

## **Topic-Reading and writing style in translation**

The concept of style is a complex one, and there are many different views of its nature, several of which will be discussed in this chapter. But a prerequisite for any such discussion is a basic definition of the term. The role of style in translation is made even more complex by the fact that there are the styles of two texts, the source text and the target text, to take into account. And in each case, the style of the text can be seen in its relationship to the writer, as an expression of choice, or in its relationship to the reader, as something to be interpreted and thereby to achieve effects.

The translator is a reader of the source text, and so the effects of its style upon the translator need to be examined. Important issues to consider here are how style is read, how it achieves its effects upon the reader, and what its relationship to various factors in the creation of the source text is seen to be.

On the other hand, the translator writes a new text in translating, and so the style of the target text is an expression of the translator's choices. Some studies of translation consider how the style of the target text conforms to certain norms (of the genre, of the target language, or of the linguistic, literary or cultural system into which the target text fits).

Taking all this into account, we can thus consider style in translation from at least four potential viewpoints:

- i) the style of the source text as an expression of its author's choices
- ii) the style of the source text in its effects on the reader (and on the translator as reader)
- iii) the style of the target text as an expression of choices made by its author (who is the translator)
- iv) the style of the target text in its effects on the reader.

It is important that translation studies overall should not focus on either the style of the source text to the exclusion of the target text or vice versa, nor on the author of either text to the exclusion of its reader. But different types of study will focus on different aspects. The emphasis of the discussion in this book will be on points (ii) and (iii) above: the style of the source text as perceived by the translator and how it is conveyed or changed or to what extent it is or can be preserved in translation. This is because most discussion of style in translation has been concerned with the translation process, and the process necessarily most closely involves these two factors. Assumptions made about stylistic choices in the text,

(i) above, are largely seen in the light of how their effects are experienced and understood by the translator. But there is a further reason for this focus, and it has to do with the relationship between theory and practice. Most of the book's main concern, then, is with the translator and the translator's task, and encompasses the source-text author and the target-text reader to the extent that they impact upon this task.

### **Topic-Before stylistics: the spirit of a text**

- 1) What is meant by "the spirit of a text" in the context of translation?
- 2) How did early translation theories consider the role of style before the formal development of stylistics?
- 3) Why is it incorrect to label early translation theories as "stylistic approaches"?
- 4) How did structuralist linguistics contribute to the development of stylistics?

In the 1970s and 80s, functionalist theories of translation like the skopos theory of Reiß & Vermeer, which maintains that the translation process is determined by its purpose, were strongly influenced by Russian Formalism and Prague Structuralism. Structuralism was primarily a development in linguistics, concerned with identifying and classifying linguistic data in the greatest detail, but it had its parallels and influences in literary study, in the work of writers such as Roland Barthes and Jonathan Culler and later in the post-structuralist theory of critics such as the later Barthes, Hillis Miller and Derrida, who took up the structuralist arbitrariness of signifier and signified and explored the instability of meaning which results.

Though generative grammar, in its concern for the mind as a source of linguistic explanation, was very different from structuralist linguistics, both approaches have a common feature which they share with text-based literary criticism: an understanding that the formal features of language are important. In text-based criticism this was reflected in a focus on "the words on the page" of a literary text, to use a phrase made famous by I.A. Richards and, to a greater or lesser degree, on a separation of the actual visible, measurable features of language from such issues as history, background, and context in all but its most immediate senses. However, though we cannot equate stylistic views with linguistic views, nor linguistic with structuralist, nor structuralist with purely formalist views, the growing realization that language involves the mind and the mind is concerned with culture and context has not until recently had much effect within translation theory on views of the style of the source text.

Cognitive stylistics, through its concept of context as cognitive entity, involves a concern with social and cultural factors, it has been able to develop, in ways

relevant to translation, what might be seen to make up what Tabakowska calls the “human factor” in the study of language.

Some of these approaches will be considered in more detail later but for the moment it is enough to be aware that the current development of a stylistics which aims to embrace both social and cognitive factors is still underway, and that even the more formal, limited type of stylistics which preceded it did not develop until around the middle of last century. We cannot therefore expect to be able to trace the influence of stylistics proper on translation studies until recently.

Definitions of style will vary according to whether their authors wish to make links with rhetoric, with structuralist linguistics, with generative linguistics, or with any other subsequent development in linguistics or literary studies. But recent translation theory has not been concerned with the actual definition of style, any more than earlier views of translation were; the main stylistic issues have been to do with questions of relativity, universality, and literariness. This is because they relate intimately to the question of what is translatable.

### **Topic-Universals of style and creative transposition**

We have established thus far that stylistic approaches can look at different parts of the translation process, and that style itself can be seen to mean different things in relation to language, and therefore in its relation to translation. A third area about which there are very different views is the relationship of language, and specifically of style, to the universal and the particular.

Jakobson’s answer, in a 1959 article on translation, was that translation in a strict sense is not possible, at least for poetic texts, but “creative transposition” is possible because “cognitive experience” is universal, as are certain characteristics of poetry such as its concern with style and pattern. In focussing on the poetic function of language, Jakobson differed from the common structuralist view (e.g. Saussure 1959) that language is arbitrary. Poetic language was non-arbitrary, governed by its sound patterns, partially hermetic, and ambiguous, and thus functionally distinct not just from non-literary language but also from non-poetry.

Furthermore, if some types of universals can be shown to have a biological basis, there would be little point in denying them. Malmkjær, for example, points to work done in the late 1960s by researchers such as Berlin & Kay on colour, which suggests a universal set of concepts that vary in each particular language. Such work emphasizes the “commonality” of languages.

A view of universality based on biology was simply not available to Jakobson; his sense of common cognitive values was empirical, intuitive and perhaps ideological, just as a postmodernist emphasis on difference is all these things.

Jakobson's concern with the universal underlying the specific was not just a view of language and style, but also affected how he saw the similarity of literature to other genres, and the connections between different types of translation. If Jakobson's quest was for "The Magic of a Common Language", then that common language underlies also what he describes as different types of translation in his 1959 article. Here he famously distinguished intralingual translation (rewording in the same language), intersemiotic translation (such as a film based on a novel) and "translation proper", or interlingual translation, whereby an "entire message" is transposed into another language. Just as everything can be translated, so too different types of transposition, rewording or adaptation are forms of translation.

