they have sold very well in the global TS community: the two notions are often discussed as basic terms in Translation Studies and as though the idea went back to Venuti. But the new paradigm was Schleiermacher’s and not his, and, as someone who supports the integration of theory and practice, I think it is immaterial whether it is one of “translation” or “translation studies”.

ST: In the *Turns*, after alerting the reader that your appraisal of the history of TS was to be carried out from a European perspective, you wrote that “even from a non-European perspective however, there is a broad consensus that many basic insights and concepts in Translation Studies today go back to the German Romantic Age which forms our historical starting point” (2006: 3). At a particular point (2006: 19) you substantiate your case by citing Steiner³⁵ (1975: 269)³⁶ and his list of 13 thinkers³⁷ who, according to him, were those who actually wrote anything fundamental or new about translation – seven of those 13 thinkers having had a place in your overview of the German tradition, three of whom belong to the German Romantic

³⁵ <http://www.contemporarywriters.com/authors/?p=auth234>

³⁶ Steiner, George (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

³⁷ Those are Saint Jerome, Martin Luther, John Dryden, Friedrich Hölderlin, Novalis, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Friedrich Nietzsche, Ezra Pound, Paul Valéry, Stephen MacKenna, Franz Rosenzweig, Walter Benjamin and Willard Van Orman Quine.

Age, namely Hölderlin³⁸, Novalis³⁹ and Schleiermacher. You complement the picture furnished by Steiner by adding Etienne Dolet and Alexander Fraser Tytler as two outstanding figures from other traditions. Nonetheless, there are those who think that the basic set of insights and principles of our discipline is to be located some hundreds of years before the German Romantic Age. Furlan (2006: 11)⁴⁰, for instance, argues that the basis of modern traductology was actually established in the Renaissance – the epoch in which Luther and Dolet lived. He states that Leonardo Bruni Aretino's *De Recta Interpretatione* (1420 – 1426) "is undoubtedly a landmark text between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and the foundational text of modern translatorial thought" (2006: 11)⁴¹. He goes on to point out that one easily recognises in the ideas of the thinkers of that era the outlines of our contemporary thought on translation (2006: 13). Taking Furlan's remarks into consideration, how do you relate Renaissance thought with the one fostered during the German Romantic Age? Would it be correct to relocate the basis of our discipline to the Renaissance?

SNELL-HORNBY: Insights and maxims on translation go back for thousands of years, as we know from Cicero, Horace and Jerome, and there can be no scientific basis for a final location of the beginnings of our discipline, simply because we know too little about what happened in the dim and distant past. For a long time the history of translation was a neglected field, Delisle and Woodsworth's *Translators through History* (1995) was a landmark, and Volumes 1 and 2 of Vermeer's monumental history of translation (Vermeer 1996 and 1996a) are devoted entirely to the Middle Ages, which takes us back a few centuries from the Renaissance – and then don't forget the ancient traditions of China, India and Baghdad. It is all a matter of perspective, and for my book *The Turns of Translation Studies* I found André Lefevere's grouping of precursors, pioneers, masters and disciples very suitable, partly because it was of manageable dimensions and can relate to present-day discussions. In Lefevere's book Martin Luther, the great founder of the Reformation, is described as the main precursor of the German tradition - his celebrated *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (Circular Letter on Translation) of 1530 is familiar to most German schoolchildren - because it is common knowledge that through his Bible translations he helped form the German language of today. One could refer to other great figures; besides Etienne Dolet in France there was John Wycliffe, a forerunner of the Reformation in 14th century England, and so on, and the Renaissance was certainly a key period for translation, as it was for all art and culture in Europe. But the German Romantic Age was significant for my book because it marked the beginnings of a development, an almost continuous line, which we can relate to in the discipline today.

