Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

English Dissertations | Department of English

7-16-2012

The Art of Future Discourse: Rhetoric, Translation and an Interdisciplinary Pedagogy for Transglobal Literacy

Estefania Olid-Pena

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_diss

Recommended Citation
Olid-Pena, Estefania, "The Art of Future Discourse: Rhetoric, Translation and an Interdisciplinary Pedagogy for Transglobal Literacy." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2012.
http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_diss/94

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

THE ART OF FUTURE DISCOURSE: RHETORIC, TRANSLATION AND AN INTERDISCIPLINARY PEDAGOGY FOR *TRANSGLOBAL LITERACY*

by

ESTEFANÍA OLID-PEÑA

Under the Direction of Beth Burmester

ABSTRACT

Theorists who have categorized translation as an imperfect and never-ending task have also questioned the legitimacy of this field over the years. It is uncommon for other disciplines to consider translation a topic of study. Except for translation classes in which students discuss in detail the nature of the translators' tasks and their methodology, professors of other disciplines rarely address the fact that the voice of the translator is an overlooked, yet an important component of any translation. As a consequence, students around the globe read translated works without acknowledging translators' ethos and their rhetorical situation. The consideration of this voice in those translated texts is mentioned only in passing, if at all. Due to the lack of discussion that relates the disciplines of translation and rhetoric, it is imperative to re/examine and re/frame the current state of the rhetoric of translation and comment on the traditional and

historiographical ties that intertwine these two disciplines. In this way I argue that translation, as a discipline, should be considered part of the rhetorical tradition, and a key element within rhetorical education. This relationship between rhetoric and translation is further complemented with the pedagogical application of practical rhetorical and translation tools in the analysis and critical interpretation of selected Western translated texts. The fruition of this goal will be presented through a new approximation to the reading of these very same texts. To this end, I am also introducing a new literacy called *Transglobal* whose aim is twofold: For one, it aims to decenter preconceived patterns of thought that confine the interpretation of translated texts within the boundaries of mere ideological superstructures, but it is also based upon a pedagogy that is global, transcending all national boundaries. In sum, what I am proposing is that professors of all disciplines engage in a rhetorical and translation dialogue with their students to broaden the understanding and current perception of translated texts.

INDEX WORDS: Rhetoric, Translation, Transglobal, History of rhetoric, History of translation, Transglobal literacy, Literacy

THE ART OF FUTURE DISCOURSE: RHETORIC, TRANSLATION AND AN INTERDISCIPLINARY PEDAGOGY FOR *TRANSGLOBAL LITERACY*

by

ESTEFANÍA OLID-PEÑA

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2012

Copyright by
Estefanía Olid-Peña
2012

THE ART OF FUTURE DISCOURSE: RHETORIC, TRANSLATION AND AN INTERDISCIPLINARY PEDAGOGY FOR TRANSGLOBAL LITERACY

by

ESTEFANÍA OLID-PEÑA

Committee Chair: Beth Burmester

Committee: Lynée Lewis Gaillet

Annette Grant Cash

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

August 2012

DEDICATION

To my Tía Piti who at the age of 87 told me "el sueño de mi vida es que completes tu disertación" ("The dream of my life is that you finish your dissertation.") In days when I lost hope and felt like giving up, her words resonated in me allowing me to move forward. So I did…finish, and this dissertation is for you.

And last…

For my dad Dr. Roberto Olid and my mom Carmina who always believed in me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this journey, I have been fortunate to be surrounded by the most gifted and supportive group of individuals. Of all, I owe the most gratitude to my husband Chris Wigley whose love and support helped keep me grounded and sane during all these years. I also would like to acknowledge my Bosnian brother Val Causevic whose unconditional love and constant encouragement made this journey a lot less arduous. A special thank you to Crystal Todd Wright who happily volunteered to put my methodology into practice in her English Composition class at GSU. I would also like to thank my incredible committee members Lynée Gaillet, for keeping me focused, and Annette Grant Cash, for listening, guiding me, and always reminding me that a dissertation was a difficult, yet attainable goal. I will be forever indebted to you and your unbelievable editorial skills Annette. I am particularly grateful to my dissertation chair, Beth Burmester, for her extremely helpful comments and feedback. Finally, warm thanks to my family and inter/national friends who have had to put up with me writing away on the laptop instead of spending quality time with them. You know who you are. Much love to you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

PREFACE 1

INTRODUCTION 5

1 TRANSLATION AS AN ART: THE PROFESSION OF TRANSLATION STUDIES AND THEORIES 13

1.1 History of Translation as Practice in the History of Rhetoric: Classical Rhetoric 16

1.2 History of Translation as Practice in the History of Rhetoric: Early Christian Rhetoric from the Late Classical Age to the Middle Ages and Medieval Rhetoric .. 19

1.3 History of Translation as a Practice in the History of Rhetoric: From the Renaissance to the Eighteenth Century 21

1.4 The Rise of Translation Studies as a Discipline 25

1.5 Translation Studies and Modern and Postmodern Translation Theories 29

1.6 The Ethos of the Translator: Problematizing the Work of Translation as Global 33

2 TEACHING WRITING, TRANSLATING WRITING: TRANSLATION AS A WRITING PRACTICE IN THE RHETORICAL TRADITION 41

2.1 Origins of Translation Theory in the History of Rhetoric 42

2.2 Roman Rhetoric: Translation in Roman Schools 45

2.3 The Influence of Classical Rhetoric and Teaching Translation in the Middle Ages 48

2.4 Rhetorical Education, Translation, and Writing in the Renaissance..... 50

2.5 The Teaching of Writing in the Enlightenment 56

2.6 Teaching Rhetoric and Translation..... 59

2.6.1 Rhetorical and Translation Pedagogies in the Nineteenth Century..... 59

2.6.2 Rhetorical and Translation Pedagogies in the Twentieth Century..... 61

2.6.3 Rhetorical Practices in the Twenty-First Century 66

2.7 Interdisciplinarity Revealed: Rhetoric and Translation 67

2.8 Classroom Collisions..... 69

3 THE TOOLS AND METHODS OF TRANSLATION: INTERPRETING AND TEACHING TEXTS..... 72

3.1 What is Translation For? Aims and Purposes in Pedagogy..... 73

3.2 Designing a New Methodology and Theory for Teaching Translated Texts 75

3.3 Enhancing Transglobal Literacy 80

3.4 The Rhetoric of Teaching Global Citizens: Converting Translational Literacy into Transglobal Literacy..... 84

3.5 Methodology (Part 1): The Rhetoric and Techniques for a New Model and Theory of Translation Pedagogy 91

3.6 Methodology (Part 2): Purpose and Implementation..... 102

4 ON TRANSLATING PHILOSOPHY AND CLASSICS. CASE ONE: THEORY, EDUCATION AND QUINTILIAN 109

4.1 More Nuances of Philosophical and/or Scholarly Translation 115

4.2 Multiple Translations of *Institutio Oratoria* **118**

4.3 Translation Excerpts Selected for this Case Study **122**

4.4 Case Study I: *Institutio Oratoria* **124**

5 ON TRANSLATING LITERATURE. CASE TWO: LITERATURE, POPULAR CULTURE, AND DON QUIXOTE **131**

5.1 Nuances in the Translation of *Don Quixote* **135**

5.2 Multiple Translations of *Don Quixote* **140**

5.3 Brief Account about the Translation Excerpts Selected for this Chapter **145**

5.4 Case Study II: *Don Quixote* **147**

5.4.1 Analysis of Titles from Don Quixote's Chapter Eight (Volume 1) *147*

5.4.2 Analysis of Excerpts from Don Quixote's Chapter Eight (Volume 1) *150*

6 CONCLUSION: A RHETORICAL THEORY OF TRANSLATION. THE FUTURE FOR A NEW TRADITION OF UNDERSTANDING **155**

WORKS CITED **165**

WORKS CONSULTED **175**

APPENDICES **182**

Appendix A: Exegesis of the Translated Texts **182**

Appendix B: Glossaries of Rhetoric and Translation **185**

Appendix C: Case Study I: Quintilian **189**

Appendix D: Case Study II: Cervantes **195**

Appendix E: Works that Relate Translation to Rhetoric **203**

PREFACE

I come to this study as an international graduate student, a graduate teacher assistant, a student of foreign-language translation, an avid reader of rhetoric and translation theories, and a translator, namely translating Spanish texts into English, and English texts into Spanish. In my experience in all those roles I find myself impassioned with outrage when I read pieces of mistranslated texts in the United States. After over thirteen years of higher education, I have taken a plethora of undergraduate and graduate classes – both in Europe and in the United States – where faculty members asked students to buy a specific edition of the translated text by a foreign author, never addressing why they preferred that version to another. None of these professors ever asked us to evaluate the rhetorical nature and collaborative ethos of translated texts. The consideration of the multiplicity of voices in those texts was mentioned only in passing.[1] Sometimes there was a sense of acknowledgment on the professors behalf, a moment in which they recognized the work of the translator and the possible biases of the translated text. It is due to this very predicament that undermines translation and rhetorical practices that I decided to seek out ways to decenter the way translated texts are currently taught in the classroom. If we open our minds to the possibility of considering translated texts from the standpoint of translation and the rhetorical tradition then we are allowing ourselves to get a more thorough understanding of all Western translated texts, and the arts of translation and rhetoric. By limiting the scope of my research to only discussing Western translated texts, I am aware that I may be limiting this potential relationship. While I recognize the risks of imposing an interpretation of

[1] I am referring to the author of the original work, the translator, and other possible contributors such as outside readers, editors, and co-editors of the translated work.

translated texts that is based upon Western classical rhetorical precepts of a long-gone civilization I understand that we are potentially and purposefully restricting the meaning of any translated text.[2]

My claim is that translation needs to be considered within the field of rhetoric and composition studies. In order to foster this claim I have created and developed a new theory of literacy called *Transglobal* that connects rhetoric and translation for study and research within English departments. *Transglobal Literacy* focuses on exposing the global value of translated texts through the understanding and interpretation of their subtexts. This literacy aims to create knowledge through the practice of advancing global citizenship in the classroom. Once I lay out the basic tenets of this theory and methodology, I put the methodology into practice by presenting two case studies that explore both philosophical and literary translated texts. To this end, I have envisioned five chapters, a conclusion, and five appendices for the dissertation.

I begin in my introduction laying out the background, significance and scope of research of this study. In Chapter One – Translation as an Art: The Profession of Translation Studies and Theories – I specifically focus on the emergence of the discipline of Translation Studies, with an emphasis on history and discussion of key theorists from the 1950s to the present. This chapter discusses the gaps and weaknesses in the institutional history of this field, and how it has evolved separate from the field of Rhetoric and Composition.

In Chapter Two – Teaching Writing, Translating Writing: Translation as a Writing Practice in the Rhetorical Tradition – I present a linear history of rhetorical education and the teaching of writing as a practice as they were first introduced in the Greco-Roman period. I specifically draw attention as to how translation played a significant role in the rhetorical

[2] The application of Non-Western rhetorical values upon Western texts is beyond the scope of my research in this work.

curriculum since antiquity. This exploration will lead into the main focus of my study, which happens in the Roman Period, when both translation and rhetorical practices coalesced in the classroom. I particularly focus on the Renaissance when "double translating" exercises were implemented with the sole purpose of improving students' grammar and writing skills. This discussion will lead into eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century theories and practices of both rhetoric and translation and will culminate in a discussion of my methodology.

Chapter Three – The Tools and Methods of Translation: Interpreting and Teaching Texts – discusses the role of culture and politics in translation; more specifically when it comes to translations that are "preferred" and canonical versus those that are not as favored. Here I also analyze what makes teachers select a specific translation as opposed to another. In addition, this chapter lays out the practice and application of translation and rhetorical theories and it is where I discuss my methodology in detail. My theory of *Transglobal Literacy* is elaborated here. In particular, this chapter is meant to guide teachers who want to put this theory into practice. It also sets up the next two chapters of this work, which examine two case studies of different genres and historical moments where translation is rhetoric, and translators act as rhetoricians.[3]

Chapter Four – On Translating Philosophy and Classics. Case One: Theory, Education and Quintilian – sets the way with a closer examination of Quintilian and Roman Rhetoric. My rhetorical and translation analysis leads into a discussion of how Quintilian is usually translated, read, and taught, and how this traditional pedagogical application needs to be expanded. My inquiry also compares three translated excerpts from Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*.

Chapter Five – On Translating Literature. Case Two: Literature, Popular Culture, and Don Quixote – presents the second case study comparing, first, five titles from Chapter Eight of

[3] These two case studies include philosophy and literary texts.

Cervantes' *Don Quixote* as well as four excerpts from the same chapter. Within this chapter, I discuss the needs for a rhetoric of translation for humanistic literature, and provide a segue into the discussion for the conclusion of this work.

In my Conclusion – A Rhetorical Theory of Translation: The Future for a New Tradition of Understanding – I synthesize the lessons to be gained from my analyses and case studies, and here propose a variety of suggestions for changing the college curriculum and graduate programs in Translation Studies and Rhetoric and Composition, in order to combine the history, art, and theory of both fields into a new subfield included within English Studies, or as a new multi- and interdisciplinary cluster area. In addition, I present a brief account of what came about from the application of this methodology in an English Composition class at Georgia State University.

The last section of this work contains five appendices. In Appendix A, I include a glossary of significant terms in Rhetoric and Translation Studies that are pertinent to the scope of this methodology. Appendix B contains a chart and pre- and post-questions and activities that are meant to be used in conjunction with the theory and methodology presented in Chapter Three. Appendix C contains the three English excerpts from Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* analyzed in Chapter Four. Appendix D, presents the titles and passages of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* examined in Chapter Five. Lastly, Appendix E includes a list of bibliographical works with information that intertwine translation and rhetoric.

INTRODUCTION

The opposite of standing still / is walking up or down a hill / running
backwards, creeping, crawling, leaping off a cliff and falling /
turning somersaults in the gravel, / or any other mode of travel. /
The opposite of a doughnut? Wait / a minute while I meditate.
This isn't easy. Ah, I've found it! A cookie with a hole around it. /
What is the opposite of two? A lonely me, a lonely you.
The opposite of a cloud could be / a white reflection in the sea, /
or a huge blueness in the air, / caused by a cloud's not being there. /
The opposite of opposite? / That's much too difficult. I quit.
– Richard Wilbur

Of the many aphorisms that Italian-born and Spanish-speaking poet-philosopher Antonio Porchia included in his significant work *Voces* (1943), one particularly echoes my theory of language: "what words say does not last. The words last. Because words are always the same, and what they say is never the same" (Porchia 193). American poet Richard Wilbur also considers the nature of language, exploring how some words are not apparent opposites and do not easily create meanings and counter-meanings. While others defy that kind of defining by example, in the way Porchia expresses. For Wilbur, certain words create "some opposites" that resist pairing and do not balance or negate one other; instead these words create a new dissonance, such that what a word literally *is* and what it expresses, or stands for, cannot be reconciled with a single match, nor will any one formula suffice to reach a singular, uncontested meaning or a general consensus. This mathematically challenging notion resonates with me in multiple ways, touching on my experiences as a writer, reader, translator, teacher, and researcher. We cannot take words at face value, or on a surface level, nor can we only interpret them through our own subjectivity. Rather, words, which create the fabric of our language, are cultural artifacts that need to be explored, examined, and questioned. Their meanings constantly and relentlessly shift, evolve, and transform, usually pointing back to those who create them.

Translation would not be possible without the usage of these ever changing words. And just like words, translation is always in flux, unstable, and never definitive.

As a student of both the history and theories of rhetoric and of translation, and as a teacher of writing in English and of Spanish as a language, my identity as a researcher, and my focus in this dissertation, depend on connecting the scholarly field of Rhetoric and Composition with that of the discipline of Translation Studies. To that end, I am distinguishing between the term "translation" designating an art and activity, and Translation Studies, which names the interdisciplinary field that emerged in the twentieth century and has a fifty-year institutional history. I use "translation" as a keyword to denote a more open concept, one that does not imply any particular dogmatic or theoretical perspectives, as the discipline itself promotes. My emphasis and interest lies in the study of translation as it emerged in Classical Rhetoric and was developed throughout the history of rhetorical education across Europe. To this end, the following questions drive my research: How was translation practiced and taught to students? How was translation used in the teaching of writing? Why did translation cease to be connected to the teaching of writing and rhetoric? How can it be revived as a rhetorical art?

Translation for most translation theorists – and translators themselves – from ancient Rome to the present global culture, remains regarded as a continuous work-in-progress that is inevitably critiqued, re-translated, and changed by others over time. Research focusing on how rhetoric affects the nature of any translation is rare. What is more difficult to obtain are pedagogies that address the reading and understanding of translating texts from a rhetorical perspective. In the course of my research I pinpoint a moment when translation and rhetoric were historically connected to one another. As I kept looking into these connections between both disciplines I noticed how these fields became disconnected over time. Due to the lack of

discussion that relates these two disciplines, it is imperative to re/examine and re/frame the current state of the rhetoric of translation and comment on the traditional ties that relate these two disciplines. Within this account, I argue that translation, as a discipline, should be considered part of the rhetorical tradition, and a key element within rhetorical education. In doing so, I analyze the intricate process of cultural interaction, fusion and disjunction of these two disciplines. This relationship between rhetoric and translation is complemented with the pedagogical application of practical rhetorical and translation tools in the analysis of selected Western translated texts.

The ultimate goal of this work is to add to scholarship by promoting a new literacy that I have called *Transglobal* and that focuses on encouraging students to develop a sense of global awareness in the college classroom by urging them to read critically and engage in a rhetorical dialogue regarding any translated text. It is incumbent to note that my study does not revolve around comparative or contrastive rhetoric nor does it require students to be bilingual or familiar with the intent or background of the original text; instead, it seeks to describe a new theory, finding rhetorical elements that bind translation to rhetoric, and both to acts of critical reading and interpretation. An alternative goal to this study is to enhance the value of translation as it relates to rhetoric while creating a place of debate where scholars consider translation as a multi-paned window through which readers and writers will be granted reflections and differing views to a myriad of significations. In order to set out my theory and analyze my case studies, I draw on an interdisciplinary approach as my foremost method.[4] The goal of Interdisciplinarity is the formation of new conceptual knowledge that can contribute to pedagogy. In her essay, "The

[4] *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* defines an interdisciplinary approach as a method that integrates "separate data, methods, tools, concepts, and theories to create a holistic view or common understanding of a complex issue, question, or problem" (275).

Rhetoric of Interdisciplinarity," in *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies,* Julie Thompson Klein observes that "interdisciplinary inquiry" results in knowledge that "enters the curriculum in three ways: as the intellectual foundation for interdisciplinary programs; as new topics in core curricula and general education; and as new foci for traditional subjects and disciplines" (272). Her stated goals are the ones I wish to foster in my study.

In conjunction with promoting a relationship between Rhetoric and Translation Studies, I am also exploring aspects pertaining to translated texts that are usually deemed unessential in the classroom; namely, the three artistic pisteis, remainder, implicature, domestication, foreignization, context of the situation, rhetorical situation, collaboration, point of view, style, voice, register, amplification, reduction, reordering, as these are tools used by professional and academic rhetoricians and/or translators.[5] The study also considers gender and cultural contexts. While I am aware of the multiple tools for rhetorical and translation analysis that could be considered in this study (including rhetorical tropes and rhetorical figures), I utilize only those that are pertinent to both fields.

The role of readers of translated texts does not remain unexplored. In his most acclaimed book, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (first edition 1975; second edition 1992, and third 1998), literary and language critic George Steiner presents an innovative and revolutionary view of translation that is synthesized and illustrated in the following lines: "*inside or between languages, human communication equals translation*. A study of translation is a study of language" (490). His view of translation as an interpretative act/art – an interplay between translation and the text itself – challenges other scholars' interpretations that enclose translation in an "extreme monadist position" and label the translation process as impossible.

[5] Refer to Appendix B, Glossary of Rhetoric and Translation Term or Chapter Three to seek further clarification on this terminology.

This hermeneutical approach to translation as interpretation is seen, according to Mary Ann Caws,

> as a subservience of the self to the other for a self-discovering at the limits of alterity, running always the risk of mis-taking or mis-apprehension. Best of all, it is an original repetition, a reconstitution of the creative act by the realization of all the possibilities of translation in the literal sense as it becomes a vitalizing act of love. (286-7)

The relationship that Steiner is presenting goes beyond the limits of the translator and the text. The reader plays a crucial role in deciphering the rhetorical message of the target text: "as every generation translates the classics, so every generation uses language to build its own resonant past" (30). If all translation is rhetorical in nature, then it is imperative for us to consider the many layers of complexity and signification that pervades every aspect of any translated text. This is precisely what my methodology is designed to inquire into and uncover.

The lack of literature that relates translation and rhetoric is undeniable. Those scholars who have entwined rhetoric and translation concur on how ideas about translation were initiated within the theoretical realms of rhetoric. Frederick M. Rener observes in *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler* (1989) how early theories of translation hark back to the study of grammar and rhetoric in Classical times and under the teaching of classical rhetoric. In *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (1995), Rita Copeland presents this relationship as one that evolved between academic and vernacular cultures in the Middle Ages. Her approximation situates translation within the discourse of Classical and Medieval antiquity. She defines her study as one that seeks to "define the place of vernacular translation within the systems of rhetoric and hermeneutics in the Middle Ages, [and on the other] seeks to show how

translation is inscribed within a large disciplinary nexus, a historical intersection of hermeneutical practice and rhetorical theory" (1). A year after the publication of Copeland's book, Agnes Maria Zwaneveld wrote a chapter about rhetorical theory and translation in *A Bookseller's Hobby-Horse and the Rhetoric of Translation*. Basing her theory upon Rener's *Interpretatio*, Zwaneveld views translation as "a specific form of communication [that] came as much under the rules of rhetoric as other forms of verbal communication" (87). For these three authors, translation techniques derive from traditional systems of rhetoric. None of them, however, provide a rhetorical examination of translated texts. Like many other books in the field of translation, these three authors focus on the translators' tasks and choices.

Among the few scholars who have recognized a link between rhetoric and translation are Peter France Claudia Carlos, James J. Murphy, and Carmen Benito-Vessels. Peter France, in "The Rhetoric of Translation" (2005), explores parallelisms between the orator and the translator reflecting upon "the rhetorical situation of the literary translator" (255). His article, however, centers on discussing how translation was used in rhetorical studies as a means to acquire a second language.

> In early modern Europe… rhetorical training in the schools gave a good deal of classroom time to verbal exercises … the progymnasmata of the ancients … aimed at giving young students a mastery of the resources of language which was at the heart of education, Latin. Among the exercises of the rhetoric classes, translation had an important place, particularly in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. And in more modern times it was for many decades, and in some quarters still is, regarded as one of the essential ways of acquiring the mastery of a foreign language, particularly in the most literary register. (255-6)

Even though France briefly establishes a point of reference where translation and rhetoric applications are feasible, the main focus of his article relies mostly on identifying translators' tasks. More recently, "Translation as Rhetoric," by Claudia Carlos (2009) argues the necessity to "shed light on how a translator, whatever his ideological purposes, may make specific linguistic choices in response to the constraints of a particular rhetorical situation- translating a text that an audience is not prone to accept" (337). Like Peter France, Claudia Carlos shapes her argument around translators' choices, and how those choices affect the ideological value of translated texts. James J. Murphy and Carmen Benito-Vessels have also documented and expanded upon this relationship. In numerous passages from *A Short History of Writing Instruction*, Murphy lays out specific rhetorical pedagogies that used translation exercises as a means to provide an exegetical approximation to texts. Mainly, Murphy centers on providing a historical account of all those rhetorical and pedagogical practices that led to the development of techniques that help students refine their writing. Translation as a rhetorical exercise is also alluded to by Benito-Vessels' "Las prosificaciones de las *cantigas* como traducciones exegéticas," an article in which she investigates the clashing of both fields during the Middle Ages. As I will further develop in Chapter Two, this exegetical application of translation in a rhetorical sense continued to be used and expanded during the Renaissance.

Thus far, there are very few works that intertwine translation and rhetoric. Whereas the study of rhetoric originated in the fourth century in Greece, and grew throughout the Roman Empire, maintaining a dominant role throughout European and British educational history in the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and the Age of Enlightenment, the study of rhetoric in modern Europe is neither common nor wide-spread. Conversely, this same European scholarly tradition has established a long-standing tradition in the field of Translation Studies. Every year, multiple

articles about translation are published in online and printed academic journals and magazines. Many universities in Europe offer undergraduate and graduate courses in translation, giving students the opportunity of becoming translators. Within that account, Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha describe in The *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* how "translator-training institutions [at the] university level [rose] from 49 in 1960 to 108 in 1980, [and] the global number had risen to at least 250 in 1994" (Baker and Saldanha xii). In the United States only, such a tradition of the study and practice of translation is almost non-existent. While a few universities present the opportunity to attain a translation certificate, the study of translation at the graduate level remains deficient. For Suzanne Jill Levine, opening a translation-studies program at the University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB) became "a real challenge" because, according to her account, "there's still a privileging of everything but the creative art" (Howard). The absence of the interdisciplinary application of translation precepts and exercises in the classrooms drew me to craft this methodology.

As I pave the way to a rhetorical pedagogy of translated texts, I am hoping to draw some attention to the art and problematics of translation. The Palestinian poet and journalist Mahmoud Darwish offers a metaphor that compares translators to spectators whose craft consists on delineating and articulating meaning from afar: "The translator is not a ferryman for the meaning of the words but the author of their web of new relations. And he is not the painter of the light part of the meaning, but the watcher of the shadow, and what it suggests" (Paul 5). The question that lurks in the corners of my mind when I think about translation and translation practices is one that I want others to consider. This *Transglobal Literacy* and pedagogy of translated texts attempts to ignite a conversation about the importance of granting value to rhetoric and translation.