The strong universalizing tendency of structuralism, combined with its attention to linguistic detail, has been linked to close-reading criticism. But it would be simplistic, as I have suggested, to equate structuralism (or close-reading) with universalizing and poststructuralism and postmodernism with difference. All these approaches are concerned, to a greater or lesser extent, with both universalism and difference.

### **Topic-Contextual, pragmatic and cognitive aspects of style and translation**

1) How did early formalist approaches to stylistics, such as those by Jakobson and Riffaterre, limit their usefulness for translation studies?

2) In what ways has the integration of sociological, historical, and ideological aspects improved the study of style in translation?

3) How does cognitive stylistics bridge the gap between psychological, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic aspects of style in translation?

4) What are some challenges posed by cultural differences in translation, and how do cognitive and pragmatic approaches attempt to address them?

5) How does Critical Discourse Analysis contribute to our understanding of the ideological influences on literary translation?

The notion of context was not particularly well-developed in these early writers. This lack can be seen broadly to have four aspects:

- i) the sociological, historical and ideological aspects of the genesis of source and target text are largely ignored;

- ii) there is sometimes little consideration of psychological aspects of the production and interpretation of texts;
- iii) pragmatic aspects, that is, aspects which have to do with the way people speak and understand texts beyond their actual linguistically- determined structures, are not taken into account; and
- iv) there is little consideration of the role of the reader.

These are all problems for a study of style in general and especially for the study of style in translation. As I suggested above, there were some attempts even in the 1960s, but especially in the 1970s and 1980s, to broaden stylistics away from formalism to encompass sociological, historical, psychological and pragmatic aspects. And this has made stylistics much more attractive to translation studies. D'haen, comparing the two stylistics anthologies by Donald Freeman of 1970 and 1981, notes that the former “concentrates on style in the more narrow sense” whereas the later collection is concerned with “the functioning of literature in society”.

Stylistics with such sociolinguistic awareness can be seen as “the variety of discourse analysis dealing with literary discourse” where discourse is language used in context. Discourse, and therefore also literary discourse, is seen as “a social and political phenomenon”, and its effects are viewed within the context of “larger social patterns” which go beyond the micro-context of the text in question. For translation, this has meant an increasing concern with ways in which texts are “concretised and rewritten” .

The notion which links pragmatic aspects of stylistics with the socio- logical and cognitive aspects, and with the reader’s role, is “context”. Context can be defined as the psychological and social circumstances under which language is used; pragmatics focuses on how we interpret utterances in context , and thus could be defined as “the study of meaning beyond that which is encoded in the linguistic structures themselves” If semantics is the study of truth conditions, then pragmatics is non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning, and covers those aspects which depend on the reader’s inferences (as in relevance theory) as well as those which depend on the relationships between the text and its context, including its sociolinguistic and psychological content.

Cognitive stylistics can be said in general to have brought together the pragmatic concern with what goes beyond a text’s relation to an observable reality with a concern for context as a cognitive construct which takes in the social and historical aspects of the production and under- standing of texts. It is one of the assumptions

made throughout this book that the study of translation will need to consider all these factors, and that a cognitive stylistic approach seems the one most likely to make this possible.

### **Topic- Relativity and thinking for translating**

The consequences for translation of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, according to Hyde, are that, because it suggests that a text is intrinsically bound to be untranslatable, it emphasizes the source-target relationship and a view of the target text as inferior to the source text. However, says Hyde, such a view fails to take into account the relationship between source language and source text (and between target language and target text) which were so important for Jakobson, especially in literary texts. It is Hyde's view and here he is presumably drawing on the Russian Formalist notion of "making strange" – that literature is made up of devices which help circumvent the limitations of whatever particular way of seeing a language embodies, a notion similar to Lecerle's (1990) or Venuti's (1998) remainder. Hyde does not, then, deny that different languages embody different ways of thinking, but he sees this as, on the one hand, not a barrier to translation if pragmatic and contextual factors are taken into account and, on the other, not a problem for literature because literature by its very nature resists such limitation.

Throughout the recent decades of generative linguistics, with its emphasis on the universality of grammar, it has become common to dismiss the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis as leading to too great a relativity. For translation studies, it is easy to see why such a rejection might be welcome.

"Thinking for speaking", "thinking for translating" and "reading for translating" thus all suggest that language influences thought at least momentarily. These notions also suggest that human minds are flexible enough to change mode and to see the world from different points of view, and also to know that others are doing so. And they appear to avoid both a narrow interpretation of Sapir-Whorf relativism and too great an emphasis on universalism.

In fact, Venuti's description of a translated text stylistically defamiliarized not by an author's personal style but by heterogeneity and marginal uses of language is very close to Pilkington's description of the literary text itself as using "strange language, archaisms, 'phonetic roughening'". This suggests that a literary translation is, above all, consciously literary in that it is defamiliarized. Defamiliarization might thus serve not only to circumvent the differences between

languages as Hyde (1993) suggested, but also to make literary translation more literary than non-translated literature.

### **Topic-Translating literary and non-literary texts**

The distinction between literary and non-literary texts, however it is formulated, is crucial to translators and translation researchers for an understanding of the factors that influence translation. For literary texts, says Kohlmayer (1988:150), the translator cannot simply concentrate on the target language to the extent that functionalist theories such as Reiß & Vermeer (1984) suggest, because literary translations work by allowing readers to see the effects of the original, even if they do not experience them directly or in the same way. This must surely be true of literature in general: we do not, nowadays, throw down a Hardy novel in horror at the transgressing of convention, yet nevertheless we can see that contemporary audiences might have done so. This suggests that both translated literature and original literature do not depend for their effects wholly upon the expectations of a particular audience, and also that the contexts we create when reading are cognitive entities: they do not have to reflect our current situation or even what we have personally experienced.

However the style signals the specifically literary nature of a text, the distinction between literary and non-literary texts has consequences for the translator. These may vary from whether s/he will take on a particular commission, to whether a translation is evaluated as adequate, and even to the question of where postgraduate degrees in Translation Studies should be located in the structure of a particular university. For this book, one consequence of the question as to what constitutes a literary text is whether and to what extent the views of style here discussed can be applied to both literary and non-literary texts.

One way in which the difference between literary and non-literary translation can be seen is in terms of function. According to Nord (1997) it is possible to see literary translation as having a different skopos – or aim – from non-literary. This may take the form of an attempt to make the target text work as a literary text (what Nord calls “instrumental translation” 1997:5ff.), with the same openness as had the source text to various interactions and interpretations by the reader. Secondly, it is possible to say, as Gutt does (2000:130), that a literary translation has a closer link to the source text than non-literary, in that it preserves the style and not just the message; in this sense, a literary translation is “documentary” it documents the source text.