³⁸ <http://kirjasto.sci.fi/holderli.htm>

³⁹ <http://kirjasto.sci.fi/novalis.htm>

⁴⁰ Furlan, Mauri. "Prefácio a *Antologia do Renascimento*", in *Clássicos da Teoria da Tradução. Antologia bilingüe*, vol. 4, Renascimento. Florianópolis: NUPLITT, 2006. (p. 11-13)

⁴¹ This is the interviewers' translation. The original reads as follows: "(...) é seguramente um texto-marco entre a Idade Média e o Renascimento, e é o texto fundador da reflexão tradutológica moderna."

ST: On page 134 of the *Turns* you say that among all the fleeting variables concerning translation in our globalised era, in which the role of computational tools play is a pivotal one, a particular aspect has remained constant, namely the fundamental components of translatorial competence, which in turn can still be specified as “proficiency in the language(s) concerned, basic knowledge of the relevant theoretical approaches in TS, subject area expertise, and cultural competence”. Given the plurality of theoretical approaches in TS – and even the existence of theorisation on translation outside TS, as discussed earlier – what does “basic knowledge of the *relevant* theoretical approaches in TS” mean? Do we not face unavoidable dissent in the determination of what is *relevant* and what is not?

SNELL-HORNBY: Relevance does not exist in isolation, of course, but indicates reference to something. So the theoretical approaches I mention must be relevant to the particular project or subject concerned. The passage you quote refers to an article by Karl-Heinz Stoll (2000) on the profile of the modern translator working in software localization and language technology. For this area theoretical work on terminology and some knowledge of translation memory systems are as relevant as the skopos approach, whereas the theories of Descriptive Translation Studies – and Deconstruction – would be relevant for work in literary translation, and so on.

ST: In his interview, Lambert stated his belief that there is a central issue in TS that seems to have been barely dealt with up to now. He said that all disciplines at our universities “have been developed somewhere at a given moment; they have a past and they have an intercultural past. There is no discipline that has not been obliged to reformulate in a given language things that have been formulated in different languages. So the very basis of any scholarly work is conditioned by interlinguistic phenomena, and translation can never be voided as part of it. So I would say, at least in theoretical-conceptual terms, translation is one of the key problems of university – but universities have never accepted this. So “universe-cities” are more “cities” than “universe”! They are local manipulations of would-be universal knowledge. And dealing with that issue should be one of the functions of translation and Translation Studies in universities” (2010: 221). The impact of translation on scholarly activity is undeniable, and the lack of a conscious engagement with it by universities is quite patent, hence our question: how can translation and TS fill the void identified by Lambert and help to deal with this key problem of universities / universe-cities?

SNELL-HORNBY: I agree that translation as such is basic to all university disciplines and that this fact and all the problems involved in it are ignored or taken for granted. It is deplorable that Translation Studies has not yet succeeded in creating an awareness of the impact translation has on all scholarly work. I remember the most tedious subject in my undergraduate German Honours Course was the history of the German language, particularly Old High German, where every text was examined only by virtue of its sound-shifts, its endings and its atomistic dialectal variants. This was also the case, by the way, with Luther’s *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*. It was only after working in Translation Studies

that I realized that all the authors whose texts I had found so dreary were prominent translators (or translations), Bishop Ulfila, Notker of St. Gall, the Strassburg Oaths, Tatian, Otfried von Weissenburg – and of course Martin Luther – and that they had all made a considerable impact on the history of their times. I wish I had a solution as to how Translation Studies could make universities aware of how important translation is (at my own university there has been a certain improvement in our status and significance over the last few years, but it is not enough): I can only say that it will be a central task of the next generations of translation scholars, now that the discipline is established and has come of age as it were, to tackle this crucial problem and to communicate the importance of their subject – especially for those who distribute the funds.