1 TRANSLATION AS AN ART: THE PROFESSION OF TRANSLATION STUDIES AND THEORIES

To translate: To transport; to remove. It is particularly used of the removal of a bishop from one see to another. To transfer one to another; to convey; to change; to interpret to another language; to change into another language retaining the sense.
– Samuel Johnson

Translation, as well as rhetoric, has several literary and mythical origin stories, based on human communication as an art and skill. Considering Johnson's dictionary definition of 1755 (above), the element removed from language within these myths regarding translation is human unity. Most Translation Studies accounts reflect upon the word "babel," and recount the renowned story of the Tower of Babel, including Eugene A. Nida, George Steiner, Paul Ricoeur, Jerzy Jarniewicz, Nancy K. Jentsch, Lawrence Venuti, Octavio Paz, Paul de Man, Jacques Derrida. In Old Hebrew, the word "babel" translates as "Gate of God," but its meaning is a "confused medley of sounds or voices." This Old Testament parable accounts for God's wish to instill the confusion of tongues and differences among human beings, so they cannot unite together and challenge God's power. In the book of Genesis, according to the King James translation[6], the story goes:

> At one time all the people of the world spoke the same language and used the same words. As the people migrated to the east, they found a plain in the land of

[6] The translation history of the text of the Bible is itself complicated. The Old Testament was originally composed in Hebrew and Aramaic, between 1450 and 1420 BCE. It was translated into Greek in 300 BCE, and Jerome's Latin Vulgate Bible, which included the Old Testament, the New Testament (originally written in Greek between 50 and 100 CE), and the Apocrypha books (composed from the Septuagint Greek manuscript in 200 CE), was available in 382 CE. by 500 CE. The Bible had been translated into 500 languages. The first printed book, from the Gutenberg Press, was the eponymous Gutenberg Bible, in Latin, in the year 1455. The first English language print edition of the Bible was published in 1535, and the King James' translation was first printed in 1611, from Latin. Revised, new, and standard editions of the Bible followed regularly over the years, and the latest translation and revision was produced in 2002 (Jeffcoat).

> Babylonia and settled there. They began saying to each other, "Let's make bricks and harden them with fire. … Then they said, "Come, let's build a great city for ourselves with a tower that reaches into the sky. This will make us famous and keep us from being scattered all over the world." But the LORD came down to look at the city and the tower the people were building. "Look!" he said. "The people are united, and they all speak the same language. After this, nothing they set out to do will be impossible for them! Come, let's go down and confuse the people with different languages. Then, they won't be able to understand each other." In that way, the LORD scattered them all over the world, and they stopped building the city. That is why the city was called Babel, because that is where the LORD confused the people with different languages. In this way he scattered them all over the world. (*Holy Bible*, Genesis 2.11)

Thus giving the rationale for why humans are diverse in culture and language, and also why some of the discrepancies among societies are rooted in the barriers of languages. This Biblical account has a parallel in Greek myth, and Classical Rhetoric.

Hermes, the Ancient Greek Olympian god of "language, learning, and crafty wiles," among other "divine roles," has been credited to teaching "mankind their many tongues, and so was the god of 'the babelisation of the language,' so to speak" (*Theoi Project*). According to the second century Roman *Fabulae 143,* of Pseudo-Hyginus, Mercury, the Roman version of Hermes, and Jove, the Roman version of Zeus, were both involved in human communication:

> Men for many centuries before lived without towns or laws, speaking one tongue under the rule of Jove [Zeus]. But after Mercurius [Hermes] had explained [or created] the languages of men (whence he is called *ermeneutes*, 'interpreter,' for

> Mercurius in Greek is called *Ermes*; he too, divided the nations), then discord arose among mortals, which was not pleasing to Jove [Zeus]. (*Theoi Project*)

Though these two origin legends are the most well-known, there are more legendary accounts of *Transglobal* translation.

The Epistle of Aristeas provides one such context, and the occasion of the translation of 2,000 Sanskrit Buddhist treatises is another. "The Letter of Aristeas" has had a historically disputed authorship and date, but the most recent scholarly article about it persuasively proposes that the previous dating assigned to it in the latter half of the second century CE, should be corrected to the late third century CE (see Rappaport). While the author of the text poses as a "pagan courtier," scholars believe the real writer was a Jew living in Alexandria, hence the account has more legendary than historic prestige as part of the history of Translation Studies (Thackeray 4). The story contained within the letter is that 72 translators all "produced identical versions" of the Hebrew Old Testament, and that their work "was the result of comparison and conference" (Thackeray 4). The other ancient recounting of collaborative translations occurred between 250 BCE and 1200 CE, when "hundreds of bilingual individuals [purportedly] translated almost two thousand Sanskrit Buddhist treatises into Chinese" (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 11). By the seventh century, a Sanskrit-Chinese lexicon existed, and some of the Chinese translations are now the only extant versions of sacred Sanskrit manuscripts (Banerji 593-95). Religion, Christianity and Buddhism, served as a major influence bringing foreign words to new audiences, from ancient times to the Middle Ages, and creating a desire and foundation for the necessity of translation for communication with and across cultures. For instance, Baker writes that there are sections in the second book of Herodotus's *Histories*, written in the fifth century, that talk about translation, "notably the creation of an Egyptian interpreter … and the

transmission of Egyptian religion to Greece." She continues saying that "because Herodotus never tells people how to translate, he is not thought of as a translation theorist" (Baker 161). Adding to the power of myth and legend, historical facts and narratives also indicate an educational and institutional genealogy for Translation Studies, and for the place of translation specifically within the rhetorical tradition.

1.1 History of Translation as Practice in the History of Rhetoric: Classical Rhetoric

Two major theories guided translation as it was practiced in its beginnings. While some historians credit Cicero as the beginning of translation theory, most scholars within Translation Studies agree that both Cicero and Horace became the greatest influences on those who followed (Bassnett 50). Horace's admonition in his *Ars Poetica*, "nor must you be so faithful a translator, as to take the pains of rendering [the original] word for word" (Smart and Blakeney) has had the opposite influence he intended: it has served as- a guiding theory from Antiquity onward, though not without its critics or the recommendations of other methods, notably from Cicero, who advocated sense-for-sense translation, by arguing in *On the Ideal Orator* that the translator should be an orator, not an interpreter, and should strive to capture "the same ideas and form," not identical diction and syntax (qtd. in France 259). In time, word-for-word would become attached to translation theories labeled "literal," while sense-for sense, became theories called "paraphrase," "liberal," or "loose" (see Venuti *Invisibility*). The goal of translation as being "transparent" and the translator being "invisible" has been contested throughout the history of translation texts and guides (*Invisibility* 1). Venuti observes, "Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way"

(*Invisibility* vii). Rhetoric too has been both criticized and praised for manipulating language and communication.

Discussions about the act and nature of translation hark back to the first century. Like rhetoric, its aim has also been questioned: Is it about creating art? Being persuasive? Remaining "true" to the original or discovering truth? The history of translation itself started with a series of essays, excerpts, and prologues by ancient Roman translators who promulgated and maintained the usage of sense-for-sense renderings, notably Cicero, Quintilian, Evagrius, and Jerome, among others (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 17-18). Other translators and rhetoricians, like Horace and Augustine of Hippo, believed that word-for-word translations should predominate, especially when it pertained to the translation of the Bible (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 18).

Between these two polar theoretical positions, we encounter a few individuals whose opinion falls in the middle. Boethius stands out as an author who expressed his struggle between these two translation models. Boethius and his translator, King Alfred, are known as theorists who bridged the gap between these two theoretical approaches to translation and endorsed a happy medium between the Greek and the Latin cultures and their language traditions. Boethius did so by translating many books by Aristotle from their original Greek into Latin, and Alfred by translating Boethius into Old English.

Works by Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian, who are commonly read as part of the rhetorical tradition, are infused with passages and reflections on translation. Cicero's famous dictum sense-for-sense took over views that subscribed to word-for-word methods of translation and was favored generally until the nineteenth century (France 260). In 'De optimo genere oratorum,' *On the Best Style of Orators*, composed as a "Preface" to his translations of speeches by Aeschines and Demothenes, Cicero outlined his interpretative method of translation "in the

manner of the orator, translating the same themes and their expression and sentence shapes in words consonant with our conventions. In so doing, "I did not think it necessary to translate word for word" (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 21).[7] Although Cicero's translations are not extant, his description of his method and theory for translation set a trend among his followers (Quintilian, Jerome).

Quintilian takes Cicero's ideas a step forward by introducing new terminology in the field. He distinguishes *metaphrasis,* or word-for-word, translation and *paraphrases,* or phrase by phrase translation. In his *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian writes "I do not want translation to be a mere paraphrase, but a struggle and rivalry over the same meanings" (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 26). Through his work, Quintilian employs translation not only as a tool to acquire a second language, but also as a way to enrich the target language (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 24). This idea is crucial in later theories. To define oneself as a true orator, one should exceed the emulation of the Greek models. Imitation and translation of texts from Greek into Latin, therefore, becomes a method followed by Pliny the Younger and those pupils who wanted to become better orators (Pliny the Younger 115).

[7] With the passage of time, Nietzsche would claim that Cicero's ulterior motive behind his method of translation was ultimately imperialistic and subversive. In *Translation – Theory and Practice*, Weissbort and Eysteinsson follow Nietzsche's claims by noting that "in Roman times … translation relates to the construction of a supranational culture, based on Rome, and becomes an assertion of Roman cultural independence from or parity with Attic Greece" (20).

1.2 History of Translation as Practice in the History of Rhetoric: Early Christian Rhetoric from the Late Classical Age to the Middle Ages and Medieval Rhetoric

Drawing on Cicero's views of translation, Jerome also advocates for a sense-for-sense rendering, even if that meant altering the word of God. In Jerome's *De Optimo Genere Interpretandi*, he defends himself against those detractors who deem his translation as incorrect. In his preface to *Chronicles of Eusebius,* Jerome reveals his adversity against this sort of translation: "If I translate word-for word [he says] it sounds absurd." And in *To Pammachius,* "On the Best Method of Translating," Jerome makes his position apparent: "I proclaim at the top of my voice, that in translating from Greek, except from Sacred Scripture, where even the order of the words is of God's doing, I have not translated word by word, but sense for sense" (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 29-30). His attack against literalist forms of translations becomes apparent in his work, even though he criticized classical rhetoric, and desiring to separate it from Christianity, he ultimately accepted its usefulness (Bizzell and Herzberg 433). In the decades that followed, Jerome's Vulgate Latin Bible became the prevalent translation of the sacrosanct text. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, conversely, did not approve of Jerome's translation and proclaimed that the only possible text that could and should be read had to be one that resembled the most the word of God (Bizzell and Herzberg 433). The text Augustine was referring to was none other than the Septuagint. To justify his assertion, Augustine duly noted that the Holy Spirit had guided the Septuagint translators (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 18).

Before the ninth century, virtually all translation was from Greek or Hebrew or Aramaic into Latin. But King Alfred the Great, the monarch of the West Saxons in Great Britain, changed that with his translations of texts into Old English. Although his approach to translation

depended upon the Ciceronian dictum, King Alfred chose to translate some passages *ad verbum*. Translation into languages other than Latin followed King Alfred's initiative (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 18). For instance, the Benedictine Reform of the tenth century led to renewed interest and production of "grammar books" in Anglo-Saxon, such as those by Alcuin and Bede. These grammar books, based on Latin predecessors, were studies of language (Crellin). Another prime example is Ælfric, born in 950, who wrote the first Latin grammar textbook "in a medieval vernacular language" (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 39). In this book, he created a pedagogical method that taught grammar and that "rest[ed] on the foundation of his own training in Latin under Bishop Æthelwold, who [was] likewise known for having translated Latin texts into English for his own pupils and for instructing them in the rules of grammar" (Magennis and Swan 197). For Ælfric, the instruction of grammar through translation ultimately improved the understanding of both languages.

By the 1300s, translators realized that they could use their translations as rhetorical and persuasive means to further their personal and political agendas (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 55). Around the year 1387, Benedictine Monk Ralph Higden wrote in Latin the *Polychronicon*, a "history of the world, reflecting the historical, geographical, and scientific knowledge of the fourteenth century;" an account that was later translated by John of Trevisa into English (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 47).[8] In the opening section of the Caxton printed edition in 1482, 'Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk upon Translation,' a fourteenth century defense of Philip IV's policies against certain aspects of papal authority is included by John Trevisa. But, more importantly, the text presented a case against translation by reasserting the value of the Latin language, and then undid that argument with one in favor of translation. In his dialogue with the

[8] This author is also known as Benedictine Monk Ranulf Hidgen or Benedictine Monk Ranulph Hidgen.

Lord, the Clerk said that "the Latin is both good and fair; therefore it needed not to have an English translation" (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 48). Very cunningly, then, the Lord reassured the Clerk that English translations were necessary, and just like Aristotle's books were translated from Greek into Latin, certain books simply had to be translated into English, reinforcing the idea of the translator being like an orator, and the connections between translation and rhetoric as mediators of communication.

1.3 History of Translation as a Practice in the History of Rhetoric: From the Renaissance to the Eighteenth Century

With the invention of the printing press, the advent of printing books, and the rise of publishers across Europe and England beginning in the fifteenth century, many manuscripts required translation into other languages and were sought by printers for a growing market of readers. Both in terms of practice and application, many Translation Studies scholars consider the sixteenth century the golden age of translation for the history of France and England. In the introduction to his translation of Estienne Dolet's *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, James S. Holmes declares that Dolet's 1540 text was "the earliest independent treatise to be published in a modern European language on the principles of translation" (41). In Dolet's view, the word-for-word method, along with the use of neologisms, was to be avoided when translating. Dolet is arguably the first person who uses the words "translator" and "translation" in French, as well as the first who alludes to a fivefold system of rules that good translators should follow to improve the quality of their work and whose main purpose is to avoid word-for-word renderings.

> In the first place, the translator must understand perfectly the sense and matter of the author he is translating. … The second thing that is required in translating is that the translator has perfect knowledge of the language of the author he is translating. … The third point is that in translating one must not be servile to the point of rendering word for word. … The fourth rule, which I shall give at this place, is more to be observed in languages not reduced to an art than in others. [The fifth is] the observation of rhetorical numbers: that is to say, a joining of arranging of terms with such sweetness that not alone the soul is pleased, but also the ear is delighted and never hurt by such harmony of language. (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 75)

In this same introduction to Dolet's work, Holmes goes on to say that this manual became one of the first treatises that set forth the principles of translation (53). The sixteenth century is mainly celebrated for presenting multiple versions of the Bible and canonical works of classical literatures. Some of the key translators for English texts include Martin Luther, William Tyndale, Estienne Dolet, Sir Thomas Elyot, Sir Thomas Hoby, George Chapman, John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Samuel Johnson, William Cowper, and for French translations, Joachim Du Bellay. During the Renaissance and the Reformation, translations of Latin texts into vernacular languages, and vernacular texts into Latin, written by men and women grew to be more prolific.[9]

The eighteenth century initiated a turn in mentality about translation. Many of the translations in this century propagated new theoretical approaches to this subject matter. According to scholar Peter France, "the principal rhetorical aim of eighteenth-century translators,

---

[9] In *Translation –Theory and Practice*, Daniel Weissbort and Astradur Eysteinsson dedicate ten pages of their work to point out the work of some women translators. In this short chapter, Jane Stevenson barely explores the works of these women. More studies are certainly needed to reclaim the works of women translators, a subject that is beyond the scope of this research.

in France as well as in Britain, was to assimilate their texts to the receiving culture" (260). John Dryden's Preface to his translation of *Ovid's Epistles* is often quoted by many scholars as being the first translator to delineate a tripartite model of translation into 'metaphrase' (a word-for-word translation), 'paraphrase' (a sense-for-sense translation), and 'imitation' (when translators detach from original text when they consider it appropriate). By the reading of his Preface, it becomes apparent that Dryden subscribes to paraphrasing as the primary method for translating. By the end of his career, however, Dryden noted the importance of incorporating aspects of what he called "imitation" and "metaphrase" into his techniques. Dryden's approach to translation "forged the guidelines for the discussions of more recent times" as it instigated an ongoing debate about translation that prevailed well into the twentieth century (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 1). In Dryden's prescriptive and triadic division we find the first attempt to systematize translation theory, and a model that was later followed by other writers of translation.

In the eighteenth century, translators often opened their work with a Preface, including persuasive segments of precepts and regulations that led them to translate in their fashion. To most of them, the core of a good translation relied on the usage of vivacious contemporary language. Translation methods and theories started to be noticed in the writings of these translators, and to directly influence translation practices for others. After Dolet's dogmatic interpretations about translation and translators' tasks followed more from other scholars. For instance, Laurence Humphrey, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, presented his personal views about translation in *Interpretatio Linguarum* (1559). Of all the translation works published in the nineteenth century, Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1792) is considered the first manual ever written about translation in English. Over time, Tytler has earned the status of one of the most discussed translation theorists of the nineteenth century.

Tytler, a professor at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland, delineates three essential principles to translation:

> 1. The translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.
>
> 2. The style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
>
> 3. The translation should have all the ease of the original composition. (Tytler 16, 113, 200)

In this work, Tytler challenged Dryden's tripartite vision of translation, particularly disapproving of the paraphrasing method because this practice often led translators to create loose versions (Bassnett and McGuire 63). It is worth noting that James S. Holmes states in *Modern Poetry in Translation* that Tytler's three rules of translation were possibly taken from George Campbell's work. Holmes also recognizes Tytler's book for being one of the most-read books about the principles of translation in English (27). In *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England the Latin Writings of the Age,* James W. Binns claims that Laurence Humphrey's manual, a precursor to Tytler, is worth noticing, as it comprises riveting theories about translation. In his 600-page treatise, Humphrey focused on discussing the inherent value of translation. Book I described three types of translation: word-for-word, free translation, and a translation that lies between these two types. In Book II, he slanted the discussion towards imitation. In the final section of his book, he gave a detailed account of word-for-word translation choices; thus, directing his attention to style and the careful use of rhetorical devices (Binns 209-12). In spite of Humphrey's efforts to contribute to the history of translation and draft

what Dryden would later classify as a tripartite notion to translation, Humphrey's work did not attain the popularity of other translation manuals.

1.4 The Rise of Translation Studies as a Discipline

The theoretical pillar of Translation Studies emerged and expanded its wings in the centuries that followed. J. M. Cohen, a translator of canonical texts in the twentieth century, claims that the constant emphasis that prevailed during the Victorian period to archaize and distort translations contributed to the ongoing negative view of Translation Studies (see Bassnett and McGuire). In "Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Studies," Anthony Pym reiterated Cohen's ideas by saying that "nineteenth century translating was predominantly 'literalist,' 'mimetic' or oriented towards 'formal equivalence'" (1). The nineteenth century "saw the beginning of a counter-movement, a refusal of this form of oratorical translation, or rather the choice of a different rhetoric of translation" (France 260). This century not only brought a shift in the way people translated, but also placed more emphasis on archaizing and foreignizing modes of translation, a technique that did not relinquish the notion of faithfulness. A group of German thinkers (Herder, Goethe, Humboldt, the Schlegel brothers, and Schleiermacher) provided important manuscripts about translation and dominated this era of translation theory. In England, the controversial debate between Matthew Arnold and Francis W. Newman over the translation of Homer's *Iliad* became a central part of Victorian translation criticism and captured the attention of many curious readers at the time. On the one hand, Arnold believed that a verbatim reproduction of the original made for a more believable translation, on the other, Newman aspired to render a translation that "allude[d] to a broad readership while at the same time staying true to the various 'peculiarities' of Homer's epic, and the broad spectrum of

expression he found in it" (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 210). Their differing views about translation reframed nineteenth century conceptualizations of translation methods and methodology.

Following Victorian principles of translation became the main preoccupation of many translators during the first half of the twentieth century. Innovation and renovation of translated texts was considered as continuing to install translation practices that pertained to the Victorians. In accordance with foreignizing methods of translation, translated texts were filled with archaic, literal, and pedantic language and only managed to target a few cultured readers. Pym maintains that, during this time, there was a shift from the emphasis on literalist and mimetic modes of translation to a more dynamic and non-literalist approach. Ezra Pound was the first to mark this type of practice in the twentieth century. To Venuti "Pound translations avoided transparent discourse that has dominated English-language translation since the seventeenth century" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 177). Pound's efforts to show the relevance of "interpretative" and free translation prevail in his work. This interpretative translation method reflects upon translators' choices to create a work that facilitates the reading process of translated texts to audiences. He foresees, however, a problem that translators face when attempting to satisfy the needs of all audiences by noting that

> in the long run the translator is in all probability impotent to do *all* the work for the linguistically lazy reader. He can show where the treasure lies, he can guide the reader in choice of what tongue should be studied, and he can very materially assist the hurried student who has a smattering of a language and the energy to read the original texts alongside the metrical gloze. (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 92)

Pound's approach to deliver highly foreignized translations was short lived and generated mixed reviews from his contemporaries; some of which considered his translations 'strange' and 'defective' (John Bayley and Arundel del Re) while others like Mary Sinclair or A. Hyatt Mayor praised Pound's work for its 'freshness' and sense of 'remoteness' (Venuti, *Invisibility* 175-6). Although Pound's modernist and "interpretative" approximation to translation was well received in the1950s, some of his detractors (George Whicher and Leslie Fiedler) considered that Pound went too far in his efforts to foreignize the text and "banish[ed] Pound's translations to the fringes of British and American literary cultures" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 181).

Translation theories became more solidified and even more related to linguistics in the latter twentieth century. In the midst of this century, Jiří Levý situated translation within the communicative realm and called it a hybrid form, a composition made of an amalgamation of two structures. Among the most contemporary writings about translation, the most talked about works have been those of George Steiner's *After Babel* (1975), and James Holmes' *Translated!* (1988) the latter being an iconic series of essays and papers that were collected and posthumously published in one volume. To Steiner we owe a new perception of translation, one that explores in detail how various theories of translation are rooted in hermeneutics and language analysis. Steiner claimed that before the development of Translation Studies as a coherent area of academic specialty, the theories and practices of translation were randomly scattered and lacked consistency. Prior to the second half of the twentieth century, Steiner considered that translation went through a pointless and stagnant debate that kept revolving around the two main modes of translation that evolved from classical rhetoric: The word-for-word and the sense-for-sense.

James S. Holmes, a poet and translator, is particularly known for his English translations of modern Dutch and Flemish poetry, and of the Latin poets Catullus and Martial, as well as his essays on the academic study of translation (Broeck 1-2). In collaboration with Itamar Even-Zohar, of Tel Aviv University, Holmes is considered to be a pioneer and the founder of Translation Studies. Through his work, he instigated curiosity around the formation of the field, and raised awareness of a field that had largely been relegated to the margins of scholarship. Holmes also helped establish the Department of Translation Studies at the University of Amsterdam (1982). More developments in and about the inclusion of Translation Studies in the academic setting followed. For instance, the first doctoral dissertation in Translation Studies was completed, and a Ph.D. awarded to Mary Snell-Hornby, from the University of Zurich in 1987. It was published as *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* in 1989, and revised and reprinted in 1995. In her book, she further expanded the nature and scope of this field and insists upon the importance of grounding and classifying translation as a discipline of its own.

The 1990s witnessed a radical evolution of translation. By 1995, Pym and Caminade "list at least 250 universities in over sixty countries offering four year undergraduate degrees and postgraduate courses in translation" (Munday 6). Multiple conferences and lectures were held, journals were launched, and many books were published in and about the field. Also in 1995, Snell-Hornby created an international dialogue that positioned Translation Studies as an independent discipline. Since then, other scholars have adopted a rather eclectic interpretation of translation theories. In his article "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites: The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm," André Lefevere provided some insight about the subversive aspect of translations. In his view, any sort of rewriting of literature could have the potential to recreate the locus of the original text as long as it altered the

text to the bare minimum. By constantly redirecting its content to the original text, the translation would free itself from possible constraints of meaning. Most recently, Mary Snell-Hornby has disclaimed the overall understanding that classified and categorized translation into different disciplines or sub-disciplines. Instead, she advocates for a partial disassociation of Translation Studies from other disciplines. Although she does not entirely negate a relationship between translation and other fields, her holistic approach to translation renounces any kind of milieu that triggers an association between translation and other disciplines. In the section "Translation as an independent discipline" of her book *Translation Studies –An Integrated Approach*, Snell-Hornby contends that translation is often used as a vehicle to just teach languages. In her opinion, the recurrent subscription of translation to the field of linguistics, literature and communication has resulted in most translation theorists having a non-solidified and ever-expanded notion of the term.

1.5 Translation Studies and Modern and Postmodern Translation Theories

The most prominent contemporary scholars who have contributed to building the field of Translation Studies are A. K. Ramanujan, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Talal Asad, Eva Hoffman, Gregory Rabassa, Suzanne Jill Levine, Ted Hughes, Douglas Robinson, Lawrence Venuti, Susan Bassnett, John Felstiner, Edwin Morgan, and Seamus Heaney. For each of them, the definition of translation differs slightly. In his essay "On Translating a Tamil Poem," the poet and translator A. K. Ramanujan defined translations as "transpositions, re-enactments, interpretations. Some elements of the original cannot be transposed at all. … The translation must not only represent, but *re*-present, the original" (230). Spivak problematized the act of translation in her 1992 article "The Politics of Translation." In her view, translation could

potentially become a powerful resource that could shackle the very foundations of the rhetoric of any language. According to Joyce Tolliver, in "Rosalía between Two Shores: Gender, Rewriting and Translation," "the transposition of a text into the language of global dominance carries … an ideological weight that cannot be ignored" (33). This statement goes hand in hand with the opinions of prominent scholars such as Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, André Lefevere, Susan Bassnett, Robert de Beaugrande, among others.

Metaphors regarding the invasive nature of translation started to develop in the 1920s and 1930s, but gained more strength when Walter Benjamin compared translation to construction work in his essay "The Translator's Task" in 1922. Many other analogies followed that compared the translation act to "terrorism, archeology, contact zone, [and] oppressive power relations" (Balmer 222). The disruption of the original language was perceived as a subversive tool that attacked prevalent ideologies and unveiled the voice of the suppressed other. *If This Be Treason* (2005) is based upon Gregory Rabassa's and other translators' experiences, reflections, and anecdotes about translation. For Rabassa, himself an acclaimed American translator of Latin American literature, the role of the translator is first and foremost a writer, an artist, who instinctively pursues the closest approximation to the original text. In her 2009 book, *The Subversive Scribe,* Suzanne Jill Levine delves further into the translation of Latin American fiction and writes about the excessive attention that has been paid to the translation of poetic texts.[10] According to Levine, the works of Latin American writers shine for their level of complexity and encounter many obstacles if translated into another language.[11]

---

[10] Many writers devoted themselves to writing about the difficulties of translating poetry. During the 1950s and 1960s a movement called "ethnopoetics" established a relationship between poetry, anthropology, ethnography, and linguistics.

[11] Addressing the many caveats in the process of translation of Latin American texts is a subject that needs further exploration and clarification in the field of Translation Studies.