For the author of a non-literary text, for example an academic text such as this book, being open about one’s own position can be helpful in avoiding the suggestion that one is pretending to put across unadulterated facts. So let me state

clearly my own position as regards the distinction between literary and non-literary translation, as it affects decisions taken by the translator.

## **Topic-Reading, style and the inferred author**

As we saw in the previous chapter, studies of style in translation have looked at the role of style in the source text, the recreation of style in the target text, and, to a lesser extent, the analysis of target text style. The latter aspect will be taken up in section 3 of this chapter and section 3 of the next chapter. The first two aspects are of most direct relevance to the process of translating, and I will focus mainly on these because I want to emphasize that a translator's knowledge of analytical and theoretical work on translation can affect translation practice.

Current views recognize that Jakobson and early structuralist stylisticians as well as many early generative stylisticians had an overly formal approach based on a view of texts, and especially the details of their style, as encoding a message, which could be decoded and (in translation) reencoded. One major change resulting from the perceived inadequacy of the code model has been the increasing contextualization of stylistics, which views as less straightforward the link between the world, the text, and the minds of those involved in its creation and reading. According to Weber the view that "that there is no direct mapping between words and the world" is the basic premise of cognitive linguistics. Indeed, there cannot be a direct mapping if one accepts Sperber & Wilson's view that utterances do not directly encode but merely resemble thoughts. Because no such direct mapping exists, cognitive poetics involves thinking "about what we are doing when we read". In terms of Wales' definition of style as the perceived distinctive manner of expression, given at the start of this book, we need, then, to focus on the word "perceived". It is the reader's perception of style which matters. If this is so, then what both cognitive stylistics (or poetics, and its bordering discipline of cognitive linguistics) must be telling us about finding meaning in a text has at least these two aspects:

- i) meaning is not encoded in the text so it cannot be decoded but is constructed according to the cognitive context of the person reading, and while the context may contain shared, communal elements, there will also be individual ones; and further
- ii) the relationship between whatever meaning is constructed and the outside world is not, especially in literary texts, such that we can expect to measure the information gained from the text against the world and declare it true or false.

What these insights mean for the translation of style is to suggest that the process of reading a source text is not something which involves analysing all details of content and style until a meaning is got at and then stopped, and the (uncontroversial) meaning transferred through translation into another language (or medium, if it is intralingual translation).

But though the New Critics shared with the formalist critics the view that meaning resides in the text, they did not necessarily equate it with the meaning intended by the author. Beardsley, for example, states explicitly that knowledge of an author's intentions will not help the reader or critic to interpret a text; the belief that it will is the "intentional fallacy". It is not what the author intended, but what a text actually says, that makes interpretation possible. The author's choices which underlie style thus become less important: the translator must pay close attention to the style itself and it will reveal the meaning to be transferred into the target language.

A writer like Fish to some extent opposes both these views: it is the reader who creates the interpretation; however, the reader always tries "to discern and therefore to realize .... an author's intention". But "intention" is here not to be understood in a narrow sense; it is simply a recognition that readers "are dealing with intentional beings" when they read a text. This does not, in Fish's view, lead to a notion of concreteness or stability of meaning; but there is a "community" (ibid.) of readers who will agree to some extent. This suggests that a translator must be aware of such commonality of interpretation, a view endorsed by Snell-Hornby, who emphasizes the role of "group convention", particularly in specialized texts.

In translation it makes sense to speak of an inferred author. If there is a point in translating, it must be to communicate a source text, in the broadest sense, in another language and situation. Translators thus, as I have said elsewhere, have no choice but to make such assumptions or inferences about what the author meant, if translation is to be possible. Though there is a sense in which, especially for a critically sophisticated reader, it does not "matter who is speaking", it does matter if the reader is also a translator, because who is speaking will influence both initial decisions to translate and, in the act of translation, decisions on how to treat the style of the text.

## **Topic-Implication, relevance and minimax**

But meaning in its entirety is by nature underdetermined by semantics, and it is pragmatics, rather than semantics, which helps interpret whatever the explicatures do not say. Such further interpretation is by inference rather than decoding, and depends upon implicatures. There is an important difference between implications and implicatures. Implication is in the text, but an implicature is attributed to a speaker: it is taken to involve an intention to suggest something. Relevance Theory thus takes for granted that we assume there is a speaker who has intentions. But much of the work done in Relevance Theory and other cognitive pragmatic views of translation sees the forces exerted by the text in less negative terms than are suggested by talking of manipulation. Gutt, for example, speaks of “communicative clues”, that is, clues to the communicative intention of the speaker, provided by stylistic features. Such clues might also indicate text-type or the cognitive state embodied in the text.

These clues lie in the style because style is how rather than what is said and all theories of (literary) meaning agree that “linguistic signs never coincide with intended or interpreted meanings”. But here we come up against the notion of “intention” again. Who is the agent of “intended” in the statement quoted above? The Relevance Theory answer is that the gap between the actual utterances in a text and the thought behind it “is filled by the hearer’s inferential recognition of speaker’s intention, guided by contextual clues”. In this sense the intended and interpreted meanings are the same. This notion of speaker’s intention does not need to be “predicated on an unchanging authorial intent”, because the author is inferred by the reader to fit the latter’s own context. MacKenzie points to the affinities between this view and Schleiermacher’s notion of the translator’s reconstruction of authorial intention. In Carston’s view, such pragmatic inferencing is a direct result of the speaker’s or writer’s decision to leave the text open to inferences. Hatim stresses how important it is that this typical quality of literary texts should be preserved in literary translation. The notion of inferencing accords well with the translator’s sense that what a translation produces is a text which fuses the original author with the author of the translation, a sense expressed by Scott when he wonders what “Baudelaire sounds like in my voice”.

If meanings are thus open, then to some extent every reading is potentially a misreading. But this is not a particular problem for Relevance Theory as it has no reason to distinguish between readings and misreadings. For translation, a Relevance-Theory view will not need to distinguish between correct and incorrect translations, and it will not need to spend time deciding what is meant by equivalence: equivalence is what the translator thinks it is.