ST: In CETRA's Summer School of 2009 Peter Flynn⁴² presented a lecture entitled "Fieldwork in Translation Studies – Why not Ask them Yourself?" Leal (2010: 202) chronicled the event thus: "Flynn described his PhD research, which was dedicated to Dutch translations of Irish poetry. He interviewed 13 Belgian and Dutch translators of Irish poetry so as to understand their views and to compare them to their actual work. His main aim was to put the translators in the spotlight, and also to investigate which values inform language, translation strategies and culture. He interestingly remarked that, in the future, translation theory will probably be propelled by translators, and not so much by so-called theorists." What is your take on this subject and on Flynn's proposition?

SNELL-HORNBY: I would like to hear from Peter Flynn what he means by a "so-called theorist". As we have seen above, many of the scholars who have already "propelled" translation theory have themselves been translators: apart from the historical figures I have mentioned above, this applies to André Lefevere, James Holmes, Hans Vermeer, Susan Bassnett, Lawrence Venuti – and so the list could go on. There are of course scholars who only theorize, just as there are translators who "only" translate without reflecting much about it, but the idea that future translation theory will be propelled by translators is only a continuation of what has been going on for centuries.

ST: In Chapter 5 of the *Turns* you take a critical look at the state of our discipline at the beginning of the 21st century. Since its publication, what developments have you noticed and which one(s) do you consider worth paying attention to?

SNELL-HORNBY: The developments which have struck me most are the increasing influence of technology on communication (and hence translation), the globalization of the discipline and the monopoly of English. As I said above, I find the latter counter-productive for Translation Studies and would plead for the support of linguistic and cultural diversity. Globalization can be put to positive use by Translation Studies becoming institutionalized in countries where it formerly played no part, but above all by "mainstream" scholars and schools of thought being enriched by activities and ideas from distant countries hitherto

⁴² Peter Flynn is a professor at Lessius University College, Antwerp.

overlooked or barely noticed – and for this Brazil might be an outstanding example.

Mary Snell-Hornby
mary.snell-hornby@univie.ac.at
Universität Wien

Gustavo Althoff
gualthoff@gmail.com
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Alice Leal
alice.leal@univie.ac.at
Universidade de Viena

Bibliography

- BAKER, Mona. 1995. „Corpora in Translation Studies. An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research.” *Target* 7 (2): 223-243.
- BASSNETT, Susan and Lefevere, André (eds.). 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- DELISLE, Jean and WOODSWORTH, Judith (eds.). 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- HERMANS, Theo (ed.). *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- HOLZ-MÄNTTÄRI, Justa. 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- REISS, Katharina and VERMEER, Hans J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- SNELL, Mary. 1972. *German-English Prose Translation*. München: Hueber.
- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary (ed.). 1986/1994². *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Francke.
- _____. 1988/1995². *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- _____. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies. New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- _____. 2007. “‘What’s in a name?’: On metalinguistic confusion in Translation Studies.” *Target* 19 (2), 313-325.
- _____. 2008. *Translationswissenschaft in Wendezeiten. Ausgewählte Beiträge zwischen 1989 und 2007*. (Ed. Mira Kadric and Jürgen Schopp). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- _____. 2010. „Is Translation Studies going Anglo-Saxon? Critical comments on the globalization of a discipline”. In: *Why Translation Studies Matters*, D. Gile, G. Hansen and N. Pokorn (eds.), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 97-103.
- STOLL, Karl-Heinz. 2000. „Zukunftsperspektiven der Translation.“ In: *Paradigmenwechsel in der Translation*, P.A. Schmitt (ed.) 235-264.
- VERMEER, Hans J. 1996. *Das Übersetzen im Mittelalter (13. und 14. Jahrhundert)*. Vol. 1. *Das arabisch-lateinische Mittelalter*. Heidelberg. TextConText.
- _____. 1996a. *Das Übersetzen im Mittelalter (13. und 14. Jahrhundert)*. Vol. 2. *Deutsch als Zielsprache*. Heidelberg. TextConText.
- WOLF, Michaela (ed.). 1997. *Übersetzungswissenschaft in Brasilien. Beiträge zum Status von “Original” und Übersetzung*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.