More studies about the nature of translation emerged in the twentieth century thanks to the relentless efforts of a group of scholars. Douglas Robinson created the term "Western Translatology" to refer to the translation of Western texts in his article "The Ascetic Foundations of Western Translatology: Jerome and Augustine." With this term, Robinson wanted to resituate the beginning of Translation Studies within the boundaries of Christian antiquity because, in his view, Roman modes of translation and theory were "unfocused [,] difficult to read … without impatience; it is too casual, too free-spirited, too willing to give the translator free rein … for us to take it seriously" (3). American translation theorist and translator of Italian, French, and Catalan, Lawrence Venuti has brought more awareness to translation as a practice and the discipline of Translation Studies through his multiple publications. What Venuti calls the violence of translation is the forcible application of one text/culture upon another and an act that creates a radical change in the perception of the readers' reality. This process forces readers to explore and question the hegemonic world that surrounds them (see Venuti *Invisibility*). Having published over twenty books about translation, the theorist, translator, scholar, and founder of the Center for Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies Susan Bassnett has also established herself as another figure of towering reputation in the field of Translation Studies; a field that she "situates … in the center rather than on the fringe of comparative literature" (558). Her book *Translation Studies* (1980) was "reprinted six times since, this book set out to describe a new field, and has provided Translation Studies with much of its impetus and pedagogical direction over the last three decades" (British Council). Besides making endless contributions to the field of Translation Studies, Bassnett has also greatly contributed to the translation of theater and opera texts.

The theoretical framework of Translation Studies continues to be fruitful during the twentieth century. Although Pound's translation methods drew a lot of attention in the twentieth century, the most cited author in essays about translation to this day is the German philosopher Walter Benjamin, who, in his introduction to Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens* wrote what became the most important essay in Translation Studies. In the 2009 MLA convention session about Translation Studies, most of its presenters often referred to Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator" (1923). Another essay deemed influential for Translation Studies is James McFarlane's "Modes of Translating" (1953) because it "raised the level of the discussion of translation in English" (Bassnett, *Translation Studies* 79). This essay has been credited for being the "first publication in the West to deal with translation and translation from a modern, interdisciplinary view and to set out a program of research for scholars concerned with them as an object of study" (Bassnett and Munday 73-77).

The main writers about the theory, practice and history of translation have always been translators themselves. Peter France, for instance, declared that "until quite recently, with few exceptions, [the theory of translation] was the work of *practitioners,* some of the eminent ones. Many of the most famous texts are not so much academic treatises as short personal statements" (qtd. in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 6). Most of these translators have solidified their work by constantly engaging into a public examination about their translation practices. Translation Studies would not be the same without the voices of these translators. Sometimes and, due to editorial constraints, translators are not given the chance to explain themselves, and their task becomes invisible to the reader. This invisibility creates a false sense of "transparency," and that seemingly conceals the ideology and mediation embodied in the translator, as Venuti has argued.

Invisibility needs to be resisted by both translators and readers, to raise the status of translation and to recognize the theories and products of translators (See Venuti *Invisibility*).

1.6 The Ethos of the Translator: Problematizing the Work of Translation as Global

Translators dwell in a negotiating – and multifaceted – realm. Not only do they have to find a middle ground between their own beliefs and their editor's demands, but they also need to be able to reevaluate some of their core beliefs and compromise their ideas with the content of the original text. They are creating a new text, but it relies upon the original as well as must stand on its own. Within this semantic space, translators consolidate their position as the primary negotiators of meaning. Before starting the translation process they need to consider their audience and make sure that they are appealing to their taste. This kind of visualization is almost identical to that of orators wishing to persuade an audience and needing to understand both the subject and the audience to craft the right words. Both translators and rhetoricians have the need to construct ethos – the authority, credibility, and character necessary for readers to believe, trust, and hold them in esteem.

Reflecting on translators' tasks has become another topic in Translation Studies. Sometimes this task is delineated by translators' themselves, while other times we find it in translation manuals or stated by theorists in academic publications. "The Rhetoric of Translation," published in *The Modern Language Review*, in its 100 year anniversary issue in 2005, defines the translator's task as "a new form which can do justice to the material, transporting (translating) it so as to bring it home to a more or less clearly defined public, deploying what Barthes would have called the "codes" that govern discourse in a given society" (255). The bulk of historic texts on translation can be characterized as manuals, guides, and

prescriptive texts that instruct translators on how to practice the art. The scope of translators' tasks has been defined ever since the advent of printing in the fifteenth century when Dolet, Chapman, and Tytler delineated three dominant approaches to the role of translators. In the aforementioned section, one of the first theorists who problematized the nature of translators' work was Étienne Dolet, who, in his *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, sets forth five principles that any translator should follow to remain faithful to the original. In "Epistle to the Reader of the Iliad" (1598) George Chapman follows Dolet's systematic depiction of the role of the translator by creating himself another series of precepts that mark the work of a good translator. For Chapman, translators must:

1. Avoid word for word renderings.

2. Attempt to reach the spirit of the original.

3. Avoid overloose translations, by basing the translation on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses. (qtd. in Bassnett and McGuire 55)

Almost three years later and in his landmark study "Essay on the Principles of Translation," Tytler categorized this task as a duty that attended to "the sense and the spirit of his original, to make himself perfectly master of his author's ideas, and to communicate them in those expressions which he judges to be best suited to convey them" (7). Dolet's, Chapman's and Tytler's perception of translators' tasks and duties do no not constitute isolated examples about principles of translation and translation practices. In most introductions to the translations of canonical texts, translators are given the opportunity to reveal the hurdles of their work and usually include sections where they elaborate upon some of the choices they made during the process. Though the series of justifications translators provide in these prefaces and/or

introductions are not prescriptive in nature, their remarks about their translation process should also be considered part of the translation canon.[12]

The problem of translation is most glaring in the semantic and stylistic choices that could alter the function of the original text. Some of the semantic variations of the text most translators have categorized as problematic are humor, idiomatic expressions, slang, dialect, sarcasm, and the rendition of poetry in the original. Among the syntactic complexities that could hinder the translation process translators have identified incredibly long sentence structures, an inordinate amount of fragments, excessive punctuation or lack of thereof, and the inclusion of foreign words in the original. Most translation style guides and textbooks provide solutions to some of these problems although, practically speaking, it is ultimately up to the translator to resolve the conflict at hand. Coming to terms with the finality of their work is yet another area of struggle for most translators. Literary translator Ros Schwartz explains that translators need to approach the text with a specific mindset and recognize that there is always room for improvement.

> In an ideal world, a translation is the result of a constructive collaboration between publisher, translator, editor and sometimes the author too. Translation is a solitary profession and translators can be prickly about criticism. We need to be receptive to feedback and recognize that a translation can always be improved, and often a second pair of eyes is invaluable. (qtd. in Paul 39-40)

The issue of "untranslatability," as indicated by J.C. Catford has become another area of discussion in Translation Studies. For Catford, the first problem surrounding translation is

[12] In contemporary publications, the tendency is to include the name of the translator either at the beginning or at the end of the work. Translators no longer have the option to justify their options and position as mediators of both texts.

linguistic – either at a semantic or a syntactic level. She refers to the second problem as cultural because it entails a lack of culture in the target text, one that cannot be reproduced because it does not exist in the target language. To Peter Bush, the problem stems from the difficulty of reproducing a translation that is based on the knowledge and the lore of the target culture. Thus, the concept of untranslatability is directly linked to the translators' choices: "A translator creates a new pattern in a different language, based on personal reading, research and creativity" (qtd. in Baker 129). In 2008, Ros Schwartz and Nicholas de Lange wrote an article that contributed to the volume *Translator as Writer*, edited by Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. In "A Dialogue: on a Translator's Interventions" Schwartz and de Lange concur with Bush in that translation choices are based upon a journey that encompasses a search within the translator's voice. They also offer practical advice to translators as a path to finding the voice in the process: "The translation has to be cohesive and coherent. … Your translation is your reading of the author. Your choices are inevitably going to be subjective, your vocabulary is a personal vocabulary" (10-11).

Another question that looms on the horizon of Translation Studies ponders the matter of re-translating– mainly mainstream or canonical texts – and matters that classify a translation as acceptable or disclaim it as unworthy. In "Philosophical Translation and Untranslatability: Translation as Critical," Emily Apter pinpoints one possible reason why texts are retranslated: "[T]he general rule seems to be that the greater the time lag between a text's original publication and its translation, the greater the chance the text will be misread or creatively recontextualized" (52). According to Hjelmslev, in the transition between two languages, a translation is considered satisfactory when "given two different forms of expression, it is possible to identify the same continuum or purport of the content" (Eco, *Experiences* 86). Multiple translators have stated their opinion regarding these issues, one of them being Burton Raffel, translator of *Don*

Quixote and other canonical books such as *Beowulf* and *The Canterbury Tales*. Raffel enforces a fairly strict policy when it comes to retranslating texts, "I don't want to do the 150th recording of Beethoven's 'Third Piano Concerto.' If there are 149, that's enough. There are still plenty of great works in other languages that have never been translated" ("The Art of Translation").

Translators of retranslated texts always seem to find a *raison d'être* for their work. Edith Grossman, who published a new version in English of *Don Quixote* in 2003, announced in the introduction to her translation that she opted not to read other translations of *Don Quixote* to prevent unnecessary interferences with her own work. Many translators ask themselves the same question. Why should they bother to retranslate classical texts when they have already been rendered multiple times? For some translators the act of retranslating constitutes an opportunity to recreate the text through another angle. This lack of authorship poses both a challenge and a tremendous opportunity to modify the social and textual status quo for these classical translators. Baker notes that "there is not only no author to dictate. Often, there is no information at all to be had about the author, let alone about the circumstances of the work's composition" (185). Given the scarcity of contextual information, translators need to patch up these holes and partly rely on the work of previous scholars.

As to what constitutes a bad translation, scholars such as Gill Paul have argued that at times the work of the editor can come in handy in time to save the translator's work: "If a book has been translated accurately but lacks the magic that was integral to the original, then it may be possible to salvage the text by introducing a prose style or a very good English editor" (69). In "The Translator's Task," Benjamin recognizes the value of translation by describing its purposefulness in the world. He also defines a bad translation as "any translation which intends to perform a transmitting function [but] cannot transmit anything but information [,]" and one

that provides an "inexact transmission of an inessential content" (70-71). Renderings of translations that were considered controversial and unfitting in some cultures resulted in dire consequences for translators. For example, in the sixteenth century, Étienne Dolet "was burned at the stake for adding in his translation of one of Plato's dialogues the phrase 'rien du tout' 'nothing at all', in a passage about what existed after death" (Munday 22). We faultily believe that we have come far from the years that stigmatized translators' work and emphasized the pointlessness of translation. Though scholars like Octavio Paz acknowledged that an original text could never be reduplicated, he proposed a counter argument for all of translation disparagers. He wrote:

> Every text is unique, at the same time, it is a translation of another text. No text is entirely original because language itself, in its essence, is already a translation: firstly, of the non-verbal world and secondly, since every sign and every phrase is the translation of another sign and another phrase. However, this argument can be turned around without losing any of its validity: all texts are original because every translation is distinctive. Every translation, up to a certain point, is an inversion and as such it constitutes a unique text. (qtd. in Bassnett, *Translation Studies* 38)

Some critics classify translation as tautological in nature. Their condemnatory remarks about translation continue to hurt the discipline and what it accounts for. In his recent book, *Is That a Fish in Your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything* (2011), David Bellos provides specific examples that address the reluctance that most people feel towards translation. A mostly universal consensus about translation is that it cannot replace the original or, as Bellos puts it, "translation is no substitute for the original." What Bellos goes on to argue is that, if it

were not for translation, people would not be able to read untranslated works because they do not speak the language of the original. He furthers this statement by saying that "people who declare translations to be no substitute for the original imply that they possess the means to recognize and appreciate the real thing, that is to say, original composition as opposed to translation. Without this ability they could not "possibly make the claim that they do" (Bellos, Kindle, section 5758).

On November 22, 2008, on the National Public Radio Program "All Things Considered," Rick Kleffel discussed "The Art of Translation" and how much it is part of popular culture, even as it is underappreciated:

> Living in America, it's easy to forget that most of the world does not speak English; and that much of the world's literature is not written in English. In order for us to read the best of what the rest of the world writes – and in order for the rest of the world to experience our best literature – skilled writers work in the art of translation. ("The Art of Translation")

Kleffel's opinions, and the evidence he provided with his interviews of practicing translators, resonates with Bellos's views of translation. Considering that there are over six thousand languages in the world, how many cultures are unknown to us because their works have never been translated into modern languages? Published in 2010, *Why Translation Matters* by Edith Grossman is another New Millennium attempt to revalidate translation and save it from oblivion and misunderstanding, much as rhetoric and composition needed rescuing in the twentieth century. Grossman's compelling appeal towards that validation becomes clear from the beginning of her work:

> Translation expands our ability to explore through literature the thoughts and feelings of people from another society or another time. It permits us to savor the transformation of the foreign into the familiar and for a brief time to live outside of our skins. It expands and deepens our world, our consciousness, in countless, indescribable ways. (Grossman, Kindle, section 191)

Translation not only expands our constricted perspective on the world, it also enhances our lore by uncovering blind spots of our perception. It makes us feel like we belong to a dimension other than our own. It creates an ulterior world of wisdom and creativity by deterritorializing our preconceived notions of reality. When reading these translated texts, our national identity crosses cultural boundaries among domestic audiences without even having to travel abroad.

Octavio Paz, in "Translation: Literature and Letters," aptly noted that "thanks to translation, we become aware that our neighbors do not speak and think as we do" (qtd. in Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 154). By fostering and instilling translating values into the rhetorical equation, we might be able to expand the horizons of students who, otherwise, would remain blindfolded about translation and what translation entails. Exploring the far-reaching effects of translated texts through a rhetorical and a translating lens could potentially alter the way students read and perceive them. What this critical reading exercise proposed in this work aims to achieve is threefold: First, it attempts to ensure an ethic of sameness between two fields; second, to establish a connection between the reader and the translated text; and third, to allow the reader to become a global citizen through the attainment of a *Transglobal Literacy*.

This chapter has provided a history of translation theory as it developed from a practice within the rhetorical tradition, and as it branched into the inter-disciplinary field known as Translation Studies. I have explored the ways that translators and orators, or rhetoricians,

mediate language, and thus shape communication. I showed connections between rhetorical theory and translation theories. Chapter Two examines the teaching of writing, and how translation was integral to the success of that pedagogy. It will draw noticeably on the history that led translation and rhetoric to coalesce at one point within the history of rhetorical education.

2 TEACHING WRITING, TRANSLATING WRITING: TRANSLATION AS A WRITING PRACTICE IN THE RHETORICAL TRADITION

Thou are Translated. – William Shakespeare

Since its inception, rhetoric has wielded enormous influence in the history of human discourse and encompassed a myriad of definitions that cannot be estranged from one another. In the general Introduction to *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg catalogue numerous definitions of rhetoric in a list:

> [T]he practice of oratory; the study of strategies of effective oratory; the use of language, written or spoken, to inform or persuade; the study of the persuasive effects of language; the study of the relation between language and knowledge; the classification and use of tropes and figures and the empty promises and half-truths as a form of propaganda. (i)

Disclaiming the importance of rhetoric in the modern world would be shortsighted; yet many people still fail to understand the importance of rhetoric in everyday life and education, and continue to adhere its meaning to some sort of derogatory and often political agenda. Sometimes rhetoric becomes a label to describe patterns of organization, rather than a means to invent argument and create knowledge.

Among all the possible definitions of rhetoric, the one that most relates to my work is one that I recently heard from James J. Murphy himself at the "Blending of Disciplines: Rhetoric and the Social Sciences" conference at Emory University on March 19, 2012, who called rhetoric "the art of future discourse." I wholeheartedly subscribe to this definition for the following reasons: If we opt to consider rhetoric as a yet unspoken and unwritten art, we could probably let loose its denotative and connotative meaning and come to terms with the fact of reimagining and reconceptualizing the concept. As relentless users of rhetoric, it is our duty to re/define it without subscribing it to any ontological and/or metaphysical constraints. This "art of future discourse" may describe both rhetorical practices and the act of translating a text. It also fits, and expands, definitions of rhetoric beginning with Greek and Roman sources by bringing light to the conceptualization of translation practices and pedagogies in the history of rhetoric. About the history and practices of translation, Baker has noted that "from the Greco-Roman period through the Reformation and up to the modern era, [this history] has been told in many ways" (102). The emphasis on the historiography of the teaching of writing from a rhetorical standpoint has also been dissected by translation theorists mentioned in my introduction.[13] My aim in this chapter is to bring transparency to how translation played a significant role in the teaching of rhetorical practices and to explore the far-reaching effects and the historiography of these practices.

2.1 Origins of Translation Theory in the History of Rhetoric

In the fourth century BCE in Athens, Greece, rhetoric found its way through society and was used in a curriculum based on edification. In *The History and Theory of Rhetoric*, a text that introduces students to the study of rhetoric, James Herrick reveals how the education of both the

[13] A complete list of works that relate translation to rhetoric can be found in Appendix E.

mind and body were imperative in the Greek didactic system. Debra Hawhee has also explored the connection to training the body and mind in the wrestling schools, *palaestra*, in Athens, where Sophists taught rhetoric in public gymnasiums to adolescent boys (143-44). Young pupils were instructed in "studies that provided moral strength to the soul – mainly music and literature – and gymnastics that strengthen the body" (Herrick 33). Greek education began at home. Older adolescents often chose to continue their education by working with Sophists, who were *metics,* or foreigners to Athens who did not have citizen rights but could pay a fee to be residents. They taught rhetoric, often under the patronage of prominent citizens. Other options included the wrestling schools, and also the schools run by Plato, Isocrates, and then later by Aristotle. These academies taught rhetoric and philosophy, among other topics. Other educational opportunities included symposia, or drinking parties, where participants would compete with one another in delivering lines of poetry or speeches (see Bizzell and Herzberg; Enos; Hawhee; Kennedy; Murphy).

During these sessions, mentors and instructors used *progymnasmata*, or a series of sequenced exercises through which "students typically developed skills in composing narratives, fables, rudimentary issues and points of law, and argumentation" (Enos 23). The *progymnasmata* developed into a handbook tradition for teaching rhetoric that grew in popularity and became the standard from the Hellenistic Age through the Middle Ages.[14] The *progymnasmata* also led to a more sophisticated advanced writing instruction known as *meletes* which coincided with what the Romans would later call *declamatio* (Enos 23), and which, Enos argues, shifted the perception of rhetoric itself, as it connected rhetoric to literature (28).

---

[14] A modified and much modernized version of the *progymnasmata* would also be employed in the eighteenth and the nineteenth century as a means of learning a second language (France 256).

Learning through imitation was common in the Sophistic schoolroom. With these imitative exercises, the Sophists often compelled their students to memorize and write passages and/or speeches from a variety of sources (Herrick 37). In "Aspasia: Rhetoric, Gender, and Colonial Ideology" Susan Jarratt and Rory Ong note that these speeches

> were generated out of common materials arranged with some spontaneity for the occasion and purpose at hand. To prepare for performance, small seminar-type groups of students working with an accomplished rhetorician would listen to and memorize speeches composed by their teacher and would practice composing and delivering speeches among themselves. (16)

The exact and precise deliberation of this artifice would also be employed by the Romans in the form of a selection of exercises, one of which required the translation of texts from one language into another to ensure that students reflected upon the intricacies of both languages and improved their oratorical and writing abilities (Murphy, *Writing Instruction* 55).

Greek Rhetoric emphasized excellence and virtue, *arête*, as well as *dissoi logoi,* the ability to argue both sides of a case, or the ability to understand multiple perspectives of an issue, and to recognize cultural differences (Herrick; Kennedy). Writing instruction for the Greeks constituted a viable way of improving oratorical activity. As a matter of fact, for Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates "writing moved beyond a recording device to become an instrument that freed them and their students into the higher levels of abstract thought and expression" (Enos 34). Through the constant effort of these three rhetoricians, classical rhetoric was on its way to what George Kennedy named *letteraturizzazinone.* At a broader level, this coined term applies oral rhetoric to writing. As Murphy explains, primary rhetoric is oral and secondary rhetoric is written discourse, so *letteraturizzazinone* describes that movement from primary to secondary

rhetoric (301). Kennedy further expands the definition of the term by describing it as a "tendency of rhetoric to shift focus from persuasion and narration, from civic to personal contexts, and from speech to literature, including poetry" (Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, Kindle, section 85). This shifting came about because of writing. As Enos asserts, Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle "were so proficient with writing that they were able to apply that system to higher-level problems" (34). Their theories and their schools created the basis for teaching rhetoric in the following historical periods, particularly influencing Cicero's Roman rhetoric, and the teaching of writing and reading in the Middle Ages. These aspects create connections with translation theory as well as rhetorical education.

2.2 Roman Rhetoric: Translation in Roman Schools

Though the Romans inherited and adopted most of their knowledge on rhetorical training from the Greeks, they did not settle for the Greek heuristic system. In their relentless search for taxonomic procedures, the Romans created a methodical approximation for the study of rhetoric. In *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula describe Roman schools as extremely successful, "replicable, exportable, and portable" spaces. Over time, these institutions "became instruments of imperial power: the schools followed the soldiers, Latinizing the conquered peoples of Europe and Asia" (Kindle, section 5299). From 300 BCE to 500 CE rhetorical training was fully integrated in the classroom setting. During these sessions, students were required to memorize a series of declamatory exercises and recite sections of discourses. A concept that the Romans borrowed heavily from the Greeks and used as part of

students' rhetorical training was *Imitatio* or *Mimesis*.[15] Of the seven steps that encompassed *Imitatio* (Reading Aloud or *lectio*, analysis of the text or *praelectio*, memorization of models, paraphrase of models, transliteration of models, recitation of paraphrase or transliteration, and correction of paraphrase or transliteration) translation became an instrument that facilitated one of these steps (Murphy, *Short History* 55-60). In the implementation of the transliteration of models, students were to be bilingual as this exercise required them to translate at a higher proficiency. Using this sophisticated technique students had to translate "from Greek to Latin verse; recasting Latin prose to Latin verse; re-casting Latin prose to Greek verse, or vice versa; making the model shorter, or longer, whether in verse or prose; altering the style from plain to grand or vice versa" (Murphy, *Short History* 59). To reach the level of writing prowess required in these schools, the Roman pleader and instructor Quintilian recommended the "translation from Greek, paraphrase of various kinds, theses, proofs and refutations, commonplaces, declamations, history, dialogues, and even (for amusement) verse" (Murphy, *Short History* 118).

It was believed that to achieve an outstanding level of proficiency in the declamatory style, students needed to master grammatical structures. For the Romans, grammar was studied in two languages: Greek and Latin. The best educated Romans traveled to Greece to study, and were fluent in both Greek and Latin and in the writing and reading of both languages. Hence, "translation was a practice common to both disciplines: in grammatical study it was an exercise;

[15] Plato mentions in *Protagoras* how students had to memorize the classics and imitate and recreate the morals of the worthy individuals portrayed in these books: "And when the boy has learned his letters and is beginning to understand what is written, as before he understood only what was spoken, they put into his hands the works of great poets, which he reads sitting on a bench at school; in these are contained many admonitions, and many tales, and praises, and encomia of ancient famous men, which he is required to learn by heart, in order that he may imitate or emulate them and desire to become like them" (Plato).

in rhetorical study it was considered both an exercise an art form" (Copeland 9). The large Roman Empire required administration that relied on writing, for legislation, legal cases, politics, and commerce, as well as writing for pleasure, as publishing and the collection of manuscripts and the formation of public and private libraries created a demand for written texts. Longinus' treatise *On the Sublime* is often referred to as the work that marks a shift in the conversion from orality to writing. In "The Reader in History: the Changing Shape of Literary Response," Jane Tompkins points out that this book is the first one to ever address the need to know how to write effectively as a means of attaining political greatness. The text also connected rhetoric and poetics, and included excerpts of poetry and speeches that exist in no other source, thus preserving examples of greatness that influenced Medieval and Renaissance rhetorical education. The elaborate memory schemes described in Roman rhetorical handbooks also influenced medieval rhetoric, pointing to a continuing need for reciting and writing from memory. But the works that influenced the medieval period the most were those by the Romans, who were the first to discuss translation as part of writing instruction.

Horacian principles about rhetorical pedagogy resonate with those of Cicero in that both authors see teaching translation as an imitative model and "tell their readers not to rework foreign texts in Latin word for word" (Baker 161). Following Cicero's lead, Quintilian also favors the use of translation exercises as part of the grammar school curriculum. In Book 10 of *Institutio* Oratoria, Quintilian also insisted on the importance of using *Imitatio* as a technique to improve rhetorical composition. From the Roman time period through the Renaissance, readers generally knew both the source text and the translated one, so for them, translation was, as Bassnett emphasizes "an exercise in comparative stylistics," since the content could be

comprehended in either language (52). Translation exercises were employed in the Byzantine period by professors of law, also known as *antikisores*, who

> used to make Latin texts accessible to their students in class by providing a detailed intro in Greek to the particular Latin section of a given law. This was not a word for word translation but a general explanation of the law. Students were asked to attempt a translation of the Latin texts. This was known as interpreting *Kata Poda*. (Baker and Saldanha xvii)

Translation in Roman Schools belonged to the rhetorical curriculum and wielded power in producing individuals who gained extraordinary command of their language.