The notion of relevance as maximization is thus not new; and the notion of optimal relevance is only interesting for non-literary translation. Sperber & Wilson's view that stylistic and poetic effects are achieved by the reader working out what can be done with weak implicature has much in common with Ingarden's notion of realization or Iser's notion of gap-filling. But, importantly, the "wider the range of potential implicatures" the more poetic the text. In the following section we will look at what this has meant in concrete terms for translators and what it could potentially mean.

## **Topic-Relevance Theory and translating for relevance**

Gutt, first published in 1991, is the book most translation theorists associate with the application of Relevance Theory to translation. Gutt's aims were laudable: to show that we can explain (rather than merely classify and describe) the facts of translation without the need for a special translation theory, focussing on translation as communication. Like all good theories, that put forward in Gutt's book aims not to drive but to explain its subject. Thus Gutt said, quite rightly, in a recent contribution to the Relevance-Theory email list, that "I do not advocate any particular translation approach". But Gutt's book is both dense and a little disorderly; it is sometimes difficult to make out a clear line of argument. Gutt made a number of suggestions about how translation could be explained using Relevance Theory. The most important of these are:

- i) translation, as communication, works under the assumption of relevance (that what the translator intends to communicate to the audience is relevant enough to them to make processing it worthwhile);
- ii) a translated text is an instance of interpretive, as opposed to descriptive, use (the translator is saying what someone else meant);
- iii) texts in which the way of saying – the style – plays an important role require direct translation, as opposed to indirect translation, which, like indirect quotation, just gives the substance.

Meister's name is not actually there, but, for this translator, is implicated. The translator can exercise the freedom to include it or not, or include some other clue to the cognitive state the poem is seen to suggest. It will take a certain amount of reading and re-reading to see 'Meister' in 'my stars'. But this is true of the original, too, because it is the way poetry works: stylistic features demand engagement with the text.

As Erkazanci (unpublished) points out, both domesticating and foreignizing translation practices could in fact be seen as instances of direct translation, because both render the style of a text in one way (to fit target expectations) or another (to violate target expectations), but in neither case is style ignored.

As Sperber & Wilson make clear, not all interpretations of a text are available to all readers in all contexts. Assuming that the text will work subject to relevance (not because the author obeys the relevance constraint consciously but simply because this is the way communication works) then the more literary the text is (in the sense given in 1.6, of being a text whose style carries much of the meaning), the more readers will look for maximal relevance, as opposed to the “optimal relevance” of non-literary communication situations.

So what is the reward of reading for maximum relevance? Several writers have defined it as “cognitive gain”. It is important to realize that “cognitive” is not used here in the sense in which it is used by Iser, to contrast with what is apprehensible by “the human senses”.

As the example from R.S. Thomas given in the previous section suggests, Relevance Theory would not bemoan the impossibility of locating definite meaning, but would celebrate it. In this particular case, it is linked directly to the need for the reader to explore the religious and philosophical possibilities the poem gives rise to.

A translator, on attempting to translate a text, will make a distinction (whether in the terms favoured by Katz or Dowling or Gutt does not matter) between what the words mean in a basic (lexical-semantic) sense, on the one hand (the meaning of “cloud” as a noun and as a verb), and what they implicate (for example in the ambiguous structure “mind clouds”) on the other.

Yet the fact that these are the “weakly implied” meanings, the gaps which, as a literary text, these lines invite me to fill, means that the other side of the difficulty is that I could in fact proceed to do a translation based on a gloss without any further knowledge of the source text than that gives. I would simply have more gaps to fill and fewer clues and guidelines to shape the process. In fact, this is what frequently happens, when translators translate out of languages they do not speak. It is how Hughes himself produced the poem ‘The Prophet’, a translation of Pushkin’s poem. It is also the way we judge translation, especially when we cannot fully appreciate the nuances of the source text. In these cases, the easy part to judge is primary or utterance meaning, and this is frequently the basis for evaluations of translation, especially within a language-learning situation or in reviews. Similarly, the straightforward part of a translator’s task (and a machine could do it) is the primary meaning. The interesting part, the real translation, is

those second-order meanings, the translator's meanings which reside largely in the style, and take on particular importance for the act of literary translation. If the text were constructed in such a way as to encourage a "maxmax" rather than "minimax" reading, then it might well fail in its object.

## **Topic-Style and choice**

The reader's view of style as "motivated choice" has, as we saw in the previous chapter, a parallel for the translator: she assumes that stylistic features in the source text reflect the inferred author's choices. What this assumption then means in practice for the actual translation may differ between translators and according to situation, translation aims, and approach. For functionally-orientated views such as Reiß, the function of the source text is what decides the sort of translation required for the target text, and this function, or intention, is "verbalized by the author in his text" .

Style, then, is seen in most stylistic approaches to texts as a question of (sometimes unconscious) choice. But it is not just choice of words or structures or sounds. According to Fowler, the concept of style goes far beyond this: it includes language in and outside literature, and "non-linguistic communication and other behaviour" and is therefore "unusable as a technical term". As will have become clear, this is not the view taken in this book. "Style" has indeed many areas of application, but style in language refers to those aspects of language assumed by the hearer, reader or translator, and indeed by the speaker, original writer, or writer of translations, to be the result of choice.

Fowler was right, though, in suggesting that style is not just a question of different ways of saying the same thing: stylistic choices "reflect a speaker's (subjective) choice of a given conceptualization", and thus are always in this sense a reflection of different content rather than just different expression. The concept of choice has a moral inflection: philosopher Berel Lang speaks of "moral style", explaining how good and evil are good and evil by virtue of a "choice among alternatives, a systematic series of choices" . This broader, moral sense of style as reflection of mind and character is also found in linguistic views which see style, through its reflections of choice, as an indication of personality. Because stylistic choice is optional, the style "tells us something about the person who uses the expression".

## **Topic-Clues, games and decisions**

It might be helpful at this point just to summarize some of the distinctions between different types of translation which we have met in the previous section and to try to see how they relate to one another, and to style, even at the risk of oversimplifying the ideas behind them. Firstly, there is the distinction made by Nida & Taber, who spoke of formal correspondence to a source text and dynamic equivalence to its function, thus in both cases focussing on the relation of target text to source text. House distinguishes overt translation from covert. Reiß & Vermeer contrast intertextual coherence between source text and target text, on the one hand, with the necessary intratextual coherence of the target text, on the other. Nord speaks of documentary translation, which shows us the source text more clearly, and instrumental, which functions as communication between source-text author and target-text reader. None of these distinctions is exactly the same as any of the others because they focus to varying degrees on function and form and on the source text or the target text. And all of these distinctions are best seen as scalar rather than polar opposites: a translation may be more covert than another or have greater formal equivalence, but few translations will be wholly one thing or the other.

Nord's distinction is based on function, Gutt's on the degree and manner of resemblance, but both Nord and Gutt, like House, are suggesting that some translations aim to give their readers a clearer picture of what was happening in the original than do others. None of these writers suggest that it is actual linguistic resemblance, or formal equivalence, as in the first example from Dove given above, which is meant. In fact, by suggesting that it is not the "intrinsic value" of stylistic features which is preserved, Gutt is suggesting that what direct translation needs to recreate is the relationship between features of style as "communicative clues" and the meanings to which these clues point. This is why even direct translation remains an example of interpretive use: it preserves what the stylistic features mean in the overall context of the text, rather than merely their formal shape. In this sense one can argue, as I did at the end of the previous section, that a documentary translation will be instrumental whenever it preserves relationships between meanings and the potential for effects, rather than forms.

## **Topic-Recreated choices in translation**

Views which focus most clearly on the style of the target text in its own right are often found within theories of translation reception such as have been formulated especially in the framework of polysystem theory. Toury, for example, discusses the norms governing Avraham Shlonsky's Hebrew translation of Hamlet. Toury

says that, in the various revisions Shlonsky made, the source text played only “a marginal role”. The sorts of constraint the translator observed include prosodic (he wrote in iambic hexameter), pragmatic (he complied with “contemporary convention” in his use of “poetic” words), and theatrical (he wrote a “script suitable for declamation”).

Venuti is careful to point out that foreignizing, which he traces from Schleiermacher and the German Romantic tradition, is not merely mimetic of the source text. It does not exhaust itself in “direct” strategies such as Vinay & Darbelnet discuss, like “calque”, a strategy “whereby a language borrows an expression form of another” or “oblique” strategies such as using the equivalent form of an onomatopoeic animal noise.

Gutt makes a similar point when he states that even in a direct translation it is close “interpretive resemblance” that is aimed at, and not “the reproduction of words, linguistic constructions or textual features” thus Gutt’s direct translation is different from Vinay & Darbelnet’s. But where Gutt’s view is still essentially mimetic, albeit based on a mimeticism in which translation echoes the relationship between style and what it implies, implicates or is a clue to, Venuti’s foreignizing has a virtually non-mimetic view of style: a translated text is foreignizing when it proclaims itself a translation by its unfamiliar use of language. The converse, a domesticating translation, aims not to tax the reader by unfamiliarity.

The terms “foreignizing” and “domesticating” are thus best used to describe a particular translation strategy, or the potential effects on readers. However, this is not to say that foreignizing is never mimetic. Both the “side” example and the example of “coffins clapping shut” from Dove in 3.1 shows that there LV often a strong tendency, perhaps sometimes unconscious, on the part of the translator, to make stylistic choices which echo the original, or even, in the Holzman case, a potential original.

## **Topic-The cognitive turn in stylistics and translation studies**

If one extends these questions to include translation studies, the value of cognitive approaches might be expected to lie in their potential to help us understand issues about literary comprehension, universality, and the difference between literary and non-literary texts. Most recent approaches within cognitive stylistics and cognitive literary studies have been concerned to show that “everyday language and literary language are not separate domains”, that literary meaning far from being “parasitic on core semantics”, reflects central features of the way we think,

and that therefore there is no justification for studying a posited “literary mind” separate from other aspects of mind. Emmot, however, sounds a note of caution: she suggests that an approach grounded in cognitive linguistics might be “limited by its origins since it is created to solve highly specific philosophical and linguistic problems” and works on appropriate sample sentences, thus not giving the full picture of how literary texts work.

This question of the difference between literary and non-literary texts has always been central for translation studies and the main focus of the difference is style, as can be seen from discussions in Gutt (2000) about translation and relevance, in Nord (1997) about the skopos of literary texts or in Newmark (1995) about practical questions of translating. So cognitive approaches are attractive not least because they promise help in providing insights into the nature and effects of the difference.

Cognitive stylistic approaches, then, are able to explore “theories that relate linguistic choices to cognitive structures and processes”, and in so doing are also able to explain cognitive insights which in the work of early stylisticians such as Jakobson (e.g. 1960) or Reader-Response theorists such as Iser, or critical linguists such as Fowler, remained rather vague speculation. With their basis in “our biological circumstances” they also offer important possibilities for the study of universals and of our “common pool of basic human experience” across languages and cultures. Sometimes, cognitive linguistics and stylistics could be seen as antagonistic to relativity because they stress what is biologically determined and therefore universal. In this, they may be open to some of Venuti’s criticisms that linguistic approaches sideline difference. But in fact the cognitive stylistic view of context as a cognitive entity encompassing knowledge about text-types, institutions, social roles and settings relies upon the interplay of the individual, the cultural and the universal. We know that environment shapes the brain, and this is likely to be true of all experience. For Tabakowska it is exactly this meeting of biological sameness and cultural difference that is especially important for a cognitive approach to translation.

And above all, what Verdonk (1999:295) calls the “passivity of the reader” in linguistic, stylistic and critical approaches to literature before Fish, and which made such earlier approaches rather uninteresting for translation, has, with the development of cognitive stylistics, been irrevocably shown to be a myth. The translator can now be shown to be an active participant in the reading of the source text.

It is not my intention to discuss these issues in order but I shall refer to them as they arise in the course of this chapter in an attempt to demonstrate how a

cognitive view of style in its various aspects might help explain what translators find in the text and what they do with what they find.

## **Topic-Translating the mind in the text**

The notion of mind as that which mediates between the world and the text has always been important both for stylistics and translation studies, and has been one of the aspects considered to a greater or lesser extent whenever style has been taken into account in translation. But there is much in the mind of a writer which remains implicit and the translator needs to pay attention to such implicit meanings. Schleiermacher's view is that translation involves either a movement of the reader towards the writer, or of the writer towards the reader). It is significant that the meeting is of the author, and not the text, with the reader, a view also held by Spitzer, who said that style "reveals the soul of the author".

It is important to remember at this point that, at least since Wimsatt & Beardsley and other New Critics rejected the emphasis on authorial intention, there has been a realization that we cannot identify the mind in (or behind) the text unequivocally with that of the author. As point above suggests, the translator might reconstruct an authorial voice, but still be aware that it LV a reconstruction and that it is not identical with the real author's voice.