2.3 The Influence of Classical Rhetoric and Teaching Translation in the Middle Ages

During this time, classical rhetoric turned into "the *trivium* in medieval schools, … became a dominant force in English education in the Renaissance and remained a prominent part of the curriculum until the first quarter of the nineteenth century" (Corbett 166-7). Some of these writing instruction methods were delineated by John of Salisbury and included "microscopic analysis of texts studied, imitation, paraphrase, and transliteration of what was read" (Lanham 86). Ciceronian precepts of rhetoric along with translating exercises based on imitation permeated the nature and scope of scholastic practices in the Middle Ages. By the end of the twelfth century, many universities opened their doors for the first time to students, and classical learning constituted the foundation of their medieval curriculum. Classes were taught entirely in Latin with two different methods of teaching: the *lectio,* in which a teacher gave an extensive lecture about a specific subject, and the *disputation*, a practice that required both teacher and students to question and justify a number of syllogisms. In their book *Classical Rhetoric for the*

Modern Student, Edward Corbett and Robert Connors point out that even though Medieval pedagogy appropriated Ciceronian rhetoric, it also draws attention to the study of grammar concepts such as style and arrangement. Translation, like rhetoric, "extended itself with greater or lesser force far beyond the classroom, for [both] skills were supposed to be applied everywhere" (Ong qtd. in Gaillet and Horner, Kindle, section 241). In the twelfth century in Spain in the Toledo School, for instance, translators "made the learning of the East available to the West by inverse translations of Arabic and Hebrew texts, influenced by Greek, Syrian, Persian, and Indian scholars" (Baker and Saldanha 65). Translation in some of those schools continued to be seen as a way to explore and analyze the intricacies of ancient texts. As a matter of fact, Carmen Benito-Vessels explains that the relationship between rhetoric and translation as exegesis existed from classical antiquity to the Middle Ages:

> El estrecho vínculo que se había establecido en la época latina entre gramática, retórica, traducción y exégesis no se pierde de inmediato en la Edad Media castellana y es particularmente obvio en los textos de carácter religioso. La tradición retórica latina continuó en toda la Edad Media. (207-8)[16]

In school, some of the exercises required young boys to write epistles to fictional people to enhance their creative minds. Corbett and Connors also indicate that Horace's *Ars Poetica*, Donatus' *Barbarismus,* and Book 4 of *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* became the preferred texts in the schoolroom. With these treatises, teachers ensured that students reached the level of grammar and literary competency required by the curriculum. Corbett and Connors go on to say that

[16] "The close links that had been established during the Roman era between grammar, rhetoric, translation and exegesis are not lost immediately in the Middle Ages in Spanish, and this is particularly obvious in the religious texts. The Latin rhetorical tradition continued throughout the Middle Ages" (My translation).

> since the 1st century, some of the more elementary principles of rhetoric were taught side by side with the principles of literary composition that were handled by grammarians, and a text like Horace … could be made useful to the study of either discipline. [*Ars Poetica*] could be joined in common pedagogical purpose with Donatus' *Barbarismus,* a grammatical text discussing figures, tropes, and their correct and incorrect language. (471)

At the heart of Medieval education, grammar maintained a prescriptive status. The art of letter writing was taken a step forward in the form of Artes Dictamini (or Dictandi), which engaged students in the creation of formal letters and documents. The art of letter writing was threefold: first, it was the *consolation* or a letter expressing mourning; second, the "deliberative" letter, which was designed to persuade and that resembled formal modes of speech; third, the familiar letter, which would later be used in books of decorum. These series of exercises not only entailed the students' participation, but were also designed to practice grammatical structures. The medieval curriculum structure hovered between prescriptivism and Ciceronianism.

2.4 Rhetorical Education, Translation, and Writing in the Renaissance

The main purpose of the rhetorical education in the Renaissance was to instruct students in reading and writing. To further this previous statement, James Herrick has noted that "rhetoric flourished in the Renaissance as a method of instruction in writing and persuasion, an avenue to personal refinement, a means of managing the intricacies of civic and commercial interest, and a critical tool for studying a variety of literary texts both ancient and contemporary" (147). Herrick goes on to say that between the fourteenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century "more than 2,500 books on rhetoric appeared in Europe" (147). In fact, two of the most eminent

manuscripts that ignited Renaissance rhetoric – and unknown during the Middle Ages – were discovered during this revival of art and literature by humanists: Two speeches by Cicero and the complete text of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria.* Reading books of rhetoric became an active practice among individuals in the Renaissance. With the arrival of these books, new doctrines from Greek rhetoric were translated into the vernacular; hence, granting access to a brand new audience who had never been exposed to these works. References of translation practices to attain rhetorical dexterity were found in the works of Quintilian, Cicero, and the Younger Pliny, as Tytler pointed out in his "Essay on the Principles of Translation." In addition, a new fascination in formulaic rhetoric instigated the emergence of a new genre that "manifested itself in collections of proverbs, aphorisms, and sententiae, compendia of sample letters, poetic anthologies, and dictionaries of quotations" (678). Along with a burgeoning interest in rhetoric, all kinds of punctuation marks also "found their way into the new science of vernacular grammar: colon, comma, apostrophe, and parenthesis" (Bizzell and Herzberg 8). At the time, Giovanni Battista Bernardi wrote a thesaurus that included definitions of 5,000 plus rhetorical terms. In the classroom, students were required to memorize this new terminology. In the fifteenth century the development of hermeneutical modes of teaching drew special attention to rhetoric. For the Renaissance man, achieving academic rhetorical aptitude constituted a prerequisite for running businesses effectively. A true humanist was supposed to critically decrypt a text and understand the underlying values of its semantic meaning. With the rise of this humanistic thought, a new interest for Greek and Roman rhetoric arose, which would eventually lead to more meaningful ways in changing their prevalent status quo.

Mastering the art of rhetoric ensured a life of political success, and granted access to a tool that bettered the critical understanding of ancient texts. In 1435, the humanist author

Lorenzo Valla developed a new translation technique that was based on dialectical disputations with the ultimate goal of developing the skills of eloquence. In this exercise, students had to produce a list of Latin translations of Platonic dialogues. But Valla's methodology was not the only one to recognize the driving force of rhetorical training. Along with this rhetorical awareness, a myriad of new texts and methodologies created new venues of rhetorical instruction. The first rhetorical manual in the Renaissance is attributed to Trebizond. Written in 1433, *Rhetoricorum Libri V* (*Five Books of Rhetoric*) explored and expanded upon the five Ciceronian canons of rhetoric in depth. In the meantime, rhetoric became a means of enhancing Christian preaching in the Renaissance and an indispensable tool to gaining political mileage. In the Middle Ages, rhetoric was condemned by those Christian priests who subscribed to the Socratic Method.[17] Directly calling into question orthodox understandings of rhetoric, Saint Augustine managed to uplift its status by providing a reinterpretation of rhetoric that suited Christian principles, which was validated by his contemporaries. In essence, he wanted to blend and implement Ciceronian principles of rhetoric through preaching and formal instruction. These powerful rhetorical tools could help preachers understand the Christian message presented in the Bible, and set forth their theological doctrines. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg comment on the multiple ways through which rhetoric adjusted to this new train of thought:

> [A] number of liberal subjects, such as poetry and history, were grouped under rhetoric, on the grounds that they provided various kinds of ornaments for effective writing and speech. Composition took place in Latin and involved the imitation of classical models and exercises. (571)

[17] This method associated rhetoric with empty chatter, a mere form of flattery, and an artifice of persuasion.

In the classroom, the curricular inclusion of rhetoric finally materialized itself. In *Rhetoric*, Peter Dixon synthesizes the basic structure of the curriculum as described by Martianus Capella, the author who devised this new medieval system. The seven liberal arts curriculum comprised a multivariate cluster of classes: "rhetoric, grammar, and dialectic (or logic) composed the *trivium* – literally 'three roads' – the first group of subjects to be mastered. Together with the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy) these made up the seven Liberal Arts. Poetry was assigned sometimes to the care of grammar, sometimes to rhetoric" (46). Once the students were instructed in all of these divisions, they were ready to pursue higher levels of education. In these cathedral schools or universities, teachers gave lectures and organized formal *disputations* through which the students had to argue and analyze all forms of syllogisms. During their university life, students were trained in the art of letter writing, the art of preaching or both. As part of rhetorical training, humanists continued to apply translation methods to expand their students' understanding of their native language. Martin Luther, for instance, "was perhaps the first to assume that the best translations were always into the mother tongue [and] from the 16th century on, inverse translation began to be regarded only as a pedagogical exercise by translation theorists" (Baker and Saldanha 65).

In the English tradition, rhetoric took a turn for the better when a large body of criticism and theory furthered the integration and understanding of rhetorical practices. Written by the philosopher and Dutch humanist Rodolphus Agricola, *De Inventione Dialectica* (1515) was the first manual to detach rhetoric from the dialectical realm. In his model, Agricola assigned invention to dialectic and style to rhetoric. In short, rhetoric was applied to any form of teaching that pertained to the ornamentation of speech. Many texts surfaced immediately after the influential publication of Agricola's text. With an emphasis on invention, Leonard Cox's *The Art*

or Craft of Rhetoryke (1530) is often referred to as the first manual of rhetoric published in English. Shortly after the publication of Cox's manuscript, Thomas Wilson examined the five canons of rhetoric in *The Art of Rhetorike* (1553). Other books of rhetoric followed with the clear intention of repositioning the usefulness of rhetoric as a stylistic device in their culture. Some of these titles include Richard Rainolde's *Foundation of Rhetoric* (1563), Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* (1570), and Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577). *On an Abundant Style* by Erasmus of Rotterdam became so widely used that over 150 editions appeared in the sixteenth century. Despite the surge of publications about rhetoric in the Renaissance, there are no records of books that either explored the relationship between rhetoric and translation or that provided a complete history of rhetoric.

Scholasticism remained the basis of the Renaissance curriculum in the 1600s. English Grammar Schools were created to teach humanistic beliefs. Upper levels of Grammar Schools integrated classes in the arts and sciences and predominantly focused on training students in composition, literature and rhetoric. Within the arts subdivision, rhetoric continued to play a crucial role in the development of this body of students. The arts were composed of

> logic and ethics: both contributed to rhetoric, essentially in the art of style. A number of liberal arts subjects, such as poetry and history, were grouped under rhetoric, on the grounds that they provided various kinds of ornaments for effective writing and speech. Composition took place in Latin and involved the imitation of classical models and exercises on set topics such as whether Caesar was justly put to death (Bizzell and Herzberg 571).

While proficiency in Latin was required to follow the lectures, in England some of the composition classes were taught in the vernacular. Following authors from the Roman period,

like Cicero, Renaissance writers supported imitative methods of instruction that incorporated translation exercises because it was believed that through this mechanical or drilling act, individuals improved their writing skills.

With the publication of *Dialectique* (1555) by Petrus Ramus, the emphasis was placed on dialectical analysis of texts and slightly less on delivery. While Ramus expanded the definition of rhetoric, his conception was not that far off from that of his predecessor, Agricola. For Ramus, "grammar was restricted to matters of syntax and etymology and rhetoric to style and delivery [.] Most important, however, he restricted the study of invention and arrangement to dialectic, and insisted that they not be considered in any way part of rhetoric" (129). The application of exploratory methods and a thorough analysis of the text led to a more logical understanding of its content. In Cambridge, Spenser, Green and Sidney subscribed to Ramists' beliefs and made an impression on the work of subsequent authors such as Gabriel Harvey. While Harvey's pedagogical approach resembled those of the Ramists, he placed more emphasis on teaching vernacular rhetoric. His doctrine was twofold: on the one hand it was meant to be "a process of analysis, or critical reading, followed by genesis, the complementary process of composition. [On the other,] it laid out the basis of an analysis concerned with the close examination of texts [and] the study of the ways in which authors achieve their effects" (Dixon 47). In spite of a large body of scholars who supported Ciceronianism, a few authors still remained skeptical about the application of his methods. In *An Apology for Poetry, or the Defense of Poetry* (1595), Sir Phillip Sidney opposed Ciceronian principles when he provided equal consideration to eloquence and sagacity. Sidney's methodology did not rely on eloquence alone, but on teaching students different composition procedures to broaden their understanding of any subject matter. During

these sessions, students composed a declamation and a *chria*, which was a short oration with a moral.

2.5 The Teaching of Writing in the Enlightenment

By the middle of the seventeenth century, colleges were founded in many European cities mainly due to the relentless effort of the Jesuits. At the core of these institutions, students were to master the art of "elocution both in oratory and in poetry and that the instruction be based on the triumvirate composed by Cicero, Aristotle, and Quintilian" (Corbett and Connors 471). Along with these canonical volumes, the Jesuits used textbooks written by other members in their order. With a Christian audience in mind, Cypriano Soares wrote *De Arte Rhetorica*, a textbook that conveyed the precepts of the classical rhetorical tradition in a manageable and approachable manner for his students. Overall, the Jesuits created a curriculum that revolved around the instruction of classical rhetoric to enhance their students' prose and oral discourse. A formal education was exclusively available to male students; teaching rhetoric to women was extraneous because they were not allowed to speak publicly like their male counterparts. With a clear emphasis on style, rhetorical practices found strength in the hands of the Jesuits who made it regain its credibility. In 1622, John Brinsley developed an instructional curriculum that aimed to teach students how to write "quickly." Part of Brinsley's pedagogy was based upon the premise that in order to write well in English, students needed to read and write in the classical languages:

> Writing English was closely connected with study of the classical languages, and with oral performance. Translation, imitation of models, reading aloud, copying

> dictated material and printed texts, and recitation both catechetical and disputational were standard classroom activities. (Murphy, *Short History* 216)

Prior to the Renaissance and after the fall of the Roman Empire, the presence of the study of rhetoric in the curriculum was scarce. In that regard, James Herrick claims that "rhetoric flourished in the Renaissance as a method of instruction in writing and persuasion, an avenue to personal refinement, a means of managing the intricacies of civic and commercial interest, and a critical tool for studying a variety of literary texts both ancient and contemporary" (147). Attaining rhetorical prowess entailed a methodical instruction that was fruitfully hewed to the popular aesthetic of the time.

Murphy states in *A Short History of Writing Instruction* that, prior to the eighteenth century, "the primary method of instruction was speech, and the translation, imitation, or composition a student wrote, whether in English or in one of the classical tongues, was understood as a script for oral performance" (217). In British education, rhetoric drew heavily on stylistic modes of inquiry, especially during the Renaissance. Once again, translation positioned itself as one of the methods through which writing instruction was taught in the classroom. By the middle of the eighteenth century "Greek and Roman rhetorical devices became an integral part of the theory of translation, devices that classical antiquity had never applied to translation theories. This practice signals the apex of translation theories in the time after classical antiquity" (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 16). Drilling grammar exercises and memorizing grammar structures continued to be the preferred methods of instruction well into the twentieth century. It was believed that to read and write well, students had to practice grammar assiduously. Since "writing instruction was in Latin, [students] were required to translate into a good English style.

[And so] writing and speaking, English and Latin were likely to be taught side by side" (Murphy, *Short History* 180).

The eighteenth century marked the beginning of interdisciplinary approaches to rhetoric with an emphasis on delivery. Golden and Corbett call the Enlightenment a prolific era in the history of rhetoric; mainly because it is at this juncture that rhetoric regains its legitimacy in the British curriculum becoming a course of its own. Before the eighteenth century, "writing instruction per se had centered upon oratory, letters, and sermons, [however] writing became the medium of communication and record" (Murphy 180). It is at this point in history that rhetoric started to merge with other disciplines. In the University of Edinburgh, a group of rhetoricians established a connection between rhetoric and psychology starting what would later be known as the Current-Traditional movement. Although acutely different from each other, Frederick Crews' *Random House Handbook* and Alexander Bain's *English Composition and Rhetoric: A Manual* (1866) are considered the first Current-Traditional textbooks and manuals of written composition. In his book, Bain mapped out how the power of psychological understanding lead students to mastering persuasive modes of thinking. This psychology of persuasion was also explored in the United States to increase personal power and gain control. Despite the emphasis on the belletristic quality of rhetoric, it became clear that rhetoric opened up a multiplicity of dialogues and initiated a blending process with other disciplines principally to obtain a thorough comprehension of all sorts of texts. Bain, for instance, recognized an alliance between rhetoric and philosophy in his book *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776). This is how rhetoric stepped out of its solitary status and became part of a larger scholarly discussion.

2.6 Teaching Rhetoric and Translation

2.6.1 Rhetorical and Translation Pedagogies in the Nineteenth Century

Until the end of the nineteenth century, grammar and public schools in England continued with the rhetorical tradition of the previous centuries. Some foreign languages were introduced in the curriculum of universities as it was thought that learning them could improve students' grammar. During the eighteenth and nineteenth century rhetorical practices also became increasingly favored in prose composition in France. In these classes, students had to translate incredibly difficult passages by Woolf or Ruskin into impeccably polished French. In continuing with the educative notions of the eighteenth century, students were required to memorize grammar books by heart and translate from Latin into "correct English and later from a modern foreign language" (181). In Oxford and Cambridge the practice of translation exercises were thought to improve the students' knowledge of Greek, Latin, and English (Murphy, *Short History* 191). The bilingualism that facilitated the inclusion of translation in the rhetorical curriculum began to disappear in the nineteenth century as more and more students were instructed solely in their native language. The nineteenth century, however, brought into focus the last canon of rhetoric, more emphasis on writing, and slightly less attention on translation activities. In *Composition in the Rhetorical Tradition* (1897), W. Ross Winterowd and Jack Blum succinctly summarize the basic principles of Current-Traditional rhetoric – as defined by Adams Sherman Hill in *The Foundations of Rhetoric* – and that predominated for more than half a century in college composition classes. Among the tenets of this school, Winterowd and Blum list the inclusion of the "five-paragraph essay", "bottom-up" and "methodical" modes of instruction, and the preference for a "text-oriented" pedagogy versus a "process-oriented" one (31). The belletristic

emphasis on rhetoric instigated by Blair, Jamieson and Newman in the eighteenth century retained some of the elements of classical pedagogy such as "imitation, graded practice, [and] translation into English from other languages" (Murphy, *Short History* 224). The study of grammar, style and organization were used to sharpen the command of students' native language.

The application of translation methods in rhetorical classes subsided at the turn of the nineteenth century leading to the eventual separation of both disciplines. Francis J. Child created the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory in 1806. The incorporation of this program in the English Literature curriculum signaled the beginning of a new era in literacy. A. S. Hill's English composition began to be considered a relevant class. Meanwhile, rhetoric was relegated to the margins of the curriculums of English Departments. Confined to a small corner of the academic world, rhetoric found its way in departments of Speech Communication, which eventually tied it to oratorical forms of expression. By the end of the century, English composition classes used literary excerpts to exemplify rhetorical principles, but rhetoric and translation ceased to be used in conjunction as tools to enhance writing skills.

In the nineteenth century another movement named Romantic Rhetoric arose. Linked to composition practices, this movement aimed to exalt the writer's creative side and ignored previous modes of writing that stressed invention as the primary focus of the writer. When describing the differences between these two schools, Winterowd and Blum claim that "'Current-Traditional Rhetoric' focuses on style and form; Romantic Rhetoric focuses on the writer as a creative individual" (45). Romantic Rhetoric theories differed tremendously from Current-Traditional views that explained their methods in an organized, detailed, and pragmatic style. These Romantic texts resembled rough drafts that flowed from within the writer's head in

an effort to encapsulate the writer's true voice. The divergent scope of both schools pointed the way to other theories of writing instruction. In neither of these movements can translation take place mainly because both of these schools were targeting the needs of monolingual students.

2.6.2 Rhetorical and Translation Pedagogies in the Twentieth Century

The twentieth century witnessed a change that cast traditions in a new light, and attempted to have far-reaching social effects on rhetoric. In fact, Lunsford, Wilson, and Eberly argue that "it was not until the twentieth century that the importance of rhetoric to the cultivation of citizens both began to wane in the shadow of higher education's shift in focus from the development of rhetorical expertise to that of disciplinary knowledge" (285). The creation of the National Council of Rhetoric of Teachers (NCTE) in 1911 induced a change of heart in the approximation of Rhetoric and Composition Studies. Only a year after the emergence of this group, Fred Scott – the president of English Journal (1912) – demurred against those who underestimated the status of rhetoric. In retrospect, looming on the horizon were many challenges for the tradition of rhetorical practices in the United States; however, these two events managed to bring attention to a relatively unknown discipline. In the 1920s and 1930s a group of scholars developed the Cornell School of Rhetoric and hosted the first seminar on rhetoric. For the first time, the scholars who were summoned at this first conference of Composition and Communication (1949) reflected upon the need to start teaching composition classes at the college level. They concluded that these mainly linguistically oriented classes should be taught by graduate students who, in exchange, would get paid for their services.

In the early 1960s rhetoric continued to put down more roots in the educational system of the United States; for instance, Duhamel drew attention to the study of the discipline in his book

Rhetoric: Principles and Usage (1960). Along with this growing interest in rhetoric more workshops, conferences, and lectures about rhetoric sprang up in various parts of the United States. In composition classes, classical rhetoric was used as a means of improving students' persuasive skills and writing process. The inclusion of the five rhetorical canons in these sessions became a method of instruction that skilled students used to explore their ethos as writers. With the advent of new methods of instruction, another movement called "New Rhetoric," emerged with the intention to reconsider the epistemological value of rhetoric. Though slightly unconventional in nature and scope, with this movement certain aspects of classical pedagogy were brought back to the forefront. Winterowd and Blum suggests that the primary concern of this New Rhetoric lay specifically "with the relationships among the author, his or her subject matter, and the audience (that is, *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*) and radical only in some of its methods and in the disciplines that it called on in theory building" (45-6). They also pointed out 1963 as the year that symbolizes the union between rhetoric and composition as a discipline. Starting with *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* the number of publications in this new field was practically endless. In *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, it also became clear that the dictum of this New Rhetoric was on the writing process. This school placed significant emphasis on invention as a way to help students understand rhetorical stances, and collaboration to spark the writing process. It was not, however, until the Conference at Dartmouth College in 1966 that composition instructors were finally asked to develop a collaborative approach in the classroom. Before this summit, instructors were conceived of as lecturers who communicated their knowledge in the class and facilitated the teaching lessons. This univocal pedagogical approach did not enable students to develop a voice of their own in their writing, nor in the classroom. Ken Macrorie and Peter Elbow in *The Writer's Authentic Voice: Authentic Voice Pedagogy* presented

some of the techniques that contribute to this kind of pedagogy; which included free writing as an exercise that instilled creativity. These sorts of collaborative activities engaged students' participation and enabled them to feel included in an egalitarian setting. Although the focus on invention remained intact at the turn of the decade, the expanding enrollment of exchange students in composition classes triggered a slight change of mentality in the way instructors presented their material. Within this culturally diverse setting, teachers were compelled to decenter their ethnocentric teaching methodology and adjust their pedagogy to different cultural ideologies and cognitive processes. To fulfill the needs of a culturally diverse classroom, they placed equal emphasis on arrangement and invention. Cross-disciplinary writing programs such as WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum) appeared to reconnect all students and address their needs. The initiative to create this program is attributed to Carleton College in 1974, and was immediately followed by other institutions such as Beaver College.

By the end of the 1970s rhetoric and composition instruction took an unexpected turn when Current-Traditional approaches of teaching bequeathed some of its precepts to a new movement called New Stylistics. This new movement also took some of its ideas from the generative grammar group started by Noah Chomsky in the 1950s and placed significant weight upon arrangement. It also departed from previous statements made by generativists who considered that a systematic comprehension of grammar principles was not incumbent to identify a significant change in students' writing. One of the most significant exercises this group of linguists generated what was called "sentence combining." In *Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing without Formal Grammar* (1973), Frank O'Hare posits a revolutionary method entirely devoid of grammar instruction that was used in schools and colleges across the United States. Another noteworthy text that caused a whirlwind of reactions was Joseph M. Williams'

Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace (1989). This book continued that non-grammar oriented trend, added the instruction of style, clarity, cohesion, and concision, and focused slightly less on drilling and combining sentence structures. Fundamentally speaking, the New Stylistics School believed in a mode of instruction that, whether unconsciously acquired or not, derived from the understanding of grammar rules and stylistic variations. It was the instructors' choice to determine whether they wanted to become the main facilitator in the students' learning process or, if they wanted their students to absorb the structures on their own in a primarily student-oriented setting.

In *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995), Venuti notes that "the growth of translation studies as a separate discipline is a success story of the 1980s" (vii). So the emergence of Translation Studies parallels the growth of Composition Studies, as an academic discipline within English departments, and the rise of new courses and graduate programs in Rhetoric and Composition within American colleges and universities, which also flourished in the 1980s. Composition Studies, as Stephen North pointed out in his book, *The Making of Knowledge in Composition* (1987), drew on methods and research from linguistics, education, psychology, literary studies, and history. Likewise, as Venuti observes, "Translation Studies brings together work in a wide variety of fields, including linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology, and economics" (vii). Rhetoric, Composition, and Translation Studies all have drawn on and generated research "falling within – or crossing – traditional academic disciplines" (Venuti, *Reader* 16), like philosophy. These fields separately and taken together study language, communication, history, and culture. They inform one another and use and create multi-disciplinary works that have applications for broad audiences of scholars and students. Venuti argues that "in an age of ever-increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of

the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us toward a greater awareness of the world in which we live" (vii) – an aim shared by Composition and Rhetoric and now I argue Translation Studies.

In the late 1980s rhetoric took another unexpected turn when scholars started to concentrate on issues pertaining to race, class, politics, and gender. For some writers, rhetoric became an instrument of empowerment, and a way to express their personal political agendas. In "The Ecology of Writing," Marilyn Cooper describes writing as an inherently social skill that intimately intertwines cultural with textual forms (370). More specifically, what Cooper "propose[s] is an ecological model of writing, whose fundamental tenet is that writing is an activity through which a person is continually engaged with a variety of socially constituted systems" (367). A quintessential aspect of the 90s is that it kept up with its relentless efforts to interrelate rhetoric with other disciplines. Cultural studies, literary theory, history, feminist studies and other movements joined forces with rhetoric to further its understanding.[18] Analogously, many university courses centered on recovering the history of writing. As a result of this new interest, more and more books about the history of rhetoric were published (George Kennedy; Corbett; Vickers; Conley, et al.).[19]

Preceding the beginning of the twenty-first century, very few studies investigated the nature of the writing process of speakers of a second language. But when an increasing number of scholars ventured to state different means to map this unexplored territory, this tendency finally came to fruition. Mary Louise Pratt, for instance, developed the concept "contact zones,"

---

[18] Translation Studies seems to be missing from this group of fields.

[19] In feminist studies, the voices of female rhetoricians started to be heard in the works of academics such as Cheryl Glenn, Shirley Wilson Logan, Carol Mattingly, et al. who raised visibility of these women by letting their unheeded work speak for itself. For instance, *Man Cannot Speak for Her* (1989) by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell is an attempt to unveil the silenced voices of female rhetoricians. The reconstruction of a patriarchal rhetorical history became the main purpose of this group of contemporary scholars.

which acknowledges how individuals from dissimilar and unique backgrounds can enrich their educational experience by interacting with each other. Conversely, Gloria Anzaldúa in her essay "Borderlands / La Frontera" discusses that contravened sense of self that bicultural individuals undergo in their lives. Anzaldúa's "mestiza rhetoric" validates the word of individuals whose particular social and linguistic upbringing makes them invaluable members in our society. While some educators raised awareness about the rhetoric of cultural identities, others started to encourage students to get involved in service learning in the university. These classes also demonstrated some cultural sensitivity and introduced students to a rhetoric of citizenship, which consisted of expanding and making them aware of monolithic and ethnocentric ideologies.[20] By the end of the twenty-first century, certain institutions started to offer courses that explored the many ways in which electronic modes of writing differed from other mediums. The end product, a so-called digital rhetoric, radically changed the way both readers and writers perceived these texts.