Translated literature in particular could thus be seen to change the mind in three ways:

- i) by acquainting us with thoughts or feelings we had not experienced, or reflected on, or known to exist;
- ii) by showing us that other people experience them;
- iii) by allowing us to experience those thoughts or feelings for ourselves.

In the von Törne example above, we learn the salutary lesson that, however much ambiguities might be seen as arising from the structure of the German language (which allows gaps such as in the example above), we, too, can experience a similarly ambiguous state of mind.

If the features we have looked at so far in this section – gaps in the text, weak implicatures, the characteristic of fitting many different contexts, conveying ideologies, attitudes and feelings – are all typical of literary texts, then translations will need to make sure that none of these characteristics gets lost in the translation. All of them have the effect of demanding a greater involvement on the part of the

reader than one would usually expect in a non-literary text. Unlike von Törne's poem, an actual left-wing newspaper report of the Nazi murderers would probably have supplied the subjunctive auxiliary, thus indicating a refusal on the newspaper's part to believe their ignorance. An extreme right-wing paper might have used an indicative to endorse it. And so on. One prerequisite for the survival of such possibilities in the translation is the recognition of subtle stylistic features such as ambiguity, contrasts, change of perspective, by the translator.

But not only general knowledge of the world can be universal; so can what Kiparsky (1987) calls "categories of literariness" or what I described at the end of Chapter 1 as aspects of style, such as metaphor or ambiguity. If these are not arbitrary but are psychological givens, it is necessary to consider, in looking at their translation, both the universal basis and what is specific to a language, culture, author, or text. The next four sections examine four such aspects of the style of texts and the sort of problems they pose for translation.

## **Topic-Ambiguity and textual gaps**

Early writers on translation such as Tytler in 1790, regarding ambiguity as a stylistic fault, a view which derives from Plato, saw it as the translator's job to resolve it. This sense of ambiguity as failure is also implicit in a book by Olson, which describes how problems of interpretation arise from the inadequacies of written language, including its compression and linearity which mean it will always give rise to ambiguities. German, because of its relatively small vocabulary and productive morphology, is particularly good at providing ambiguous words which signal complex states of mind.

Ambiguity may be removed intentionally in literary translation, because it is seen as a fault, or its implicatures may be missed. But in non-literary texts such as newspaper and magazine articles, many instances of ambiguity are disambiguated in context.

Though the context makes it clear that the woman's partner now means the word in this second sense, nevertheless, the possibility of its literal meaning, once foregrounded in the advertisement, could be expected to remain in the consciousness of female viewers, prompting them to buy the product. This means that the translation of an advert like this must take into account at least the following factors:

- i) the two meanings suggested by the original wording
- ii) the meaning which becomes dominant in each disambiguating context

- iii) the context itself: it is the slimming product which plays the decisive role in changing the first to the second meaning
- iv) the sense of oscillation between two possible states (expressed by “gorđa”) which the product is seen to stabilize.

Ambiguity in a text may be subtle, as in the example of the missing auxiliary in the von Törne poem, or it may be very striking, as in the Kaschnitz poem, which so obviously stops mid-sentence. In the latter case it draws attention to itself and is an instance of what is usually considered as ‘foregrounding’. This is the topic of the next section. Like foregrounding, ambiguity is one of many textual features which seem to indicate the nature of a text. Lexical ambiguity is typical of headlines, whereas open-ended structural ambiguity of the type just given is much more likely to occur in poems, where it demands the involvement of the reader to a greater extent.

### **Topic-Foregrounding, salience and visibility**

Before Relevance Theory, the notion of “communicative clue” was not used, but the idea was there. Riffaterre, for example, spoke of “stylistic devices” by which the reader was “guided ... to the essentials”.

For writers like Mukařovský and Jakobson, the foregrounded language of poetry distinguished it from non-poetic language. However, as van Peer indicates, it is difficult to maintain such a distinction in view of the fact that non-poetic language (for example in advertisements) clearly also uses language that draws attention to itself. For Furniss & Bath it is a particular type of foregrounding – the use of lines – that helps alert readers to the fact that a poem LV a poem and therefore demands a particular sort of reading. Thus a headline in a newspaper not only serves to draw attention to itself by violating grammar, in that it might miss out articles and pronouns, but also tells the reader to embark upon a search for disambiguation, as outlined in the previous section.

It is thus possible to see repetition as a particularly strong case of foregrounding. Though Sperber & Wilson say processing of patterns requires little cognitive effort, it is more likely that they merely shift the focus of effort. In the above example, the very fact that the structure of the first line of the hymn is repeated means we do not have to try very hard to understand the following parallel structures; instead, attention is focussed on the differences, that is, upon the different aspects in which one can do the impossible.

As the example from the hymn translated above show, not all languages have equal possibilities for repetition, or indeed for other types of foregrounding: the Polish example is especially hard to replicate in English. But the notion of universality, in spite of protests by Venuti that it can work towards the suppressing of otherness, is important, because it suggests that a concept such as foregrounding as a reflection of attention to salience is a universal characteristic of animate beings, and that literature exploits this. And although it is often difficult to explain in what sense something in a text is striking, studies like those by van Peer show a high degree of agreement among readers of literary texts as to what elements are foregrounded.

For a translator, such findings suggest that there are at least some textual features which the translator can feel confident will be noticeable to all readers, and so go some way towards justifying the inferences the translator makes and alleviating some of the inevitable sense of ignorance.

### **Topic-Metaphor, mind and translation**

Although Levin's view shows the beginnings of cognitive concerns, it is not in a position to address two important aspects which have been added to stylistics and translation studies respectively in recent years. The first is the question of what actually happens in the mind, the second is the issue of cultural difference, and they are related to the extent that what happens in the mind is determined by both universal features of the brain and cultural influences.

Some metaphors, however, appear to compare two basic domains, rather than conceptualizing an abstract domain in more concrete terms; these are what Crisp calls "image metaphors"; his example is Ezra Pound's description of faces in a crowd as petals on a wet, black bough. Much literary metaphor would seem to be of this type: Hughes' "moors / are a stage / for the performance of heaven" or a tomcat "like a bundle of old rope and iron" both compare something concrete to something else concrete. Literary metaphor, especially if of the image metaphor type, thus differs quite substantially from non-literary. Though most recent studies suggest this difference is not a cognitive one, this was not the view taken in Boase-Beier (1987) or that suggested by Steen, who argues that the way we read literature means that literary metaphors are processed differently; they are processed in keeping with the "maximal subjective involvement [of] the reader" (1994:241). Thus, for example, a comparison of a cat with a bundle of rope and iron will lead each reader to imagine a different bundle of rope and iron, in keeping with, and adding to, her or his mental schemata.

In general, cognitive views should be able to tell us something about the following three areas which might be seen to play a role in translating metaphor:

- i) universality versus particularity in metaphor
- ii) whether different linguistic types of metaphor should or can be or are translated in different ways
- iii) whether metaphor is a purely linguistic or even an “ornamental” figure or whether it constitutes thought on a much deeper level, and how such a distinction might affect translation.

However, though studies of the cognitive basis of metaphor such as Johnson or Gibbs do speak of how cognition is influenced by culture, it is a sort of universal human culture, in keeping with the aim of showing metaphorical thinking as ultimately biologically determined.

The three issues I gave above as useful questions one might pose when applying cognitive metaphor theory to translation are not entirely separate. The question as to its cognitive nature is tied to questions of universality, as we have just seen. But notions such as specificity and universality, and even linguistic and cognitive, are not static in their applicability, which may well vary over time. Thus Millán (1997) illustrates how the dead metaphor of the thread of a conversation, common in both English and Spanish, was very much alive at the time Cervantes was writing, and this led to all manner of permutations involving sewing, unstitching and unravelling. It is important for translators to see such questions as affected by their historical context.

## **Topic- Iconicity, mimesis and diagesis**

In cognitive approaches, iconicity as a figure of style or a characteristic of language can be seen as simply the expression of an existing link between perception and language. Because “cognitivists expect the relationship between forms and meanings to exhibit a higher degree of iconicity than do traditional models”, cognitive linguistics might be seen to argue against both the arbitrariness of structuralism taken as given by most generative grammarians, and the view common in generative grammar that there is a separate language module in the mind. However, it is worth pointing out that lack of arbitrariness, while it might certainly suggest a link between language and other aspects of cognition, is in fact very much in keeping with the concern of most generative grammar to understand the biological basis of language and does not SHU VH say anything

about the likelihood or otherwise of a separate language module (which, if it exists, will interact with others).

But we should be wary of drawing such conclusions. Are we to say, for example, that the metaphorical use of concepts like VXQ or PRRQ by a poet like William Blake, which amount to a complex symbolic system, are no different in essence from his use of iconic syntax in a poem like 'Ah! Sun-flower'? Does this mean that we can ignore iconic syntax and translate it with metaphor? We probably do not yet know enough about how stylistic devices are perceived by readers to conclude that we can.

Fischer & Nänny argue that it can take the place of arbitrariness wherever the latter is not recognized. Typical examples can be found in children's use of words such as onomatopoeic animal names where they do not know the lexicalized one.

However, the observation that iconicity exists outside of literature is not in itself evidence that literary iconicity is the same as non-literary. At the very least, it seems that the sort of unity of form and meaning mentioned by so many writers from Aristotle to Pope to Ross as specific to literature cannot be merely imagined. According to Fónagy, one reason for its "more prominent role" in literature and especially poetry is that it is an additional resource needed to convey "mental contents of high complexity". Some types of poetry, such as the futurist poetry of writers like Blok and Mayakovsky which Jakobson examined (1987:300ff.), with its iconic use of lay-out and typography, use more iconicity than others. And Fischer & Nänny feel that not only different text types but, even more significantly for translation, different languages, may vary in the degree of iconicity they use. They mention that Pound saw Chinese as having a closer link with "the operations of nature" than a less iconic, more arbitrary language.

What these differences suggest is that, for example, the translation of futurist poetry into prose would be fraught with difficulties and require compensation, and intersemiotic translation of the "book of the film" type may well result in a novel which seems very flat if it does not compensate for the high level of iconicity possible in a film. Translation from Chinese might also need to find additional means to express the iconicity inherent in its original.

## **Topic-Cognitive stylistics and the pretence of translation**

Understanding any act of communication involves a certain degree of pretence about having achieved such certainty. When we respond to a colleague's statement that it is too hot by opening a window, or a friend's remark that it is late by going home, we are making an assumption that we know what is meant. The colleague could be suggesting that he has a high temperature and needs to see a doctor, or merely making an observation. The friend could be suggesting we decide an important issue quickly, or remarking that the evenings are getting longer. We arrive at the meaning for which we have most evidence and act upon it, while being aware, if we think about it, that there are other possible interpretations. We are used to the fact that in some situations statements are more difficult to interpret than in others; absence of body language in an email can make us especially careful to question the writer as to her or his intentions.

In this sense, the answers to the first three questions I asked at the end of Section 1 of this chapter – what is beyond the text, how we as translators get to it and how we recreate it in translation – all depend upon our view of what is still relatively unknown: the mind. While it might seem risky to stake so much on what we cannot see, it should be recalled that style has always, since the earliest discussions of Aristotle, been seen as a manifestation of mental processes or properties, or mental states. There is no other way to explain that style represents choice.

But at the same time as we attribute a great deal of importance to the mind in a literary text we are also aware that we cannot be certain of having discovered its characteristics.

## **Topic-Elements of a stylistic approach to translation**

In discussing both reading of the source text for translation and reading of the target text as a translation, the underlying assumption is that a stylistically-aware analysis can help explain how readings are arrived at more easily than if analysis is impressionistic. This view of stylistic analysis does not of itself suggest it is an advantage for an actual translator to read the source text in this way; it merely suggests that stylistic awareness makes it easier to present and discuss examples.

- i) The textual meaning of the source text is more than just the words on the page because it is dependent on context. This is a view shared by Marxist criticism (e.g. Eagleton 1986), and pragmatic linguistics (Sperber & Wilson 1995), by contextualized stylistics (Verdonk 2002) and by cognitive approaches to

translation (Tabakowska 1993). Much of what goes beyond the immediate and obvious meaning of lexis and syntax of the source text is in its style. The attitude expressed in the text is in its style (Sperber & Wilson 1995), the basis for reader engagement is in its style (Pilkington 1996), the expression of cognitive state is in its style (mind style, as Fowler 1977a). Therefore it is highly important for a translator to be as stylistically aware as possible, and to use the style as the basis and focal point for a translation.