2.6.3 Rhetorical Practices in the Twenty-First Century

With the twenty-first century, rhetoric does not steer away from other disciplines; instead it gets closer to other concepts and theories and adds more fuel to other types of discourse: disability, whiteness, and queer theory. Before the twenty-first century, rhetorical instruction that instilled civic and civil involvement remained unaddressed. As a matter of fact, the teaching of rhetoric that fosters civic commitment to any society whilst promoting critical thinking is still lacking. Less and less universities engage students in activities that allow them to read global

[20] A rhetoric that explored the concept of race also emerged to finally address delicate topics that had never been discussed before.

texts from a rhetorical standpoint. In 2007 Beard ratified that developing interdisciplinary programs that conferred more attention on the history of rhetoric were still missing. He also addressed the imperious necessity of aligning and interrelating the history and theory of rhetoric with the historiography of other disciplines. The multidisciplinarity of rhetorical pedagogy remains deficient to this day and rhetorical instruction is still often relegated to the composition classroom. It is essential to detach rhetoric from interpretations that classify it as a vacuous mode of communication but, most importantly, it is crucial to continue blending rhetoric with other disciplines to further understand and expand the full array of its possibilities. My work demonstrates the connection between rhetoric and translation in the following section.

2.7 Interdisciplinarity Revealed: Rhetoric and Translation

The relationship between rhetoric and translation goes beyond the classroom setting. Reenacting and reinventing rhetoric entails the re-creation of alternative versions of its history and the history of other disciplines. Current research about rhetorical Interdisciplinarity mainly focuses on exploring its relationship "among education, religion, social practices and events of [its] time; and adds previously overlooked voices to the rhetorical tradition" (Gaillet and Tasker 74). The inclusive nature of rhetoric allows this discipline to merge with others while opening up a fluid rhetorical discussion. In "The Rhetoric of Interdisciplinarity," Julie Thompson Klein discusses possible approaches to rhetorical interdisciplinary methods of inquiry outlining them as ways through which

> scholars could investigate the linguistic dynamics of collaboration and other work modes or the ways genres of scholarship institutionalize practices. The narrative

> knowledge of personal stories, institutional case studies, and field histories might be analyzed. (265)

Although the bulk of work published about the interdisciplinary scope of the nature of rhetoric is growing steadily, much further examination is left to do.

With the exception of a limited amount of publications, the study of translation and rhetoric in conjunction, and from a pedagogical perspective, has not stimulated much research and discussion among academics. In fact, both fields have been ruthlessly and purposely banished to the margins of scholarly prestige for hundreds of years. Undermining the nature of rhetoric seems to be a constant trend since Plato called it an art of deception in his Socratic dialogue *Gorgias*. Allegories and iconography of Rhetoric as a Woman of Honor, Rhetorica, in the Medieval and Renaissance periods gradually shifted into images of rhetoric as a deceptive woman, one who flatters or disguises herself with jewels and cosmetics. Despite the negative aura surrounding the nature of rhetoric, many contemporary scholars have attempted to redefine the term in a more positive light. For example, Communications scholar James Herrick writes that rhetorical discourse is "planned, adapted to an audience, shaped by human motives, responsive to a situation, persuasion-seeking, [and] concerned with contingent issues" (5). The characteristics of any rhetorical discourse as defined by Herrick resemble those approached by translators who are constantly seeking to fulfill the requirements of their rhetorical situation to ensure the success of their work.

Venuti, Spivak and Beaugrande come to an agreement in relation to current translation pedagogies in the United States. They think that the political nature and the subversive variations of translated texts are rarely addressed in the classroom. This lack of discussion results in fewer students questioning ideologically charged translated texts, and more of them remaining

complacent with the instructor's preferred versions of these texts. In *The Scandals of Translation*, Venuti duly notes that "institutions … show a preference for a translation ethics of sameness, translating that enables and ratifies existing discourses and canons, interpretations, and pedagogies … if only to ensure the unruffled reproduction of the institution" (82). Translated works covered in the classroom often match up with standard conventions that classifies them as canonical translated texts. For instance, Cohen's English translation of *Don Quixote* was the preferred choice for many scholars and instructors because it was perceived as the one that most resembled the original. In recent years much emphasis has been placed on the hermeneutical dimension of translation; yet hardly anyone has correlated translation and rhetoric from a pedagogical standpoint. Reading texts rhetorically also reveals ideology, bias in the author and the audience, and allows for a study of reception theory and reader response that engages language and context – all things that are vital to the success of translation as an art.

2.8 Classroom Collisions

As demonstrated in this chapter, the ties between rhetoric and translation hark back to the Romans and continue well into the eighteenth century. In the sixteenth century Juan Luis Vives talks of a method that asked the students to translate from Spanish into Latin and back into Spanish. According to Vives, "as soon as they have learned syntax, let the pupils translate from the mother-tongue into Latin, and then back again into the mother-tongue" (qtd. in Murphy *Short History* 152). Vives claimed that this method significantly improved the stylistic writing of his students; however, his approach to translation placed little emphasis on the rhetoric that lies behind the students' writing or the rhetoric of the text they read.

The first person to really blend the teaching of rhetoric and translation and write a manual that specifically addressed its implementation in the classroom was Roger Ascham who, in *The Schoolmaster*, subscribed to a methodology that helped students polish their writing skills. To achieve an adequate level of proficiency in writing, Ascham's students had to perfectly imitate the work of a selected list of classics. Imitation, after all, was a tool used for learning in the Renaissance, the Middle Ages, and the Roman Period. In his treatise about writing instruction, Ascham presented a method that he called "double translation" and that consisted of translating back and forth from English into Latin and back again into English while making use of rhetorical principles. Ascham assured that in exercising this double translation method, students would be able to excel academically. As described by Murphy, Ascham outlined five different imitative models that were interwoven with rhetorical and stylistic conventions; namely style, arrangement, and invention. His method is synthesized as follows:

1. Translation: Especially double translation.
2. Paraphrase: To translate the best Latin authors into other Latin words.
3. Metaphrase: The translation of prose into verse and verse into prose.
4. Epitome: The distillation of classical works into their essences.
5. Amplification: The active implementation of imitation. (Ascham)

This early attempt to entwine two disciplines is an idea that lies beneath Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), but that is hardly put into practice in the classroom. The appropriation of rhetorical tools by translation or vice versa is not yet being utilized conjointly, but I am arguing that it must be to achieve the *Transglobal Literacy* that college students require – regardless of their majors – and that are essential to graduate students studying Rhetoric and Composition and

to those studying Translation Studies. Interdisciplinarity presents new growth for both fields and especially for pedagogy and practice.

One reason to explore translation and rhetoric is that they both aim to be epistemic as they constantly strive to foster the growth of an audience. In addition, they also subscribe to the three functions of language (heuristic, eristic and proleptic) and both the rhetorician and the translator – being the same person – need to feel at ease using them.[21] Cheryl Glenn and Martin Carcasson shed light on what makes the continuous study of rhetoric possible, maintaining in their Introduction to "Rhetoric and Pedagogy," in the *Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* (2009), that "rhetoric has always been a teaching tradition, the pedagogical pursuit of good speaking and writing" (285). Furthermore, following its popularity in classical education, "More than 2,000 years later, the pedagogy of rhetoric played a key role in the early universities of the United States," only falling from its prestige in the twentieth century, when a shift occurred "from the development of rhetorical expertise to that of disciplinary knowledge" (285-86). But that shift can also be traced to changes in literacy that emphasized writing over declaiming and reading print over listening to speakers.

The next chapter will delineate my own methodology that, like Ascham proposed, implements translation and rhetorical devices for the exploration of translated texts. However, my methodology differs from Ascham's in that it targets the needs to enhance mono- and multilingual students' critical reading and writing skills. Hélène Cixous once said that written passages amass a conglomeration of meanings that cannot be fully revealed, as they are interconnected to other messages and ideas extricated from what we read. She further elaborates

[21] According to Herrick, "heuristic language" reveals a discourse of invention and discovery; "eristic language" brings attention to the power of language; and "proleptic language" draws attention as to how words direct human thought.

this perception of reading in her essay "Writing Blind" where she claims that “no one fragment carries the totality of the message, but each text (which is in itself a whole) has a particular urgency, an individual force, a necessity, and yet each text also has a force which comes to it from all the other texts” (qtd. in Sellers xvi). Insofar as readers establish a different approach to the reading of a text, they could see the text with new eyes, without any biased notions. Just like the translator of classic texts, active participants of this methodology will have to unravel the discrepancies in meaning of the translated text while dealing with the absence of a textual context. Rather than seeing the translated text as a byproduct of an original author, students will bring awareness to the text by deconstructing its meaning. Through the application of *Transglobal Literacy*, students will amplify their conceptual, procedural, and rhetorical context and further develop their translational literacy. Broadening their spectrum of interpretation will aid them in developing research skills and gaining first-hand knowledge on global issues. In such context, students will receive systemactic exposure to global issues, which in turn, will ease cross-cultural boundaries in the classroom.

3 THE TOOLS AND METHODS OF TRANSLATION: INTERPRETING AND TEACHING TEXTS

Thinking and acting as global citizens [means] understanding the need for all peoples to seize common opportunities and defend against shared threats. – Kofi Anan

It is common practice for students of translation studies to note the discrepancies and commonalities among different translated texts in their classrooms both at the undergraduate and the graduate level. Most of these classes, however, tend to focus on the analysis of formalistic aspects of these texts, and mainly address issues pertaining to the linguistic incongruences

among them; namely their lexical, conceptual, and formal semantics. Conversely, students taking literary courses and courses in rhetorical history and theory rarely engage in a conversation about translation. I find both these approaches inadequate and propose changes in pedagogy that can be applied in a wide variety of courses teaching textual literacy, and those courses that engage both reading and writing of global authors and texts.

3.1 What is Translation For? Aims and Purposes in Pedagogy

During the MLA series of conferences on translation held in 2009, Sandra Bermann, Cotsen Professor of the Humanities, Professor of Comparative Literature at Princeton University, proposed a methodology to bring translation to the forefront of pedagogical practices. Bermann, in her *Profession 2010* article, "Teaching in—and about—Translation," urges academia to start teaching translation as a cross-curricular course that focuses on discussing the patterns that arise from translators' stylistic and semantic choices. Her work furthers that of noted translator Antoine Berman in his work *Toward a Translation Criticism*, in which he argues that translation is both critical and creative, and subject to the application of ethics to its theory and practice.[22]

Sandra Bermann strongly believes that if students examine translated texts from a socio-historical perspective, they would be able to decipher and "note how texts move beyond their original literary or cultural context that affects other cultures while being transformed in turn" (87). Though Bermann manages to bring attention to the problematic approximation that translation carries, her perception on this matter remains narrow in scope. Whereas her ideas sound practical in theory, she does she provide a pedagogical model to execute her procedural

[22] *Toward a Translation Criticism* was translated from French into English by Françoise Massardier-Kenney, published in 2009.

method. Besides, Bermann specifically refers to a class devoted to the study of translation, and thus deliberately discounts other scenarios that could benefit from the interpretation of translated texts. The class she envisions also examines in detail who and what is translated, what triggers the preference for one translator versus another, the reception of translations by the audience to which the translation was released, its date of publication, and the subsequent readers' reaction way after its publication. In sum, the class proposed by Bermann is indissolubly linked to the examination of translators' tasks, placing little emphasis on the analysis of texts. The focus of this type of approximation to translated text relies heavily on a closer examination of the socio-historical context of translations.

In the same conference, Jonathan Culler concurred with Marilyn Gaddis Rose's claim in that translation should be "used as an instrument of literary criticism" (95). In his article, Culler adds that the incorporation of examining radical translations could trigger a great deal of discussion in the classroom. Following Bermann's steps, Culler delves into the educational usefulness of translation but, unfortunately, fails to disclose any pedagogical application to his analysis. What most of these scholars have not addressed – and for that matter most educators who teach translation in their classes – is something as unassuming as reminding students that the translation they are about to read was not written by the original author. Before we venture to envision a multidisciplinary application of translation, we first need to acknowledge multivocality in translation. Despite sounding trite, most Anglophone students still read translated texts as if their original authors' themselves had composed them. Instead of questioning the veracity of their reading, students are often asked to analyze these texts without reflecting on the collaborative aspect that constructs translation practices. To make matters worse, students often read a version of the text that hews to the demands of their instructors, who

frequently single out translated texts conforming to mainstream notions that categorize them as canonical and/or standard.[23] As they shift their attention away from the translator, students become gradually imbued in a misleading process that distorts their perception of the text. Providing a space where students can have impromptu and situated conversations about translated texts is almost non-existent in many disciplines.

3.2 Designing a New Methodology and Theory for Teaching Translated Texts

The aim of the methodology I propose in this chapter is not to shed some light on the translators' tasks or their endeavors; instead, it attempts to unveil translators' ethos inscribed in the text while unraveling, revising, and re-envisioning the rhetoric ingrained in the translated passages. In other words, it does not aim to focus on the translators' or the original authors' autobiographical accounts, nor does it try to undermine or scrutinize their linguistic choices; rather it seeks to resituate translators' ethos in a rhetorical discussion where they become the words they transcribe. By conferring meaning to their work by means of analyzing their rhetorical product, and not their individuality, we are still paying tribute to the work of these often-unrecognized figures. In her book *Translation Studies*, Susan Bassnett reiterates the lack of conversation pertaining to the multidisciplinarity of translation and reflects upon the current state of this field in academia. Despite conscious efforts of a select group of scholars, thinking about translators as an invisible entity remains a worldwide trend among readers; after all, Bassnett argues that "a vast majority of British or North American students read Greek and Latin authors

[23] The choice of one translation versus another depends on other extraneous factors. It might simply have to do with instructors' preference of one text versus another. Oftentimes, they select the latest translation of their text of choice based on the assumption that it will probably relate better to the needs of contemporary audiences.

in translation or other texts whilst treating the translated text as if it were written in their own language" (14).

While much has been discussed about the integration of Translation Studies within the realm of other disciplines, very few scholars have endeavored to develop a grounding pedagogy that entwines translation with rhetoric. Lawrence Venuti remains one of the few scholars who have always striven to discuss the relevance of analyzing translators' tasks in scholarly discussions and in the classroom. Venuti's account expresses his concern about the present state of pedagogical methods used in the analysis of translated texts. In his view, current conversation and interpretation of these texts leads to a biased understanding of the text. Venuti's main preoccupation stems from an increasing number of students who continue to explore and interpret translation from a one-dimensional perspective and who mechanically dissociate translators from their work, a move that not only reinforces their invisible role, but also positions them as pariahs of their own composition.

Venuti claims that the translator's invisibility is a persistent tendency that refuses to acknowledge the contributions of translators. Venuti also implies that this invisibility is nurtured by editors who push translators to remain on the outskirts of their own work. His yearning for translators' inclusivity led Venuti to posit a cross-disciplinary pedagogy of translation that he describes in *The Scandals of Translation* (1998). He asserts:

> A pedagogy of translated literature can help students learn to be both self-critical and critical of exclusionary cultural ideologies by drawing attention to the situatedness of texts and interpretations. … Recognizing a text as translated and figuring this recognition into classroom interpretations can teach students that their critical operations are limited and provisional, situated in a changing history

> of reception, in a specific cultural situation, in a curriculum, in a particular language. (Venuti, Kindle, *Scandals*, section 201)

While Venuti encourages educators to "develop course materials that cross disciplinary divisions between languages and periods," his approach is integrally adhered to the examination of translation as historically and culturally situated through the interpretation of a term he calls the remainder and that I will address further later.

In the same way as Venuti, the fulcrum of my methodology enables an interpretative act on the readers' behalf. Scholars such as John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte claim that the act of reading is in itself a translation, a mode of collaboration and interpretation that activates the readers' minds in a two-way process undertaking to understand and create knowledge. For these two scholars,

> readers are transplanted into the atmosphere of a new situation that does not build just one clearly defined reality, but rather possibilities of various realities. Reading reestablishes the uncertainly of the word, both as isolated phenomenon and as semantic possibility of a sentence, paragraph, or the context of the entire work. (*Craft* x)

By undertaking this methodology, readers are compelled to situate themselves in that undefined reality and explore the multitudinous dimensions of translation. The first step towards better understanding the terrain of translation starts with a closer examination on translators' experiences and those who assist them in the process.

Translators have openly professed their struggle to come to terms with the final version of their translation. Other obstacles translators have to face are deadlines and self-doubt. For them, this open-ended process called translation is rather unsettling. Some translators have even

gone on to claim that, once they have completed their translation, they rarely revisit it (see Venuti *Scandals*). In such situation, the work of editors is crucial to mediate between translators and their texts. Paul names a few of these editors' responsibilities.

> [In] many cases the acquiring editor is not the person who will be working on the book on a line-by-line basis. Some editors deal only with structural changes, and work on getting the style and 'flavour' of the book right, while the nitty-gritty details are handed over to in-house or freelance copyeditors. (Paul 38)

Paul goes on to name some of the tasks that "good editors" are expected to do and not to do when revising the final copy of translated texts. In his view, editors should

1. Approach the text as an original book rather than a translation.
2. Bring a fresh pair of eyes to the text, pinpointing any areas that do not work, making suggestions about solutions to problems and discussing them with the translator.
3. Highlight inconsistencies, clichés, libel and repetition, and refer them back to the translator.
4. Correct any errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation, and ensure the text conforms to the publisher's house style.
5. Show their editorial corrections to the translator, before it is too late to correct any errors that have crept in.
6. Respect the voice of the translator and treat him or her as they would any original author.

Conversely, editors should not

1. Rewrite the text in their own voice, changing vocabulary choices that the translator has made.
2. Over-Anglicize and sanitize the foreignness of the text.
3. Make changes that will not be visible to the translator and then send the edited text for typesetting without showing it to the translator (70-1).

About improving or revising his final rendition, translator William Weaver noted in "The Process of Translation" that "once a translation of mine is published, I never re-read it. I know that, if I did, I would soon be reaching for a pencil to make further additions and subtractions, in the futile pursuit of a nonexistent perfection" (Biguenet and Schulte, *Craft* 117). It is in light of this situation that we should call for more discussion about all of the voices that join to conform and consolidate the content translated texts.

In his article "The Rhetoric of Translation," Peter France claims that "the dominant rhetoric of Britain, France, and many other cultures has been given the illusion of listening to the voice of the authors as he or she would have spoken had they been born in our time and place" (259). Following Venuti's and France's trains of thought, it is our responsibility as instructors to guide students and facilitate a way through which they will think about the original author as the seed that created the work but whose work has been revised, transformed and interpreted in the hands of translators and other possible contributors. By overlooking the dynamic function of translators, students will remain in the shadow of the full spectrum of meaning of translated texts and will have limited access to global literacy.

3.3 Enhancing Transglobal Literacy

The dearth of works discussing the role of readers of translated texts is undeniable. In fact, John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte claim that given the lack of documentation "on how the reader reacts to a text, it might be appropriate once again to look at the translator's approach to a text in order to extract some understanding about the act of translation." In the preface to *The Craft of Translation,* these same authors advocate for a complete and "comparative evaluation of … translations [as this exercise] should address how consistent each translator was in his translation" (xiv). The truth is that the application of this activity into practice only takes place in translation programs. Unfortunately, instructors of most disciplines deny translation the right to be revealed and ignore its very existence in the classroom. This silence solidifies the absence of translation and marginalizes the discipline even further. Unlike any other sort of experience, the reading of translation in the classroom enriches and redefines the readers' already founded worldview. In fact, Paul Gill argues that a good translation "allows a reader to experience firsthand a different world. Hearing the sounds, tasting local fare, seeing the sights and what lies beneath them" (55). Among the many aftermaths of translation is its ability to interconnect cultures and to transcribe the meanings of one society into another. Translators allow readers to travel to remote locations, to experience the flair of nationalism in other countries, and to openly think about otherness. In their transgressive role, translators break boundaries and become negotiators of national identity.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I believe it is important that we allow students to interact with the translated text; primarily because these interactions could grant them a different knowledge of themselves. At the same time, we are locating them in another culture as readers of

translated texts who are broadening their conception of the world. While the reading of these texts could be fraught with obscurity and subjectivity, it could also become an incredibly rewarding practice as their interpretation entails openness, collaboration, directness, and commitment granting them the entrance into global citizenship.

In their article, "Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility," Julie Andrzejewski and John Alessio recount the hardships of their own education and how, due to the adversities they we were forced to overcome, they both decided to re-educate themselves on their own. They mention how their careers had been mostly defined and shaped by their social interaction and involvement with others, not the time they invested in the classroom. They also describe how their educational experiences have been filled with gaps they had to interpret and understand on their own, and that, most of the time, the information provided to them was faulty and lacking substantiation. For them, the problem in the present state of education stems from the fact that "students in our classes seem to arrive at the university with many of the same myths and misinformation that took [us] years to investigate and unravel." Unfortunately, far too many students still believe that "Columbus 'discovered America,' [that] George Washington is still the 'father' of 'our country'." In this context, they observe that "history is still too often the stories of great white [Anglophile] males with the few 'exceptional' women and people of color added for 'diversity [and] people from other countries are generally portrayed as less knowledgeable, less advanced technologically and often incapable of handling their own countries' affairs'" (2). In shedding light on this recurrent thread of misinformation, Andrzejewski and Alessio want educators to reflect on their own practices and reevaluate the way they convey information, starting by asking themselves a very basic question: What is the primary purpose of our instruction?

The success of this methodology hinges on the instructors' willingness to remain open to new venues of interpretation. To do so, it is crucial that instructors start seeing themselves as global citizens to better assist students in the classroom. Without the instructors' commitment to reevaluate their own thinking processes and to challenge students at a deeper cognitive level, students will not be able to obtain a broader perspective on many topics. According to Andrzejewski and Alessio, the utter disregard towards global issues in the classroom is threefold. On the one hand, some educators

> don't experience or see the immediate consequences of these problems and it becomes easier to distance [themselves] from them. [On the other hand,] they claim [that] global issues seem so unreachable and undecipherable that it is easier for people to think that they could change the situation. [Lastly] teachers have [been] taught to avoid "political" issues that differ from conventionally accepted beliefs embedded in the traditional curriculum [because it promotes] fragmentation, mystification, simplification and omission of knowledge for efficiency and control. (4)

One of the many advantages of becoming global citizens is that it allows us to better understand socio-environmental and socio-economic issues. Becoming a global citizen requires us to be part of a process that sets aside ethnocentric ideologies and offers a multiculturalist appreciation of worldwide issues.

The analysis of translated texts provides alternatives to standardized patterns of thought. The global understanding of this type of texts engages students in modes of discourse that expand far beyond the classroom space, and that could become a topic for future conversations. The pursuit of a global understanding of translated texts from a rhetorical standpoint is crucial, as

many secondary and postsecondary institutions are making international studies and a global focus to be directly tied into their curriculum and learning outcomes. However, this same curriculum overlooks how Translation Studies can be a key to this achievement, and how it can be integral to the interdisciplinary study of texts.

We should be asking why certain translations are adopted, while others are not. Which criteria drive these decisions? Convenience must not be the top reason. Critical thinking must be the basis for our pedagogy. Some translations are relegated as faulty mainly because of their unfaithful rendering of the original or its lackadaisical reception. But instead of disclaiming them altogether, why do we not use them as examples to compare them with those standard or canonical translations? Why do we not let our students be the ones who judge which translation is worse and which one is better? Would it not be gratifying for our students to compare these non-standard translations with the so-called traditional texts? Why are we denying our students the possibility of enriching their worldview? After all, students could also learn from those professed subaltern versions of the texts. The crux of the matter still remains as to why some instructors feel the need to impose one text over another and the truth is that, most of the time, we find that they are excluding those texts that have been neglected by their academic community. William Weaver, in "The Process of Translation," notes that "because there are no rules, no laws, there cannot be an absolute right or an absolute wrong [translated text]" (Weaver). Although his statement particularly refers to the translation of literary texts, it could be applicable to the understanding of all sorts of translations.[24] There is indeed something to be learned from all translated texts because, in one way or another, they reflect the worldview of a specific bilingual and/or plurilingual ethos, particularly texts employed in everyday

[24] Note that I am not referring to any forms of translation produced by some translation machine devices or some forms of translated propaganda or commercial literature.

communication and aimed at informing readers, like signs, websites, and technical writing. Getting students to consider multilingual communication helps them situate themselves within a context of international relationships, especially to get them outside an Anglo-centric bias and to experience a wider range of communication methods and techniques.

Most scholars have addressed the concept of global citizenship as one that generates a critique or an in-class discussion of socio-political and cultural concerns that pervade our society. About the concept of global citizenship, Andrzejewski and Alessio mention that addressing issues pertaining to this concept "can provide meaning to the curriculum. Students feel comfortable interacting with diverse groups of people" (10). Richard Brosio adds to this discussion by stating that misinformation and myths about current global issues are hurdles that educators have to address in the classroom. With this methodology, I am proposing the reevaluation of the eremitical understanding of global citizenship as one that belongs to a protean and unrestrictive domain and promotes interdisciplinary collaboration. Global citizenship should promote a reexamination of connections among the disciplines rather than dwelling upon their constrained existing notions. In addition, this methodology addresses the value of the global and rhetorical polyvalence of translated texts.

3.4 The Rhetoric of Teaching Global Citizens: Converting Translational Literacy into Transglobal Literacy

The first step towards breaking down the insularity that prevails in translation and rhetorical studies is to achieve a broader understanding of global citizenship. By purposely decentering the way students read translated texts, we are fostering different patterns of reasoning and interpretation in the classroom; this scripted decentralization of texts will lead the

way towards their personal understanding of global citizenship. Furthermore, students who are challenged to pursue this methodology are also activating and enhancing their own literacy. As Cushman, Kintgen, Kroll, and Rose note in their introduction to *Literacy. A Critical Sourcebook*, "[literacy] surrounds us, is so familiar as to go, at times, unnoticed. … Literacy permeates our daily routines. … The very familiarity of literacy, however, conceals another significant fact about it: Its central, often contentious, place in so many discussions and debates" (1). It is our duty as instructors to raise awareness about literacy in the classroom; especially when it encompasses broadening the understanding of our students' most immediate realities, and helping them break free from the shackles of ethnocentrism. The systematical application of this methodology is geared toward the pursuit of a pedagogy that brings students' literacies to the forefront and enhances their understanding of global citizenship. At the same time, we are implicitly fostering the four types of literacy posed by Karen Cadiero-Kaplan.