- ii) Reading is a cognitive process; the translator as reader of the source text plays an active role in constructing a reading, which involves the construction and modification of contexts. This assumption is based on Reader-Response Theory (Iser 1979), Relevance Theory (Gutt 2000) and many other pragmatic approaches to literature (Lecerle 1990), language (Sperber & Wilson 1995), and translation (Diaz-Diocaretz 1985). This applies equally to the reader of the target text.
- iii) The translator can convey some of the richness and the openness to reader involvement of the source text if it is borne in mind that the style represents (author's, narrator's, character's) choices (Thornborough & Wareing 1998). This is not to say that these choices represent different ways of saying the same thing but different ways of saying which reflect different ways of seeing; what is said also varies according to how it is said. One of the ways such choices are reflected

### **Topic-Using style to translate mind**

Literary translation can be seen as the translation of style because it is the style of a text which allows the text to function as literature. One way of putting this is to say that the style, as the direct reflection of the author's choices, carries the speaker's meaning, both conscious and unconscious, and so the translation of a literary text is the translation of a particular cognitive state as it has become embodied in the text. It is in this sense that a translation can, as Shelley put it in 1840 "spring again from its seed" .

This in turn has led me to translate HQW" the first time with "lost" and the second time with "free", both words which in themselves can suggest either a positive escape or a removal. It has further led to combining the idiom "pull yourself together" with "into a ball", which is what a hedgehog does to hide. And it has prompted the insertion of "my" in stanza 3 to suggest both the poet's name Meister ("my stars") and to draw attention to the change from the externalizing, second-person address of the second stanza to the internalized, first-person description of the final one. It links the poet's name with the word "lifeless", suggesting a preoccupation with death.

But it is not only in literary texts that style can be seen as indicative of mental attitude or belief. As we saw in 4.1, this especially applies to journalism. A German magazine text about a condition which supposedly affects half a percent of the German population (RFXV, 14 May 2005) clearly shows the attitude of its author, Juliane Lutz, that this is a serious illness. Words and phrases such as “geradezu besessen” (completely obsessed), “groteske Schicksale” (grotesque fates), “leiden” (suffer), “tragisch” (tragic), “schwere, mitunter sogar lebensbedrohliche Mangelerscheinungen” (serious and sometimes even fatal deficiencies), “katastrophal” (catastrophic), indicate the

What this discussion would appear to suggest is that the writing of an instrumental translation demands that we see the style as indicating the attitude of the original writer; this may in fact be a major component of the meaning of the text.

### **Topic-Ambiguous translation**

However, more thought will show that this is not in fact a cognitive difference, or at least not an absolute one: in English we can say “when the war ends, if it ever does” or “if and when the war comes to an end” though neither of these would work well in the compressed form of a poem like this one. The only thing a translator could do, if s/he does not wish to translate the German hopeful uncertainty into either clear doubt or certain hope, is to change the structure somewhat and use an expression like: “The war might end / at the end of time / and we’ll go for a walk” and, further on “It could happen / it could be good”. In fact, Oser’s translation works perfectly well as an English poem. But because it changes the uncertainty of the original, we could consider it not to be a translation if a translation’s task is to preserve the interactive nature of the original. We could also argue that it does not allow the reader to experience a state of hopeful uncertainty, which is, at least in one possible interpretation, exactly what the title itself suggests.

In Reader-Response and Relevance-Theory terms – point (iii) above – this means that Holocaust writing in particular, in common with other types of writing which aim to bear witness, makes the reader decide how to deal with gaps, how to articulate the unspoken. The consequence of (iv) is that a translation must not inadvertently reduce the orders of intentionality or it runs the risk of both misrepresenting a confused or at least stretched state of mind and of failing to similarly stretch its reader.

There is no verb here; the reader can substitute on the one hand ‘are’ or ‘were’, on the other ‘are alleged to be’, ‘say they are’, ‘believe themselves’ and so on, each inserted verb expressing one of two possibilities: they were ignorant or they were

not. The reader of the paper must fill the gap and so must the reader of the poem, but both possibilities are equal, so the reader (of the paper and of the poem) can or must entertain both at once, just as the butchers themselves kept a split mind. There is a further ambiguity of tense, for the missing auxiliary in German, besides being subjunctive or indicative, can also be past or present: perhaps they were ignorant but are not now.

### **Topic-Metaphorical thought translated**

The metaphor is made more complex by the fact that white and black are seen to be relative, not absolute, qualities, influenced by perception: white is coloured in the sun, white is black at night.

The cognitive stylistic approach to metaphor sees metaphor as cognitive rather than linguistic. The emphasis in understanding the metaphor lies less with whether a particular instance is a simile or an instance of metaphor proper and more with the cognitive metaphors upon which the linguistic realizations are based. But how does this perception of the metaphors as cognitive rather than A second point is that metaphor, especially in literary texts, also frequently serves to create allegory.

Conceptual metaphor reflects, and can influence, the way we pursue our thinking. This is especially true of metaphors in scientific texts for the mind itself. If the mind is seen as a sponge, different theories will be explored and different types of tests developed than will be the case if it is seen as a Swiss army knife. So the metaphor used cannot be replaced in translation with something in the target culture which has different characteristics. Of course, this is highly unlikely to happen in a text discussing models of the mind: here the type of model is of such obvious importance that it would not be changed by a translator.

### **Topic-Keeping the echo: translating for iconicity**

We know that iconicity is a feature of all natural languages (Anderson 1998) though the degree to which different structures can be considered iconic is a source of controversy. But what this fact suggests for a translation of Blake's poem into another language is that, firstly, it may be better not to keep the [bl] sound itself, for it may have different connotations in other languages, and also, secondly, that simply finding a set of sounds used in appropriate words in the target language will not necessarily work if there is no sense that meaning can be attributed to these particular sounds. A translation must therefore take into account not just the patterns in this particular text, but all further instances within the

language and culture of the target text to which the pattern will allow access. Thus a careful translation involves extracting some common core of meaning from the English words, which I have here described rather loosely as “unpleasant staining”, and finding a sound in the other language which also occurs in many words not in the poem and might have similar associations.

Recent studies of the creative aspects of translation (for example, the articles in Boase-Beier & Holman 1999 or Perteghella & Loffredo 2006) suggest that the difference between original writing and translation is in some respects not clear-cut. All writing, says Barnstone, is translation. Yet some translators clearly feel that the two types of writing are, in Willard Trask’s words “entirely different”. Michael Hamburger, trying to express this difference says it is the difference “between playing music and composing music”