> 1. Functional literacy: Skills that are necessary to participate in school and society successfully.
> 2. Cultural literacy: Teaching core beliefs, values, and morality with a curriculum that includes "Great Books."
> 3. Progressive literacy: Encourages the inclusion of students' voices, culture and a variety of literature and discourses as part of the curriculum; and
> 4. Critical literacy: Requires maturity for the social transformation in which the ideological foundations of both knowledge and culture are recognized as unavoidably political. (380)

In addition to these four literacies, instructors also need to bear in mind a fifth form called transnational literacy. In her landmark article, "Teaching for the Times," Gayatri Chakravorty

Spivak defined this type of literacy as one that adjusts to current perspectives pertaining to internationally and politically oriented texts. Of literacy in general and transnational literacy specifically, Spivak notes that

> we must remember that to achieve literacy in a language is not to become an expert in it. I am therefore not making impossible demand[s] upon the graduate curriculum. Literacy produces a skill to differentiate between letters, so that an articulated script can be read, re-read, written, re-written. Literacy is poison as well as medicine. It allows us to sense that the other is not just a voice, but that others produce articulated texts, even as they, like us, are written in and by a text not of our own making. It is through transnational literacy that we can invent grounds for an interruptive praxis from within our hope in justice under capitalism. If we were transnationally literate, we might read sections that are stylistically non-competitive with the specular experimental fiction or certain sections or post-coloniality with a disarticulating rather than a comparative point of view. (16)

Furthering this point is a recent article by Ezra Yoo-Hyeok Lee titled "Globalization, Pedagogical Imagination, and Transnational Literacy" in which the author highlights the importance of teaching this type of literacy to younger students. He also discusses some of the problems that involve creating the class that "help[s] foster the transnational literacy suggested by Spivak and Brydon," and expresses a sense of urgency in developing a "post-colonial pedagogy pertaining to transnational literacy" (8). Lee's article serves as a platform to illustrate his concern about the scarcity of books that provide a pedagogical application of transnational literacy in "this age of globalization" (8). Lee, following Spivak, also sees transnational literacy

as a didactic tool that "could assist in the critical engagement of a reading of the world in and through literacy and through literary and cultural texts" (7). As related to Lee, Diana Brydon in "Cross-Talk, Postcolonial Pedagogy" also observes that "decolonizing the mind closely relates to decolonizing the classroom" (80). Despite the numerous critics who have subscribed to expanding transnational ideas, Spivak herself pointed out some of the fallbacks pertaining to the complex dynamic nature of this sort of literacy.

> We [academics in the United States] are caught in a larger struggle where one side soldiers to exploit transnationality through a distorting culturalism and the other knows rather little what script drives, writes, and operates it. It is within this ignorant clash that we have to find and locate our agency, and attempt, again and again, to throw the clashing machinery out of joint. (7)

While scholarship that focuses on transnational literacy is vast, there is still a huge pedagogical void pertaining to the nature of translated texts.

The shibboleth of transnational literacy draws primarily upon post-colonial literary analysis, and focuses on the political agendas behind subaltern texts that have been recurrently neglected by most scholars. Although transnational literacy seems to be promoting an ideological agenda the term itself is imbued with a sense of otherness that does not necessarily apply to the core of this study. Transnational literacy centers its attention on the ideological amalgamation of events and the rhetorical situation of authors. The implementation of transnational practices often calls for the interpretation of texts that contain ideologically charged and subversive language. Due to the broader nature of my proposed methodology, the term transnational literacy as depicted and presented by Spivak becomes a rather limiting way to dissect and interpret translated texts. It is in light of the narrow scope of this term that I propose a new form of

literacy that will raise awareness of global issues. For the purpose of this study, I suggest the usage of a sixth type of literacy I have named *Transglobal Literacy* and that will address global notions of texts whilst promoting interdisciplinary collaboration between rhetoric and translation. Whereas transnational literacy fosters values grounded in exploitation and aims to address the iniquities in globalization, *Transglobal Literacy* embraces a global interpretation of translated texts as a possibility for all students to engage in a broader epistemic discussion of all sorts of translated texts that may or may not encapsulate a political agenda. The main purpose of this literacy is to decenter preconceived patterns of thought that confine the interpretation of texts within the boundaries of mere ideological superstructures and to create a pedagogy that is global, transcending all national boundaries. In his manuscript *On the Sublime*, Longinus said that

> the whole universe is not enough to satisfy the speculative intelligence of human thought; our ideas often pass beyond the limits that confine us. Look at life from all sides and see how in all things the extraordinary, the great, the beautiful stand supreme, and you will soon realize what we were born for. (275)

With this pedagogy, I aim to situate students in the global and universal space that Longinus defined, a place where they do not have to study abroad to increase their understanding of global issues, nor to travel to an unknown country to explore the axiomatic universality of texts.

As an instructor and a scholar, I also intend to depart from other conceptions of globality by situating our students at a vantage point for exploratory and critical reading and analysis of texts. Whereas the term transnational "extends and operates across national boundaries," the term transglobal "moves or extends around the world" (Wiktionary). The flexibility subscribed in the definition of transglobal leaves room for the analysis of translated texts whose unwavering significance in the realm of education has been shattered by recalcitrant reluctance. In *After*

Babel, literary critic George Steiner claimed that "in the absence of interpretation there would be no culture" (30). Fostering a transglobal interpretation while acquiring transglobal literacy ultimately enables students to explore and decode the underlying meanings of cultures other than their own. In addition, this sixth type of literacy cements their position as global citizens and allows them to understand a variety of voices at a national and a global level. It also enables them to engage in competent critical reading for meaningful activities in the classroom. At the same time, it encourages students to execute an activity that is rooted in the situational thinking of the translator's ethos and that focuses entirely on translated texts.[25] In the context of their rhetorical situation, translators are aware that no two languages dovetail completely; for this reason, they are forced to reconnect and reconcile the meanings of words and be at peace with their final product. To come to a fuller sense of translation practices and what constitutes the value and function of translated texts, students need to be aware of the existence of the situational thinking and rhetorical situation of the translator.

When comparing and contrasting translated passages, students are, in a way, undertaking the role of editors, embedding themselves in the translators' situational thinking, and becoming temporary bearers of the text. In this editorial role, students cast doubt on the nature of a translated text by decentering its meaning and situating themselves in an ulterior and unfamiliar context. Thus, the first thing instructors will ask students to do is to put aside any preconceived notions they may have about the source text and the author. I am not by any means implying that we should not acknowledge the work of the author, but in order for the students to focus on the translated texts, we need to ask them to exclusively pay attention to the texts at hand. We will proceed by asking them to compare and contrast the texts and to underline what strikes them as

[25] Biguenet and Schulte define situational thinking as a mechanism through which translators build meaning and emotions (*Craft* xii).

different or similar in each translation. The subtleties of meaning of one text will become more noticeable to some students than others. Restraining our students from any type of interpretation could be counterproductive; therefore, during the course of the activity, we will constantly encourage any sort of interpretative act; whether that entails a superficial analysis of the text or not. Ideally, students will think beyond a conceptual meaning of the excerpts that scratches the surface of the text, and dig deeper by thinking aloud about the texts.

By following these basic steps, students will expand the limits of their discursive thought. James Paul Gee, in "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What *is Literacy?*" defines two modes of discourse: primary and secondary. "Primary Discourse," he notes, "is the one we first use to make sense of the world and interact with others. Our Primary Discourse constitutes our original and home-based sense of identity, and, I believe, it can be seen whenever we are interacting with "intimates in totally casual … social interaction." On the other hand, "Secondary Discourse," happens in "various non-home-based social institutions. … These may be local stores and churches, schools, community groups, state and national businesses, agencies and organizations, and so forth" (527). To ensure a successful implementation of my teaching methodology, it is imperative to temporarily break free from "Primary Discourses," and promote the production of these so-called "Secondary Discourses." To think beyond the scope of prevalent and dominant discourses is challenging. It is my hope that the analysis of these translations will bring to light the multivariate cluster of intricate difficulties that translation comprises and motivate all students to ask themselves and others questions about translation.

3.5 Methodology (Part 1): The Rhetoric and Techniques for a New Model and Theory of Translation Pedagogy

The list of translation and rhetorical terms that I am proposing for my praxis includes the following terminology:

Rhetorical tools:

1. Rhetorical situation
2. Ethos, Pathos and Logos
3. Amplification

Translation devices:

1. Context of Situation: Field, Tenor, Mode
2. The Remainder
3. Implicature
4. Foreignization
5. Domestication
6. Amplification (addition of words) vs. reduction (of words)
7. Reordering.[26]

Opening the first class discussion with an analysis of Lloyd Bitzer's rhetorical situation, as he described it in his 1968 seminal article, will allow students to better situate the context in which these translations were composed.[27] In his lecture Bitzer described rhetorical situation as a discourse that "obtains its character-as-rhetorical from the situation which generates it" and is

[26] Prior to the implementation of this methodology, instructors will need to consider dedicating one or two days of classes to thoroughly discussing all of these concepts.
[27] Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy of Rhetoric* 1.1 (1968): 1-14.

made up of the following elements: *audience, exigence,* and *constraints*. According to Bitzer, *audience* refers to people who could be influenced by the discourse due to the way the text was construed; *exigences* are made up of some sort of obstacle, something other than it should be; and *constraints* consist of persons, objects or situations. In other words, *constraints* refer to an ideology that has altered the way the original text is or was perceived by a certain group of individuals.

In the context of this study, the term *audience* refers to the target culture translators have in mind when rendering their work. Though most of the time translators target modern audiences, they are also forced to reexamine and consider other possible audiences; especially if the original text belongs to a different time. In such situations, translators must frame themselves within the rhetorical context of the original text to elucidate the patterns of thought of its original audience. Lastly, *exigence* refers to the many obstacles translators face, namely the abundance of choices they have to make, self-imposed deadlines, and editorial demands. Peter France specifically addresses these choices in "The Rhetoric of Translation," where he claims that "the translator [is] faced with choices at every turn, negotiating between author and readers, between source culture and target culture" (261). To quell these fears of perfection, translators often come to different resolutions about their final product. This is partly why we should remind our students that, behind all translators' choices, lay ambivalent and conflicting feelings, as it is extremely hard to convey comprehensive affinity with the original text or what is the same, the *exigence*.

After introducing these concepts, instructors could present students with some quotes from translators where they partly talk about the hindrances of translation. In an article by Gregory Rabassa titled "No Two Snowflakes are Alike," he reveals that "it is my feeling that a

translation is never finished, that it is open and could go on to infinity." He furthers this train of thought by noting that "translation is a disturbing craft because there is precious little certainty about what we are doing" (Biguenet and Schulte, *Craft* 7). As part of the analysis of the rhetorical situation of the text, readers must also address the fact that, in the course of a translators' work, *constraints* is a concept that reappears in most texts. After all, within every translators' choice lies an impulse to "transgress discursive values and institutional limits in the receiving culture" (Venuti 15). Introducing Bitzer's rhetorical situation to the students could lead to an open, candid, and brief discussion about the rhetoric of translated texts.

As part of the rhetorical analysis of the texts, students will be introduced to Aristotle's three artistic proofs: ethos, logos, and pathos, also known as ethical, pathetic, and logical rhetorical appeals. Aristotle, in Book One of his *Rhetoric*, sets the foundation for creating proofs, or pisteis, that lead to persuasion:

> Of the *pisteis* provided through speech there are three species: for some are in the character [*ethos*] of the speaker, and some in disposing the listener in some way [*pathos*], and some in the speech [*logos*] itself, by showing or seeming to show something. 4. [There is persuasion] through character whenever the speech is spoken in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence; for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others,] on all subjects in general and completely so in cases where there is no exact knowledge but room for doubt. And this should result from the speech, not from a previous opinion that the speaker is a certain kind of person; for it is not the case, as some of the handbook writers propose in their treatment of the art, that fair-mindedness [*epieikeia*] on the part of the speaker makes no contribution to

> persuasiveness; rather, character is almost, so to speak the most authoritative form of persuasion. 5. [There is persuasion] through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion [*pathos*] by the speech; for we do not give the same judgment when grieved and rejoicing or when being friendly and hostile. To this and only this we [say] contemporary technical writers try to give their attention. The details on this subject will [be made] clear when we speak about the emotion. 6. Persuasion occurs through the arguments [*logoi*] when we show the truth or the apparent truth from whatever is persuasive in each case (38-39).[28]

Showing students the passages where these three categories of artistic proofs make themselves visible is crucial in the process of dissecting the meaning of these texts. Thinking about how the ethos of a translated passage is conveyed, the purpose behind translators' choices, and the way in which they conveyed a message could be a practical way to engage the whole class in a broad conversation about translation.

If Aristotle's definition of the artistic proofs is too lengthy or proves to be problematic for students, instructors can always provide them with a more approachable explanation of this terminology. For instance, Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee, in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, offer a much broader and concise definition: "[E]thical proofs depend on the rhetor's character; pathetic proofs appeal to the emotions of the audience; and logical proofs derive from arguments that reside in the issue itself" (8).[29] John C. Bean, Virginia A. Chappell, and Alice M. Gillam, in *Reading Rhetorically*, also postulate another concise explanation of Aristotle's tripartite appeals defining *ethos* as "the persuasive power of the

---

[28] The section where Aristotle discusses the nature of these three pisteis was extracted from George A. Kennedy's second edition of Aristotle's manuscript. It was presented in its totality to provide all instructors with the exact passage where these terms were defined for the first time in the history of rhetoric.

[29] I strongly advise the usage of Aristotle's original definition at higher levels of education.

author's credibility or character," *logos* as "the persuasive power of the author's reasons, evidence, and logic," and *pathos* as "the persuasive power of the author's appeal to the interests, emotions, and imagination of the audience" (70). The recurrent persuasive aspect behind these appeals pertains to the work of all translators, whose ethos is compromised every time they make a choice about their translation.

The next step in the process is to present a series of translation devices that will also be utilized in the analysis of the texts. To establish and maintain a logical transition with the rhetorical terminology just presented, we will lead the discussion into the introduction of what, in Translation Studies, is known as *context of situation*. Like Bitzer's rhetorical situation, the context of situation, as depicted by Michael Halliday, is divided into three subsequent components (field, tenor and mode) that help assess and understand the socio-linguistic context of any given text or communicative act. In particular,

> *Field* refers to the subject matter and the nature of the activity, i.e., what is happening, to whom, when and where, what they know, why they are doing what they are doing, and so on. *Tenor* refers to the social relationships existing between those involved in terms of power and status (e.g. father/son, manager/clerk) … and thus how they feel about each other, whether they know each other well and so on. It refers also to the role structure (questioner/answerer, informer/enquirer, etc.). *Mode* concerns how the language is being used, the organization of the text, whether it is written (faxed, e-mailed, etc.) or spoken (on the phone, recorded, etc.) Some texts are actually 'written to be spoken' (e.g. political speeches or 'spoken to be written' (e.gs. dictated letters). Mode also refers to whether a text is

> performative or reflective, spontaneous or well thought out. (qtd. in Taylor *Language to Language* 79)

According to Halliday, then, these same constituents form a big part of what any individual does, indirectly and unconsciously, in any given context of a situation. These three elements represent a large portion of translators' working process as they are always trying to balance these elements out to render a faithful chain of signifiers of the target text. The context of the situation of most translators is largely based on their life and work experience and not on their scholarly background. Christopher Taylor in *Language to Language* provides a detailed picture of how translators approach their personal rhetorical situation.

> By establishing the 'field' of a text, decisions can be made as to what terminology may or may not be adopted, how information should be presented grammatically (active/passive, stative/dynamic, etc.) and what shared knowledge should be assumed to exist between writer and reader. The 'tenor' will inform the translator as to which register to employ, in the sense of formal/informal, technical/non-technical, archaic/modern, etc. and whether the indicative (affirmative or interrogative) or imperative mood should be employed. The 'mode' points the way to the organization of the information in terms of theme and rheme, given and new information, information focus, and so on. (79)

The students' exploration of the rhetorical situation and the context of a situation of a translated text will ensure, yet again, another layer of understanding of translated texts. Of all the elements that compose both the rhetoric and the context of a situation, we will ask our students to pay closer attention to the tenor of translated texts; mainly because we want them to raise questions about the register imbued in the translation. We might want to start up by asking them questions

such as do translators use a high or a low register? Is the language stumbling or is the reading smooth? Does the change of register cause the translation to sound mechanical? Addressing these types of inquiries will make students start reflecting upon the intricacies of rhetoric and translation and impact on understanding and communicating ideas.

The next translation term we will present to our students is the *remainder*. Mentioned in Venuti's *The Scandals of Translation,* the *remainder* fosters value that is grounded in connotation. More specifically, Venuti's *remainder* refers to the unpredictable effects of translation and includes "the collective force of linguistic forms that outstrips any individual's control and complicates intended meanings" (Venuti, Kindle, *Scandals*, section 2500). By intended meanings, Venuti is referring to those linguistic forms that deviate from the norm and give translators leeway to "depersonalize and destabilize meaning" (Venuti, Kindle, *Scandals*, section 259). In other words, if a translation brims with syntactic structures and word choices strange to the English reader, that portion of the text could be identified as the *remainder*. For instance, we could consider examples of the *remainder* words that lack meaning for today's audience, discrepancies in meaning among translations, textual ambiguity, lack of fluidity and precision of structural components of the sentences, awkward punctuation placement and, overall, the use of a language that moves away from ordinary speech.

The possibility of structural variation and ambiguity in translated texts challenge stipulated, prescriptive, and conventional theories of translation that settle to please domestic readers. Following the definition of the *remainder,* we could proceed to examine the concept of *implicature* also presented and defined by Venuti in *The Scandals of Translation:*

> In the case of translation, linguistic-oriented theorists have construed *implicature* as a feature of the foreign text that reveals a difference between the foreign and

> domestic cultures, usually a gap in the domestic readers' knowledge for which the translator must somehow compensate. … To compensate for an *implicature* in the foreign text, a translator may add footnotes or incorporate the supplementary material in the body of translation. (Venuti, Kindle, section 526)

By introducing Venuti's *remainder* and *implicature* I am purposely addressing the fact that all translations work in an asymmetrical and anti-hierarchical relationship.

Using definitions from Friedrich Schleiermacher's lecture about the different methods of translation delivered in 1813, the next two terms to be introduced to students are foreignization and domestication. In Schleiermacher's view, there are two venues that constitute the translation of texts: "[E]ither the translation leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him (domestication); or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him (foreignization)" (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 42). Schleiermacher's domestication and foreignization hinges on translators' ability to foresee their audiences' response to the final translation. In this view, translators become facilitators whose options along the translating process affect the full spectrum of the readers' interpretation of texts. Almost two centuries later, Lawrence Venuti brought this terminology to the forefront, identifying the characteristics that make for domesticated or foreignized translations.

Venuti defines domestication as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values, bringing the author back home" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 15). Within this scenario, translators erase every shred of foreignness and create a familiarized and immediately recognizable text, adjusted to the target text's linguistic and cultural dimensions (20). Foreignization, on the other hand, exposes the oddness of some translated texts in such a way that readers of these texts often find it difficult to untangle its meaning.

Among the significant traits of domesticated translations Venuti lists

1. A fluent translation is immediately recognizable and intelligible because translators produce an illusionary effect of transparency. Hence, the translated texts seem natural, that is, it sounds almost as if it was never translated.

2. A fluent translation is written in a language that is current instead of archaic, that is widely used instead of specialized (jargonization), and that is standard instead of colloquial (slangy).

3. Foreign words or phrases imprinted by the foreign language are avoided, as are Britishisms in American translations and Americanisms in British translations.

4. Results in a loss of the foreign social context.

5. Avoids knotty constructions.

6. It encompasses an ethnocentric reduction of the text.

Foreignized translations are described as follows:

1. In these sorts of translations, fluency is impossible to achieve with close or "verbal translation which inhibits the effect of transparency, making the translator's language seem foreign."

2. Resists dominant values and the current regime of fluent domestication.

3. Uncovers/discloses the artificiality of the text.

4. Avoids the usage of more familiar language to the native reader.

5. While foreignized translations give readers more information about the foreign text, it also tends to increase the difficulty of understanding the text. (See Venuti *Scandals*)

In teaching translation with a *Transglobal* approach having the awareness of both domesticated and foreignized texts is crucial in helping students understand the benefits and drawbacks of each one of those methods, and discussing how these two techniques influence readers' reactions. Ultimately, students need to recognize which theory the translator is using and their position to it, which also helps show them the rhetorical grounding of translated texts.

Following the explanation of all the translation tools, my method proceeds to introduce a term called amplification and that pertains to both the field of Translation Studies and rhetoric. In Translation Studies, amplification belongs to a classification of nine translation strategies that J. L. Malone outlined in *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation* (1988). In this categorization, amplification is defined as any additional information that translators may have to include to clarify the intention of the original text. Sometimes translators make use of amplification by incorporating footnotes, endnotes, or bracketed information in their texts. Other times, these additions are merely syntactical and help clarify the complexity of structures in the source text that would, otherwise, be unclear. For teaching textual analysis, I am suggesting using only some of the nine total strategies as defined by Malone in 1988, mainly because the majority of these strategies involve the comparison of translated texts to the original.[30]

In the rhetorical realm, there were multiple attempts to define amplification. In the Renaissance, *On Copia*, written by Dutch scholar Desiderius Erasmus, was the most popular book in schools and universities for teaching rhetoric, and focused almost exclusively on the rhetorical figure of amplification as Erasmus theorized it: "On the twofold abundance of expressions and ideas" (Burton; see also Bizzell/Herzberg). In this book, Erasmus showed students hundreds of ways to rewrite a sentence, illustrating how the language both changed the

[30] According to Malone, these nine strategies include: *Equation* (also referred to as *equivalence*) and *substitution*; *divergence* and *convergence*; *amplification* and *reduction*; *diffusion* and *condensation*; and *reordering*.

meaning and created rhetorical effects evoking eloquence. He in turn influenced a huge number of textbook writers and rhetoricians in later historical periods. Considering the large amount of slight variations of this key rhetorical term over time, I have decided to make use of the explanation postulated by Heinrich F. Plett, in his entry for the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (qtd. in 2001). Plett distinguishes two methods of applying amplification: *Horizontal* and *vertical*.

By *horizontal* amplification he indicates "the enlargement of a proposition or, more generally, the extension of a text by the multiplication and variation of its constituents (places, circumstances) in order to heighten the rhetorical effect." *Vertical* amplification, on the other hand, "serves the qualitative purpose of elevating or magnifying the subject in hand" (25). These two types of amplification contribute to the understanding of the ethos and pathos of the passage, and consequently are very useful for the analysis of the translated texts being studied. Of Malone's nine strategies, I also include the analysis of two more terms: Reduction and reordering. Like amplification, these two elements pertain to the arrangement and organization of written structures. A counterpart of amplification, reduction refers to the elimination of structures from translated texts that obscure the meaning of some passages and obstructs the fluency of the target text. The last term worth noting is reordering. In *Language to Language*, Christopher Taylor defines it as "comparative syntax [and] basic inversion procedures" (61). This tool could alter the tone of the text in its totality, making it sound more or less archaic depending on the syntactic choices translators make. In this section I have provided a list of the rhetorical and translation tools that should be utilized in this methodology. The following will further delineate the purpose of my methodology.

3.6 Methodology (Part 2): Purpose and Implementation

Though the main purpose of this teaching methodology revolves around promoting the notion of *Transglobal Literacy*, we must not forget that its fundamental *raison* d'être entails guiding students through the process of critical reasoning in a practical context, and turning them into readers who question their knowledge. Maryanne Wolf, Director of the Center for Reading and Language Research at Tufts University and literacy expert who researches reading and cognition, published both scholarly works and pedagogical programs on reading and writing and linguistic awareness, especially in children. In *Proust and the Squid: The Story and Science of the Reading Brain* (2007), Wolf states how

> for Socrates, the search for real knowledge did not revolve around information. Rather, it was about finding the essence and purpose of life. Such a search required a lifelong commitment to developing the deepest critical and analytical skills, and to internalizing personal knowledge through the prodigious use of memory, and long effort. (220)

To aid students to reach an analytical and critical level of comprehension of translating texts, it is imperative that instructors understand the nature, scope, and purpose of this methodology.

The purpose of my methodology for teaching rhetoric and translation is six fold. First, it creates a theory connecting translation and rhetoric. Second, it entails the pedagogical application of both rhetorical and translation devices and reclaims translation for rhetoric, like Ascham did in the Renaissance. Third, it creates a space that allows students to read in their native language about cultures other than their own. Fourth, it fosters values that relate to global literacy and global citizenship in the classroom. Fifth, because it teaches students how to

effectively perform a close reading of the text, it offers the advantages of connecting to two other educational models, CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing), and WID (Writing and/or Reading in the Disciplines). Sixth, and finally, it is a methodology that relies heavily upon a how-centered approach to teaching, a method that emphasizes activities that occur in the writing class and allows students to discuss ideas among themselves, fostering peer collaboration and teaching, with facilitation by the teacher – instructional methods that have been shown to be superior for student learning than lecture. This pedagogy also ensures that translated texts are better-appreciated and seen from more than one stance. One of the main objectives of teaching with this methodology is to initially defy and decenter the readers point of view, to force their reasoning to actively engage.

Based on my pilot study in a college course in Spring 2012, this transglobal pedagogy could easily be presented and put into practice within the course of two days.[31] It is important to emphasize that the level of simplicity or complexity of this teaching method depends upon students' level of competency and education. Although I am specifically advocating for the implementation of this methodology in graduate courses, it could be easily applicable to any level and/or discipline that includes translated texts as part of their curriculum. The implementation of this method entails a series of steps teachers should consider prior to putting it into practice. In this first phase, instructors maintain their translation of choice in the syllabus, but research a minimum of two to three translated excerpts in addition to their text of choice. I

[31] I am suggesting two days because this worked well in actual practice for a course meeting twice a week. I encourage instructors to take the needed time to ensure the successful implementation of this pedagogical application.

propose finding excerpts in the English language as the target language.[32] The number of texts presented in class should not exceed four, or be less than two.[33] Therefore, all instructors should consider the following scale prior to the selection of the translated passages:

1. Two translated excerpts: Implies translation texts are different.
2. Three translated excerpts: Show differences among translations. The texts are somewhat different, and offer more opportunity to discuss and apply techniques.
3. Four translated excerpts: Show that translated texts are significantly different from each other, and provide an ideal foundation to explore the rhetorical and translation terms and techniques.[34]

It is also important to note how talking about the original author and the general background of the text prior to the application of this methodology may lead students into a biasing approximation of the text. In other words, we must seriously consider limiting the amount of information that we provide to our students before they read. If instructors choose to share some background information about the original text with students, they could tell them the date of publication and a succinct account of the historical context and the author.[35] The contextualization or the "placing a text within an appropriate historical and cultural framework" is something that we can do later on in the process (*A Catalog of Critical Reading Strategies* 551).

---

[32] This methodology is designed specifically for American institutions and for students whose first language is English. Should instructors from other countries venture to use it in their classrooms, they will be required to create slight variations of the current method.

[33] The analysis of two translated texts in the classroom will not be sufficient to accomplish the full range of understanding this methodology aims to attain.

[34] Instructors are highly encouraged to use four translated excerpts because this amount will truly expose how these texts significantly diverge from each other.

[35] To ensure the success of this methodology, instructors must remain firm and not release more information about the author or the context than necessary to begin the study.

When researching and gathering the required number of translated texts, instructors should consider the type of translated text they want to present to the students, and go through the four following questions to guide their selection of the excerpts:

1. Where was the translation published? It has been established that English is the target language for these excerpts. However, and whenever possible, instructors should consider including texts by both British and American translators.

2. When was it published? Although I advise instructors to utilize translations published between the twentieth and the twenty-first century, mainly because of their accessibility, it is completely up to the instructors whether they want to choose a translation prior to the twentieth century.

If they do opt to use an older version of the translation, it is essential that they use the same font size and style before handing the text to students, so visually they look the same and will not interfere with students' impressions before they do the close reading. Other questions to be considered by instructors in this process are

1. Which are the publishing companies? The collaborative aspect behind translators work relies heavily on the editing work of some of these publishing houses that play a crucial role in "amending" the ultimate version of the product. Instructors should try to find translations from different imprints (for example, ancient Greek and Latin texts from Penguin Classics, Oxford World Classics, Loeb Classical Library, and/or Dover Thrift Editions).

2. Who is the translator? Considering the translators' gender as the analysis of *genderlect* in these texts engenders another level of discussion in the classroom, and the opportunity

to explore sexism, phallogocentric language, feminist rhetorics, and rhetorics of masculinity.

Once the selection process is complete, instructors will be almost ready to hand the excerpts to students who, in turn, will take them home to read.

This first part of the students' reading process constitutes what I refer to as a "zooming out" approach to reading because it allows students a broader view of a situation presented to them. The two days that will follow the implementation of the method are twofold: On day one, instructors will present the basic terminology students will use in the analysis of the text. A glossary of terms with specific examples drawn from different translations will also be provided to the students. Once the rhetorical and translation tools have been introduced to students, instructors should give them a series of general questions as homework with the passages to read before the next class meeting:

1. Which translations are more contemporary?
2. In which texts are the characters and the narrator domesticated and/or foreignized?
3. Can you identify the translator's ethos?
4. Can you pinpoint significant stylistic variations in the texts?
5. Which translator is providing more information and who is providing less?

Once the students take these excerpts home it is extremely important for the instructors to remind them to aim for a bias-free interpretation of the text. First, they should ask students not to do any additional research outside of the classroom, and second to closely and deeply read the excerpts before coming to class.

On the second day, each student will be handed a chart with questions pertaining to the analysis of the extracts.[36] Depending on the number of students, instructors will split the class into groups using their own criteria. To further activate the conversation, I suggest a relatively large number of students per group.[37] During the course of the activity, instructors will encourage students to work together while filling out the chart and to constantly engage in discussion with their peers. This "zooming in," or reading for meaning process, encourages students to take a closer view of the text and analyze it in detail. The suggested time frame allotted for the in-class discussion depends on the course's length of time. If the class lasts an hour, I suggest a minimum of thirty minutes for the students to complete the charts and discuss the passages in groups.[38] Following this conversation, the different groups will reveal their chart answers and samples to the instructor, who will progressively unveil the information about the excerpts, following the chart in detail, and actively engaging with students. Once the elements of the chart have been addressed and disclosed, it is time to reevaluate and reexamine the pre-reading questions given to students.

The final step of the process is optional, but instructors could end the exercise with a general discussion about global citizenship and *Transglobal Literacy*, letting students know that, through the application of this method, they have partaken in a *Transglobal* discussion within the boundaries of their own classroom. Thus, with the application of this *Transglobal Literacy*, the act of reading translated texts is forever changed, just like Suzanne Jill Levine proposes in *The Subversive Scribe*.

---

[36] This chart is included in Appendix A.
[37] I propose to put students in groups of four or six.
[38] All of these factors are subject to fluctuation. In part, it depends on the instructor 's willingness to dedicate a third class to the analysis of the text. If the class lasts longer than an hour, instructors can extend the time frame to complete the chart, respond to the questions, and analyze the texts.

> A translation should be a critical act, however, creating doubt, posting questions to the reader, recontextualizing the ideology of the original text. Since a good translation, as with all rhetoric, aims to (re)produce an effect, to persuade a reader, it is, in the broadest terms, a political act. The good translator performs a balancing act, then, attempting to push language beyond its limits while at the same time maintain a common ground of dialogue between writer and reader, speaker and listener. (4)

In the next two chapters, I show how this *Transglobal* method for teaching rhetoric and translation is applied in two case studies, one a rhetorical and educational text and the other a literary text. Both of my case studies involve reputable authors with broad audiences. The first text was originally written in Latin during the late Roman Empire, and the second was published in Spanish during the seventeenth century. In Chapter Four, I apply my methodology to Quintilian's rhetorical treatise *Institutes of Oratory*, a text that sets out teaching philosophy and rhetorical theory. In Chapter Five, I present an application of *Transglobal Literacy* teaching methods to the canonical novel *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha* by Miguel de Cervantes. In this same chapter, I also present arguments related to rhetoric, translation, education, literature, and popular culture, as well as demonstrating how to apply the methodology detailed in this chapter to specific texts, authors, and translators.

4 ON TRANSLATING PHILOSOPHY AND CLASSICS. CASE ONE: THEORY, EDUCATION AND QUINTILIAN

Translation is but the key to the house of greater treasures, the fascinating treasures of classic literature. – Frank Justus Miller

Many scholars have expressed their concern over the general state of languages for years. The rapid incorporation of loanwords, along with the relentless insertion of neologisms, makes most languages in/directly interact with one another. The long quest for purity of expression and a language that is completely free of exoticism is practically chimerical worldwide. Some authors consider the use of archaic and often foreign terminology a thing of the past. The tendency toward foreignization that reigns in our lives, they claim, could lead to the diffusion of one's language. Although written over sixty years ago, the following article by George Orwell titled "Politics and the English Language," encapsulates this general state of aversion to the inclusion of other languages that prevails in some parts of society:

> Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilization is decadent and our language – so the argument runs – must inevitably share in the general collapse. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for our own purposes. (Orwell)

Given the general discontent for embracing what is unknown to us, attempting to teach texts that are semantically, culturally and syntactically charged with unfamiliar lexical items and

expressions becomes an obstruction to instructors. The truth is that most texts that pertain to the field of literary theory, philosophy, and non-fiction include a wide range of unfamiliar terminology to most readers. When those texts belong to cultures other than their own, the level of intelligibility of those texts had the potential to become undecipherable. When native readers struggle to read through these texts, they often find themselves resorting to some type of "supplemental reader's guide." Current tendencies behind the translation of those texts reveal a preference for domestication techniques, that is, for the creation of a text that facilitates the reading and comprehension of its content. If choosing the adopt foreignization techniques, and preserving what is foreign in texts, translators often include an overriding amount of footnotes, appendices, and additional information, which hamper their reading experience.

Translation used to be a much more relaxed enterprise, one that was devoid of constant scrutiny and criticism. Jonathan Rée, in "The Translation of Philosophy," mentions how rigidity in translation was not always that axiomatic.

> Before the twentieth century, translators were permitted to relax and be themselves. Chapman's *Homer*, North's *Plutarch*, Golding's *Ovid*, Dryden's *Virgil*, Urquhart's *Rabelais*, for instance: none of them is prostrated by the two stern ideals of faithfulness and naturalness. They are recompositions, in a style chosen by the translator, and they brim with locutions strange to the English language; yet they have been accepted as classics of its literature. (224)

In the "About us" section of the Penguin Classics Website, it is specified how 'classics' written any time before 1946 "were mainly the domain of students and academics, without good, readable editions for everyone else" (Penguin Classics). It was not until E. V. Rieu's English version of Homer's *Odyssey* for Penguin that a readable edition of this classic became accessible

to more than a privileged group of individuals. Rieu's effort to keep domestic readers in mind made this translation one of Penguin's bestselling novels for years. The success behind this acclaimed reception relied on Rieu's eagerness to imitate Homer's work; however, it was due to the translator's persistence on remaining faithful to this work without inundating readers with problematic verbiage or intricate sentence structures. Rieu traces out some of his views about domestication in the following passage:

> It is the editor's intention to commission translators who can emulate his own example and present the general reader with readable and attractive versions of the great writers books in modern English, shorn of the unnecessary difficulties and erudition, the archaic flavour and the foreign idiom that renders so many existing translations repellent to modern taste. Each volume will be issued at Penguin prices and the series will include, besides the Odyssey ... many other volumes covering a wide variety of literature ranging from ... Ancient Egypt to the closing years of the nineteenth century. (Penguin Classics)

Rieu's attempt to minimize the obscure elements in Homer's work contributed to the subsequent publication of classics that stood out for their domestication.

The incomprehensibility permeating translated scholarly works often calls for readers to either peruse these texts or abandon them altogether. Therefore, skipping murky passages or avoiding the reading of convoluted texts becomes a normative reaction among readers. Some scholars have addressed the difficulties of translating scholarly writing versus works of literature. In "On Translations," the Polish philosopher Roman Ingarden notes the discrepancies between these two types of works. For Ingarden, the goal of scholarly texts is to ignite cognition, and is characterized by its lexical and semantic meticulousness. Works of literature, conversely, aim at

preserving the harmonious nature of the text and call for aesthetic, lexical, and semantic precision. In addition, scholarly works have to deal with the absence of an author, which makes its interpretation even more challenging. Coping with this absence for Josephine Balmer is not easy, as often times translators have to deal with the lack of information about the work, "let alone about the circumstances of the work's composition" (Bassnett and Bush 185). Additionally, many classical and scholarly texts are imbued with multilingual and intertextual references, which call for translators to adopt a standardized position for the translation of these ideas. In "The Translation of Philosophy," Jonathan Rée observes that "the European philosophical tradition is thoroughly multilingual, therefore, perhaps to a greater degree than any other intellectual discipline" (231). To mend these multilingual challenges, some translators opt to respect the nature of these passages by keeping the terms in the same way as they were written in the original text and then italicize them. This was common practice in the nineteenth century when most translators left the writing of the words in the target language untouched to preserve the flair of the original. In the same article, Jonathan Rée notes that, although the trend to overtly domesticate translations of scholarly works prevails over other forms of delivery, there are still a few translators who purposefully foreignize their translations. Rée is of the opinion that the idea of intentionally foreignizing passages that are already difficult to understand could drag the meaning of these passages to even more obscure places. Many translators have observed that the purpose of their work is to convey the meaning of passages effectively. When delivery, however, hinges on the intention of the original author, translation ceases to be a dependable vehicle of effective communication.

Another problem that translators of scholarly texts have encountered throughout the history of translation is how to deal with multiculturalism. Although the complexity of their

work depends on the target language they are translating from, translators frequently face dilemmas pertaining to the artificiality and arbitrariness of languages. The many dissonances among languages could lead translators down a primrose path of faulty assumptions and misinterpretations. By being fully bicultural and familiarized with the intricacies of both languages, translators can relate culturally and linguistically to their audience and recognize those linguistic differences. Another challenge of translating scholarly works is to never underestimate the complexity of its meaning. Rée's analogy that relates the translation of philosophy to fleeing elements of nature illustrates the difficulty of the translating process: "For the language of philosophy is not a mighty tree, immovable and reassuringly familiar; it is flocks of strange birds, dispersing and regrouping, landing for a moment, and then flying away" (253). One of the translators most glaring concerns should be, and most frequently is, the faithful rendering of culturally bound allusions and connotations. The transferring of philosophical modes of thinking and knowledge from one culture into another could be riskier than we would expect. In his essay "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation," José Ortega y Gasset explores challenges of duplicating words from one language into another; especially when the visual element behind those words differs fundamentally from each other:

> In Arabic there are 5,714 names for camel. Evidently, it's not easy for a nomad of the Arabian Desert and a manufacturer from Glasgow to come to an agreement about the humpbacked animal. Languages separate us and discommunicate, not simply because they are different languages, but because they proceed from different mental pictures, from disparate intellectual systems, from divergent philosophies. (107)

Ortega y Gasset goes on to categorize translation within its own distinctive literary genre; a genre based on the criteria of a cluster of individuals – editors, translators, and outside readers – whose work alter the function of textual integrity (Gill 6).[39] If the ideas conveyed by these voices become "lost in translation," they are not only failing to positively relocate the knowledge from one culture into another, but they are also indirectly decontextualizing the trajectory of translated texts. *Anisomorphism*, a term used to describe how the perception of some semantic concepts differ from one language to another, also effects the directionality of these texts in terms of relatedness from one culture to another. After all, trying "to capture 'all the words of a language' is as futile as trying to capture all the drops of water in a flowing river" (Bellos, Kindle, section 4719).

Retranslations of the same text over centuries present another level of complexity to both translators and readers. Ever since the nineteenth century, the translation of the classics into English has been on the rise. Penguin, Everyman, and the Loeb series made the classics more affordable (Baker and Saldanha, Kindle, section 1741). In the United States, for instance, the constant

> demands made by undergraduate humanities and 'great books' courses from the 1920s and the 1930s onwards created a huge market for translation of classical texts. … Translations by scholars such as Richmond Lattimore (1951, 1965) and Robert Fitzgerald (1961, 1974), and by Robert Fagles (1984, 1990, 1996) who collaborated with Bernard Knox, influenced both literary criticism and popular

[39] Paul Gill defines "outside readers" as individuals who are hired and/or asked to revise translations and that "should be fluent in both the native language of the book and in English. Editors will often commission an outside reader. The outside reader will report providing a summary of the book's plot, and commenting on its literary merit and making a personal recommendation about whether or not it should be published in English." Among the issues that outside readers are asked to focus on are elements such as "style, vocabulary and structure" because they could make the book hard to translate (6).

> conceptions of the ancient world. (Baker and Saldanha, Kindle, section 1741-1751)

Whereas some translations have been rebuked for undermining the source text, others have been placed as the standard translations of the work; the latter one becoming the text of choice in the university courses.

4.1 More Nuances of Philosophical and/or Scholarly Translation

We will start this section by asking ourselves the following questions. First, what is the need of retranslating texts that have been so frequently translated in the past? Second, how do translators in their translation of the text address the absence of original writers and their rhetorical situation and cultural context, if they do at all? Given the absence of original authorial intent, translators of these texts find themselves juggling with meaning and trying to decide whether they want to resort to previously translated texts of the same work or not. Two other aspects that contemporary translators struggle with when translating classics is the dearth of source texts and their fragmentation. Making syntactical sense of fragmented structures often leads just to a misguided set of assumptions on the translators' part. In order to avoid this route of misinformation and to fill these textual gaps, translators of classical texts turn to scholarly practices, such as researching textual documentation. According to Josephine Balmer, retranslating a classic work becomes a creative writing enterprise for translators, who not only have to reconstruct the meaning of those texts, but also must do their best to remain true to their artistic instincts of the source text. Balmer herself notes that "classical translation has always had a tradition of subversion, of transgression, [and] of perversion" (190). For Balmer, the recontextualization of classical texts represent an arduous task for translators who, first, have to

decipher the intelligibility of fragmented ancient manuscripts and, second, transfer the meanings of those concepts into the twenty-first century. By inserting new syntactic structures translators are making the choice of sacrificing certain elements of the source text for the sake of readability and accessibility.

Translating and retranslating non-fiction and scholarly works calls on skills and knowledge that literary translators need. The German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, in "On Language and Words," expresses his concern regarding a full grasping of the spirit of foreign languages through translation. In other words, Schopenhauer addresses the impossibility of fully reproducing the ulterior meaning of words in another language because he sees words themselves as carriers of semantic, cultural, and individual meaning of their own. He duly noted that when translating into Latin "expressions totally different from the original have to be used. Indeed, the ideas to be transplanted into Latin have to be totally reconstituted and remodeled; the idea has to be dissolved into its most basic components and then reconstructed in the new language" (33). In short, to him, reviving these languages while reconfiguring their meaning into modern standards is a chimerical endeavor. Always bearing in mind the limitations of translating into these languages, he goes on to say that differences in meaning between these and other so-called dead languages only make for a harder translation process. This difference, he claims,

> does not leave room for a word-for-word rendering but requires that we melt down our thoughts entirely and recast them into a different form. [W]hereas translation of a modern language into another modern one requires only disassembly of the sentence to be translated into its obvious components and then the reassembly of them, the translation into Latin often requires a breakdown of a

> sentence into its most refined, elementary components (the pure thought content) from which the sentence is then regenerated in totally different forms. (35)

Throughout the entirety of this passage, Schopenhauer expresses his concern about metaphysical implications of translating classical texts; a dual process that entails the artificial and unnatural reenactment of ancient cultures, and the transposition of sociolinguistic competence between languages. Within Schopenhauer's account, the anachronistic gap between the original and the translated text make for a situation that reinforces the artificiality of translated texts, and that calls for the imperfection of these texts.

In his essay, Schopenhauer does not report any interest in unraveling translation methods or methodology, but rather his concern is with the philosophical reach of translation. Behind the translation of classical texts lies a series of technical choices that scholars in Translation Studies have painstakingly documented throughout the years. For instance, the first edition of *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* explicates some of the features and techniques that constitute the translation of classics: "The languages [of texts] are no longer spoken; the corpus of extant texts is … finite; manuscript traditions are sometimes disputed and some foundational texts, such as Homer's epics, present problems because of their oral composition." The entry also refers to this translation process as one that is "ideologically loaded (in terms of power relations, class, gender, and ethnicity)" (Baker 34). Every single one of these ideological elements represents a potential threat to the core of the source language and culture. As Lorna Hardwick mentions in an entry to the second edition of *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, "the translation of classical texts continues to be a means of negotiating intellectual, aesthetic and cultural status and of practicing realignments" (Baker and Saldanha 37). In light of the manifold display of voices that have inserted themselves in these translated

texts through the years, the analysis and understanding of canonical and/or scholarly texts is more convoluted than we presuppose. With the exception of the translation of the King James Version of the Bible in English, not a single scholarly translation has been awarded the status of the original text (see Munday). As a matter of fact, most translated texts tend to become automatically disclaimed or rejected or are replaced by other self-proclaimed improved and revised translations.

4.2 Multiple Translations of *Institutio Oratoria*

Since its publication, Quintilian's twelve-volume book has undergone periods of notoriety as well as invisibility. When the treatise first came out it was an instant success. Its popularity was felt through the years and influenced subsequent authors such as Saint Augustine and Saint Jerome, both of whom quoted the Roman author extensively in their work. During the Middle Ages, however, Quintilian's manuscript caused a lesser impact on medieval authors and led to the partial loss of the text by the eight and ninth centuries. It is not until the fourteenth century, when the Italian humanist and scholar Poggio Bracciolini discovered Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* at the Abbey of St. Gall in Switzerland, that this multivolume work started to regain its acclaimed status in the history of rhetoric.[40] Despite the incomplete and mutilated state in which Poggio Bracciolini found the document, Quintilian's rhetorical manuscript found a reputable place among Renaissance scholars gaining the canonical status that some of his predecessors, such as Virgil or Cicero, already had. Many humanist writers at the time, Martin Luther and Juan Luis Vives to name some, borrowed heavily from Quintilian's methods of

[40] Poggio Bracciolini recounts the finding of this book, along with other works of literature in a "gloomy dungeon at the bottom of one of the towers. [A place where] not even men convicted of a capital offense would have been stuck away" (Gordan 195).

teaching. *Institutio Oratoria* is to a certain extent still referred to by some as a paragon of conventional forms of teaching composition and oratory.

The main premise of the treatise centers on providing younger students with the right oratorical skills to ensure an unparalleled level of eloquence. Quintilian himself reflected upon the aim of his book in the preface: "We are to form, then, the perfect orator, who cannot exist unless he is first a good man. We require in him [the student], therefore, not only a consummate ability in speaking, but also every excellence of mind" (qtd. in Murphy *Quintilian* 6). Scholars have described it as "four major works blended into one: a treatise on education, a manual of rhetoric, a reader's guide to the best authors, and a handbook of the moral duties of the orator" (Murphy in *Quintilian* xviii-xix). James Herrick, in *The History and Theory of Translation*, depicts the manual as "a 'cradle to the grave' guide to achieving excellence as a public speaker" (108). James J. Murphy in, *On the Teaching of Speaking and Writing,* notes that "the modern reading of Quintilian, then is not a mere antiquarian exercise. His book epitomizes the best of a humane approach to literacy" (xiii). To better guide both teachers and students, Quintilian collects a number of examples, rules, and guidelines to illustrate his point. He never tries to hide the fact that he borrowed most of the teaching methods from the Greeks; instead, he acknowledges how his systematical approach to teaching oratory was only made to compile all of his teaching thoughts in a single work and to set the record straight about his teaching pedagogy.[41]

Always considering the needs of his audience, Quintilian frequently writes in a plain style and fairly approachable prose. Of Quintilian's writing style, Lee Honeycutt observes that

[41] According to Quintilian, some of his students were illicitly transcribing some of his lectures, and often rendering a faulty version of what he meant.

> his style is so studiedly elegant and graceful that the reader will sometimes be disposed to think that it would be improved by the appearance of occasional negligence. His Latinity, considering the age in which he lived, deserves the highest praise for its purity. His figurative embellishments are in general extremely happy … It must however be observed that he allows himself, in his illustrations, to use the conjunctions *quasi* and *velut* with rather too great frequency. In his phraseology, also, he is sometimes too fond of brevity. (Kindle, section 14391)

In *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Kennedy depicts Quintilian's prose as simple, direct. Kennedy, however, also mentions that at times Quintilian's verses emerge "eloquently and movingly" as we could imagine (Kindle, section 2912). Quintilian's plain style has been largely criticized throughout the years for not applying his own methods in the writing he produced. To Quintilian's detractors, Kennedy responds that scholars must not lose sight of the fact that Quintilian was a teacher, not a scholar or a rhetorician. Lee Honeycutt, however, shares the same sentiment about Quintilian's rendering and says that "in the delivery of these precepts he manifests great judgment, extensive reading, and the utmost anxiety to do his work well" (Kindle, section 14388). Considering the amount of opposing views most scholars have proclaimed about the style of the original text, we have no choice but to question the accuracy of Quintilian's translations.

Institutio Oratoria is claimed to be the first printed book about rhetoric. Immediately after its first release in 1470 by Campanus, two other editions followed within the same year. In fact, "even 100 editions were published over the next eighty years, together with a rash of commentaries and summaries" (Murphy, *Quintilian* xiii). In 1693, Edmund Gibson became

known as the first person to ever translate Quintilian's treatise into English. His version, nonetheless, was accused of neglecting the original for not giving enough attention to his collations. The recurrent omissions of some of Quintilian's passages seem to confirm the overall trend of eighteenth century translations. In 1755, W. Guthrie blatantly omitted some of the passages, and even changed the title of the work calling it *Quintctilian's Institutes of Eloquence, or, The Art of Speaking in Public in Every Character and Capacity*. In continuation with this futile trend, J. Patsall also offered a rendition that failed to include some of Quintilian's passages in his *Institutes of the Orator* (1774) (Murray, *Quintilian* xlvii). The inaccurate and mostly incomplete translations produced in the eighteenth century have often led most scholars to consider Reverend John Selby Watson's the first complete English translation of Quintilian's manuscript. Despite its copious notes, George Lewis Spalding's rendition of the book in 1798 had the potential to be in the running for the title of standard translation. Spalding's ambitious project, however, came to an end when he passed away soon before completing his translation. Of the many contemporary editions published in English, Murphy mentions a few that have been used throughout the years. He names those of "Charles Halm (Leipzig: Teubner series, 1868) and Ludwig Radermacher, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner series, 1907 and 1935). Butler uses the Halm text in his Loeb Classical Library edition of 1921. Another highly recognized and frequently used edition in Latin is that of Michael Winterbottom, *Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim* (Oxford-Clarendon, 1970)" (Murphy, *Quintilian* xiv). One of the most popular and reedited translations of Quintilian's book in English continues to be Reverend John Selby Watson's (1856). The major problem of this text, however, is that Selby used G. Spalding's Latin edition of the text that had been published between the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century as a reference for his work, not the original.

4.3 Translation Excerpts Selected for this Case Study

The following constitute the three excerpts chosen for my methodology:

1. Quintilian. *Institutionis Oratoriae: Volume I: Books I-VI; Quintilian*, Oxford Classical Texts: 1970.
2. Murphy, James J. *Quintilian. On the Teaching of Speaking and Writing. Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of Institutio Oratoria.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
3. Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. *Books 1-2.* Trans. and Ed. Donald A. Russell. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2001.

Of the revised version of Rev. John Selby Watson's 1856 translation, Lee Honeycutt says that he tried to preserve the meaning of Watson's work. He also acknowledges that he had to make significant punctuation changes to his British translation because it differed from American conventions. Following domesticating trends of translation, Honeycutt also chooses to omit most of Watson's wide array of footnotes to facilitate the reading of the text. Despite his efforts of domesticating the text, Honeycutt preserves the language of Watson's era. From Honeycutt's translation the first thing I observed is an intention to please modern audiences and to make the reading of Quintilian more pleasurable. Interestingly enough, Honeycutt never mentions how he is trying to preserve Quintilian's prosaic style, but rather focuses on revising Watson's translation to make it sound more modern.[42] Of his slightly modernized translation, Honeycutt says,

[42] According to Honeycutt, he limits himself to the revision of Watson's text due to his sparing knowledge of Latin.

> I have tried to pay homage to the lyricism of 19th century British style, while at the same time making it easier for 21st-century eyes to parse the text. In some cases, incredibly long sentences – stemming from Quintilian's own often elongated prose style – were divided to aid comprehension for the modern reader. In others, the order of words and phrases was slightly rearranged to make for easier reading. (Kindle, section 14179)

In the task to preserve Watson's text relatively similar to the translator's intention, Honeycutt remains, for the most part, faithful to Watson's choice of words and phrases. Lastly, Honeycutt also acknowledges having reviewed the Loeb series translations to corroborate and justify his translation choices.

Murphy also opts to use Watson's translation as the primary source for his version of the text. Resembling Honeycutt's choices, Murphy's text also seems to approximate contemporary readers by modernizing Watson's 1856 text. A number of Murphy's decisions to alter Watson's text are evident in the punctuation and shortening of the length of sentences and paragraphs. It is for the sake of clarity that Murphy claims to have made most of these syntactical variations of the text. To justify his translation choices, Murphy notes that he contrasted Watson's translation with two other twentieth century translations among which he mentions Ludwig Radermacher's (Teubner Series: Leipzig, 1907) and Michael Winterbottom's (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970). To facilitate the reading process for modern audiences, Murphy transliterates some words into the Roman alphabet. Part of Murphy's domesticating process includes additional notes; essentially when they helped to clarify the direct quotations or intertextual references (Murphy, *Quintilian* lii).

Unlike the other two translations, the editor of the Loeb series, Donald A. Russell, used M. Winterbottom's version of the text, followed its punctuation, and kept in the Greek words. Russell's version contrasts with other translations in the sense that he takes into account the fragmentation in which Quintilian's manuscript was found. In his general introduction to Quintilian's translation, Russell refers his readers back to Winterbottom's *Problems in Quintilian* (1970), and it does not show a thorough explanation about his translation process. Unlike other versions of Quintilian's work, Russell claims that "this is essentially a new translation of Quintilian;" although he admits to borrow from the previous Loeb classic translated by H. E. Butler. The main goal for this translation, he writes, is to "make students of classics and others interested in the general history of rhetoric, which is a much more popular subject than it was in Butler's day. Hence all the analyses, subheadings, introductions, footnotes, and indexes" (vii). By adding extensive footnotes, his work offers clarification to a modern audience.

4.4 Case Study I: *Institutio Oratoria*

The translated passages selected for this case study contains Quintilian's ideas about teaching students a fair amount of writing and reading skills for the purpose of becoming meaningful orators. To this end, I have decided to select a passage that specifically pertains to teaching students how to read; a section entitled in Russell's edition "The rhetor should read oratory and history with his pupils" (301). Some of Quintilian's advice in this excerpt emphasizes the relevance of reading passages aloud both to enhance the comprehension of the text and to ensure its proper delivery. Quintilian outlines that instructors ought to read the text to students out loud first to become familiar with how to articulate and enunciate the words of the passage. Though the ultimate goal is to reach the critical reading skills, the way to do this is to

read it aloud and ask questions about what has just been read. Quintilian is aware of the fact that analyzing the ethos of the passage contributes to the underlying message and motivations of the text; therefore, students reach the level of analysis and synthesis of the text.

This case study analyzes the many discrepancies among these translated excerpts to facilitate its thorough understanding. To this end, I will specifically address the most significant variations of these texts following the chart and questions provided in Appendix A.[43] It is important to point out that the most overriding attempt at the domestication of Quintilian's text is Russell's translation. The directness and simplicity of Russell's ethos make his translation sound as if the manuscript were based on a twenty-first century text. From his familiar and sophisticated lexicon, but yet plain style and register, Russell's modernized version of Quintilian makes the text accessible to modern audiences. The entire passage is full of expressions that contribute to the context of the situation of the text as well as its fluidity. Some of Russell's linguistic and lexical decisions include his preference for using the word "teacher" over more obsolete choices like "preceptor" or "master," as seen in Murphy's text. Other word choices are "hidden," instead of "well-concealed" (Murphy and Butler); "jokes" rather than "jests" (Murphy and Butler); "artist" and not "pleader," (Murphy) or "master" (Butler); "after all" (Russell), versus "for what object" (Murphy), or "for what else" (Butler); "badness" (Russell), instead of "vicious" (Murphy); and sentences such as "they will be lead to form their own ideas" (Russell) versus Murphy's rather lengthy version "namely that they conceive and understand," or Butler's slightly different lexical choice, "the class will be lead to find out things for themselves." Russell's much more concise version of this sentence, "it can be useful sometimes to read bad or faulty speeches," contrast with Murphy's lengthier version of the same line "nor it is without

[43] I will not address issues such as the date of publication and the genderlect of these texts, as these are tasks that pertain to our students' analysis of the texts.

advantage, indeed, that inelegant and faulty speeches – yet such as many, from depravity of taste, would admire – should be read," or Butler's passive structure, "it will even at times be of value to read speeches which are corrupt and faulty in style." Other examples include, "get rid of inattentiveness," (Russell) versus "Thus, carelessness will not come upon them," (Murphy), or "this will prevent his audience from becoming inattentive" (Butler). Another sentence that clearly illustrates Russell's modernization of the text read as follows: "[W]hat is said does not go in at one ear and out at the other." When compared to Murphy's "nor will the instructions that shall be given fail to enter their ears," or Butler's "will secure that his words do not fall on deaf ears," Russell's option conjures up an image that modern readers can easily understand.

Also contributing to the domestication of the text – and following Butler's previous translation – is Russell's inclusion of footnotes. While Murphy himself adds footnotes to his translation, Russell's easy to follow and fairly detailed footnotes once again reveal an eagerness to connect with the modern reader. Overall, Russell's domesticating strategies contribute to the fluency of the passage, which is absent from the other two versions. By expurgating Quintilian's text from overly convoluted structures and run-on sentences, and by yielding to a plain style, Russell is clearly addressing the needs of modern audiences. Unfortunately, due to his pursuit of oversimplifying some of the passage structures, the ethos of the translated piece sometimes comes across as overly domesticated. His preference for current vocabulary makes us move further away from the original text, leading us to think that we are reading something that matches with the definition of domestication described by Venuti: "The criterion of 'success' here is fluent, domesticating translation where discursive shifts are unobtrusive, scarcely noticeable, and current usages is not defamiliarized by nonstandard forms" (*Invisibility* 194).

Due to this text's lack of anachronistic vocabulary, readers of Russell's translation will probably find it hard to assimilate into Quintilian's domestic values and/or idiosyncrasies.

Of all three translations, Murphy's could certainly be categorized as the version that hews the most to the aesthetics of Quintilian's domestic ideology. In the preface to his revised translation of Reverend John Selby's nineteenth century text, Murphy states that he aims to "achieve greater clarity, either through modernization of the punctuation or through alterations of translation itself" (lii). Upon reading Murphy's passage there is, however, a need for a second and sometimes a third reading of the lines. Through the use of inversion ("nor it is without advantage, indeed,") convoluted syntax ("more regard is shown for figures that are distorted and in any respect monstrous, than for such as have lost none of the advantages of ordinary conformation"), and awkward constructions ("to ask questions upon them,") the foreignized ethos of the passage pushes the reader away from current linguistic modes of writing. The rhetorical situation of the text seems to adhere to nineteenth century stylistic conventions; namely elevated tone, stilted and opaque language, and odd-sounding constructions. Essentially, what makes Murphy's translation less domesticated is the constant use of passive voice and obsolete use of the modal verb shall. All of his choices made us situate the ethos of the passage in a remote point in time that expurgates from the text any contemporary references. Possibly as an attempt to remain faithful to the Selby's British translation, we observe how Murphy elects to use Briticisms like "the reading of whatever book each of them may fancy," or "such lecturing, indeed, as is given." While I would assume these series of Briticisms to be consistent, I tracked a word in the passage whose spelling aligns with American conventions ("labor"), not British ("labour.") Interestingly enough, Murphy, an American translator himself, embraces both the Americanisms and the Briticisms.

Of all translations, H. E. Butler's ethos (1920) exists in between domesticating and foreignizing domains. In some of the prose of this passage, he renders words that are not exceedingly outdated or off-sounding ("well-concealed artifice," "how fierce is the invective and how full of wit the jests," "when the reading is commenced," and "this will prevent his audience from becoming inattentive"); yet he balances out his semantic choices and, most of the time, makes the text sound as it were written for modern readers as the following examples indicate: ("The teacher of rhetoric," "I am not asking teachers to undertake the task of," "The teacher will produce further to demonstrate"). Compared to Murphy's favoring use of high register, Butler produces a text that is accessible to all sorts of readers, yet capturing the essence of the classical text. In contrast to Murphy's display of amplification, Butler's passage does not produce lengthy periodic constructions. Butler's preference for passive structures ("and it will be best to select them by turns," "the speech selected for reading is concerned should then be explained," "which can only be understood by one who is a master of the art himself") brings his translation closer to foreignization. Also as part of his own personal domesticated strategies, Butler creates a lexicon familiar to British audiences ("favour", "vigour"). Overall, we could say that Butler's ethos conforms to discursive domestic standards, but nevertheless produces a version of the text that is inscribed in the foreign.

The last section of this case study discusses the analysis of the *remainder* and the *implicature* of all three passages. The analysis of the *implicature* entails the identification words and/or sentences in the target text that produces a gap in the knowledge of today's readers (see Venuti *Scandals*). To bridge that anachronistic gap, translators make use of amplification and/or extensive footnotes to facilitate the reading of the text. Although, through my previous analysis of the texts, I have already presented some instances that allude to this *implicature*, there are

other aspects we must consider. Of the three passages, Russell's use of the *implicature* is the most prevailing. Russell is the only translator who, in this specific passage, includes footnotes that guide the reader through his translation. Solely on this translation excerpt, Russell provides two footnotes that contain both cross-cultural and intertextual references. The cultural specificity of one of his footnotes allows readers to situate themselves in the foreign, and to assimilate into the cultural values of antiquity from a twenty-first century standpoint. The following footnote reflects Russell's inclination toward cultural and historical specificity: "Plutarch (*Moralia* 520c) tells us of a market at Rome in abnormal or monstrously deformed slaves." Also, used as a means to consolidate his taste for domesticity, Russell, unlike his predecessors, not only uses contemporary terms that are familiar to modern audiences, but he also appeals to readers who are familiar with rhetorical precepts. Russell also follows the modern preference for capitalization of these rhetorical terms: "Narrative", "Elocution", "Composition", "Cause", "Prooemium," "Amplification", "Invention". In sum, the ethos of Russell's passage displays a trend towards being more informative that, in turn, contributes to the domestication of the translation.

In the analysis of the *remainder*, I will focus on disclosing those instances where translators have chosen to dramatically alter the implication of these texts. Just like the examination of the *implicature*, the *remainder* also focuses on determining what hinders the intended meaning of the translation and obstructs the sense of transparency of the text. My previous analysis of the words and sentences of these texts provided examples of Venuti's approximation to the concept of the *remainder*, but there are other instances in which the *remainder* makes itself apparent in those translations. The three lines that I am referring to are Russell's "calling a pupil up to stand at their side," Murphy's "should call their pupils to their laps," and Butler's "recalling their pupils to stand at their knee." Clearly, these three sentences

carry a subtext that could only be deciphered by reading and understanding the original text. However, just by reading these sentences one notices, yet again, another clear example of Russell's advocacy for domestication. In accordance with contemporary standards of teaching practices, teachers of much younger students would probably not call "their pupils to their laps," not to mention, "to stand at their knee." It is obvious by the reading of both Murphy's and Butler's lines that their intention was to specifically match the ideological framework of Greek thought and culture. The other example that strikes as more domesticated is Russell's blatant omission of the reference to a "curling iron," that both Murphy and Butler use. With this choice, Russell opts to adhere to domestic norms once again. Instead of making this specific cultural allusion explicit in his passage, Russell says "there is more beauty in those who have had their hairs plucked and skin smoothed, who singe their hair and keep it in order with pins." This passage contrasts from Murphy as follows: "[T]here is more beauty in men who are depilated and smooth, who dress their locks (hot from the curling irons) with pins," or Butler's "is more beauty in those who pluck out superfluous hair or use depilatories, who dress their locks by scorching them with the curling iron." Another noticeable domesticated option in Russell's sentence is the informal use of a verb "plucked," instead of using the more refined and sophisticated Latinized "depilated" of his predecessors. Finally, there is also something to be said about Russell's choice of the word "masculine" to describe "smooth and well-formed" composition practices and "effeminate" to describe "bad or faulty speeches." To describe the same idea, Murphy's interpretation of the same passage reads as follows: "[T]he composition is smooth and polished, and yet manly and vigorous," and refers to "inelegant and faulty speeches" as effeminate. On his part, Butler's depiction reads as "passages combining smoothness and polish with a general impression of manly vigour," and speeches that are "corrupt and faulty in

style" also as effeminate. Russell's reference to both of masculine and feminine should not go unnoticed because his interpretation is inscribed in the canonical conceptualization and marginalization of feminine writing.

With this case study I have demonstrated that meaning does not lie in words, but rather it is attached to the idiosyncratic values of an often-unrecognized ethos whose decisions could either hamper or facilitate the reading experience. The next chapter contains the second case study.

5 ON TRANSLATING LITERATURE. CASE TWO: LITERATURE, POPULAR CULTURE, AND DON QUIXOTE

Aussi Rabelais ne peut-il se traduire, tandis que la traduction la plus infidèle ne peut entièrement défigurer Cervantes. M. Guardia[44]

The analysis of literature is not exempt from nuances of meaning and, almost always, invites interpretation and allows for plurality of views. Translators are well aware of the openness of any sort of interpretation and that is why, almost all of them, could be categorized as risk-takers who challenge conventional theories of translation in order to make sense of those rather opaque passages. Sometimes translators come across passages that seem easy to translate while the truth is that it could take them much longer to complete the task. The many stumbling blocks translators face usually manifest themselves in the form of rhetorical questions: Do I update an archaic text to make it accessible, or do I match its language to the original? Do I remain true to the author's intention or do I deviate from his or her original intention? Whether

[44] "Neither can Rabelais be translated; on the other hand, even the most inaccurate translation could not completely distort Cervantes" (My translation).

readers of translated texts recognize it or not, the intended meaning of an original author is ultimately confronted by the figure of a translator who is forced to disentangle the author's linguistic and semantic voids. In "Lost in the Details: Translating Master Peter's Puppet Show," Peter Grandbois explains how "translation is a Sisyphean task, one that promises frustration and despair for the translator and dissatisfaction, at best, for the reader of the translation" (59). Regardless of the sense of dissatisfaction competent readers of translated literature might have to confront, they still could take away something of value from their reading of poorly translated pieces. In theory, the contingent nature of literary translations should allow readers to immerse themselves in a multilingual and complicated dimension of manifold meanings.

When rendering literary texts, the translator comes face to face with many possible courses of action. In *Translation in Practice*, Gill Paul names a few of the obstacles translators endure during their translation process. Among these hindrances, Paul lists "particularly long sentences, unusual punctuation or lack of it, repetition, use of dialect, or slang, the inclusion of lots of foreign words" (36). Any display of puns, regional dialects, idiolects, idioms, expletives is potentially beset with risks. Among these many hurdles, Paul includes countless numbers of literary sociolects, phonic devices, regionalisms, colloquialisms, archaisms, and convoluted lexicon. In addition to his discussion, Paul posits that a translation should awaken in readers the same kind of response that an original work would produce. In his view, the demands of these readers run high "a book to be rich, dense and multidimensional, capable of weaving magic and changing something" (ii). The first edition of *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* also provides some background to literary translation and theory:

> Literary theory breaks the nationalist canon because it is assimilated by the translation and publishing process, it introduces into the reading space of non-

> readers of the source language a work that would otherwise remain an array of meaningless letters or symbols. (Baker 128)

Although it is easy to blame most of these reading impediments on the translators' choices, considering what prompted then to make these changes could shed light on the materialization of translated texts.

Excluding the revisiting portion mainly done by editors and co-editors, translation is in itself an isolating process. Only in counted circumstances, do translators have the opportunity to interact with the authors of a source text. This intercultural collaborative project could be fruitful insofar as both parties concur with the final product. At times, some of these collaborative enterprises end up damaging this personal tie; for instance, the long-term professional relationship between American translator and editor Thomas di Giovanni and Latin-American author Jorge Luis Borges came to an end after six years of collaboration.[45] In *The Scandals of Translation* Venuti claims that this partnership came to an abrupt end when Borges realized that Giovanni was drastically changing the basic principles of his prose. Venuti explains how Giovanni would smooth "out the abrupt transitions in Borges' prose, avoiding abstractions in favor of concrete diction, even correcting quotations that the writer made from memory" (Venuti, Kindle, section 156). Obviating the author's voice negates the sole purpose of most translators' work, a purpose that should dwell on remaining as truthful to the original as possible.

---

[45] Thomas di Giovanni, however, dismisses any sort misunderstanding between him and Borges, and blames a third party for breaking this partnership. When recalling his side of the story, Giovanni says "sly attacks ensued. Stories mushroomed, and lies about me even began to appear in print. Not one of these perpetrators ever asked for my version of events in what suddenly became a minefield of contention and controversy. A new editor at Dutton informed me that I could not go on translating Borges for them because I was too expensive. I countered by offering to make the required translations for nothing, which was plainly unanswerable because I never got a reply" ("The Borges Papers").

Over four hundred years ago, Cervantes already expressed his consternation about translating literature and in Chapter sixty-two of the second part of Don Quijote. In this passage, Cervantes construes his personal view about this process and what it entails.

> Pero, con todo esto, me parece que el traducir de una lengua en otra, como no sea de las reinas de las lenguas, griega y latina, es como quien mira los tapices flamencos pero el revés. Que aunque se veen las figuras, son llenas de hilos que las escurecen, y no se ven con la lisura y tez de la haz. El traducir de lenguas fáciles ni arguye ingenio ni elocución, como no le arguye el que traslada ni el que copia un papel de otro papel. Y no por esto quiero inferior no sea loable este ejercicio de traducer, porque en otras cosas peores se podría ocupar el hombre y que menos provecho le trujesen. (Parte II, Cap. 62)[46]

While Cervantes deems the mimetic aspect of translation unworthy, he also acknowledges its intrinsic value. Cervantes' view on translation ironically coincides with that of many contemporary translators who feel that no matter how close the rendering of the target text might be to the original, it will never be identical.

[46] Still, it seems to me that translating from one language to another, unless it's from the queens of languages – Greek and Latin – is like seeing Flemish tapestries from behind. Although you can see the figures, threads confuse the images, and they don't have the clarity and vividness of the front. And translating from easy languages doesn't show any more ingenuity or style than copying from one piece of paper to another. I don't mean to imply that the practice of translating is not praiseworthy, because there are worse and less useful things that a man can do" (From part II, Chapter Sixty-Two; translated by Tom Lathrop).

5.1 Nuances in the Translation of *Don Quixote*

Jorge Luis Borges' short story "Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote," (1939) uncovers the many hindrances that embody the translation of this canonical work. The plot of Borges' short story revolves around a narrator who describes the dexterities of a multi-faceted author and translator called Pierre Menard who finds himself in the process of rendering a translation of *Don Quixote*. In this manuscript, the narrator claims that "el texto de Cervantes y de Menard son verbalmente idénticos, pero el segundo es infinitamente más rico. (Más ambigüo, dirán sus detractores pero la ambigüedad es riqueza."[47] The main problem in the interpretation of Cervantes' work, according to Menard, dwells on the fact that its narrator proclaims that his work was originally translated from the Arabic. In preserving the meaning of the original, the narrator of *Don Quixote* assures the reader that Menard is reproducing line-by-line the exact meaning of Cervantes' masterpiece. Menard's Herculean task rests on the assumption that replicating a work of art is a plausible and manageable endeavor. With this story, Borges is satirically echoing, and most likely mocking, the voices of those translators who maintain that their work is the best translation ever produced.

Some translations of *Don Quijote* have been so poorly received that translation scholars have not hesitated to express their disapproval of the work publicly. The critic Arthur Efron voiced his aversion to Cohen's rendition of poetry in *Don Quixote*. Other renowned figures in history publicly stated that they chose to read *Don Quijote* in Spanish because they could not bring themselves to read poorly translated versions of the original work. Instead of relying on the translators' rendition, celebrated authors such as Lord Byron and Dostoevsky read Cervantes'

[47] "Cervantes' and Menard's texts are technically identical; the second being infinitely richer. (More ambiguous, his detractors will say, but its ambiguity is richness)" (My translation).

masterpiece in Spanish (McGrath 7). Thomas Jefferson, for instance, spent a summer in England enjoying the pleasures of reading *Don Quixote* in the original language. The list of authors who had "nothing [but] panegyrics for Cervantes' work," is endless; notably Herman Melville, Mark Twain, William Faulkner, Jorge Luis Borges, Alejo Carpentier, Gabriel García Márquez, and scholars such as Lionel Trilling, Harry Levin, Harold Bloom, and Carlos Fuentes (Finch and Allen 772).[48]

In "Traduttore Traditori: Don Quixote in English," John J. Allen brings to light the different justifications and complications the multitude of translators of *Don Quixote* in English have confronted in their prologues. Ranking from the first translation ever written in English to one delivered in 1964, Allen provides a thorough analysis of the differences among the prologues written by Shelton, Motteux, Jervis, Ormsby, Putnam, Cohen, and Starkie. Of all these translations, Allen strongly recommends the reading of Cohen and Starkie for constantly attempting to preserve the tone implied by Cervantes. What prompted Allen to write this article was the need to understand what brought some of these translators to write something that contained so many errors and deviated so drastically from the original. Allen also claims that, through their prologues, translators are allowing themselves to justify their linguistic choices to their audience. While Allen briefly compares the prologues of Ormsby and Motteux, his main scope resides on the analysis of errors in these translations produced by the mistranslations of cognates, proverbs, euphemisms as well as parodic, humorous, sarcastic and ironic passages as they compared to the original work. To say that a large portion of these translators managed "at many points, to blur or eliminate Cervantes' explicit indications of his own artistic credo" could make most of us lose faith in the translation process (8). According to Allen, some of these

[48] To further explore what authors said about Don Quixote refer to Carlos Fuentes' influential "foreword" to Tobias Smollett's translation of *Don Quixote de la Mancha* (1986).

errors arose due to reasons such as the level of language competency of translators, or because these same translators were not cautious or concerned enough to render a faithful version.

In 1876, José María Sbarbi published a volume alluding to the many hurdles of giving a faithful rendition of *Don Quixote*. In *Refranero Español: Intraducibilidad del 'Quijote*,'[49] Sbarbi retranslates Smollett's English version of Don Quixote into Spanish and compares her end-product with the original.

> Traducir el *Quijote*, es dar á conocer á un pueblo entero en su propio idioma la fábula que creó y escribió en el suyo Miguel de Cervantes; es trasladar el asunto. Los caracteres y los cuadros, buscando siempre la mayor imitación en todos los tonos que el lenguaje recorre; es escribir todo lo que Cervantes dijo, en otra lengua que no es la suya. Empresa difícil, es muy cierto; trabajo penosísimo, y muy ocasionado á error , también es indudable ... pero si podemos decir que la traducción del *Quijote* presenta graves inconvenientes, tropiezos, dificultades, no creemos que pueda afirmarse en serio la vulgaridad de que el inimitable libro es *intraducibie.* … Las traducciones de Shelton, de Jarvis, de Smollett en inglés, las de Bartel, Bertuch Soltom, y Tierk en alemán, y las francesas de Saint Martin, Dubomial, Viardot y otros, demuestran que es traducible , y que con mejor ó peor fortuna ha sido traducido. (338)[50]

---

[49] *Collection of Spanish Proverbs: Untraslatability of 'Quixote*.' (My Translation).

[50] Translating Don Quixote is to inform an entire group of people in their language of the fable that Miguel de Cervantes created and wrote in his; it is to transfer the matter. It implies translating the characters and paintings, always looking for an accurate imitation in all the shades that a language has. It means to write all that Cervantes said, in a language other than his own. Difficult undertaking, it is true, excruciating labor; mostly prone to error. It is undeniable. Although we can say that the translation of Don Quixote presents major disadvantages, obstacles, difficulties, we do not believe that it could seriously be argued that the inimitable book is untranslatable. … The translations of Shelton, Jarvis, Smollett in English; Bartel, Bertuch, Soltom and Tierk in German; Saint Martin, Dubomial, Viardot in French, and others, show that [Don Quixote] is translatable. And that with better or worse results it has been translated (My translation).

In the same book, Sbarbi also establishes a seven-stage taxonomy that includes the reasons why the translation of *Don Quixote* into any language is problematic:

1. "Giros cervánticos o Cervantismos."
2. "Frases burlescas, dichos festivos y voces graciosas."
3. "Equívocos."
4. "Idiotismos caballerescos y términos anticuados."
5. "Sentido intencionado o picaresco de algunas palabras y expresiones."
6. "Sentido histórico o meramente local de otras."
7. "Paremiología." (349)[51]

Sbarbi supports this classification by displaying almost fifty pages of examples taken from *Don Quixote*. Despite the large set of instances that attests to the difficulty of translation of this work and its title, Sbarbi never states that *Don Quixote* is untranslatable. Another theorist and translator who has addressed the difficulty in doing justice to *Don Quixote* is Tytler who dedicated an entire section in his "Essay on the Principles of Translation" to document the arduous task of translating this work. Among the many intricacies of rendering *Don Quixote* Tytler notes "as the Spanish language is in itself highly idiomatical, even in the narrative part of the book is on that account difficult; but the colloquial part is studiously filled with idioms, as one of the principal characters continually expresses himself in proverbs" (265). The hindrances of translating *Don Quixote* have been well documented by most of its translators.

Another common question that translators ponder over is whether to include footnotes and endnotes in their rendition. While some translators use footnotes scantily, others clutter the

---

[51] 1. The language of Cervantes or Cervantisms; 2. Mocking phrases, festive proverbs, holiday sayings, and funny voices; 3. Mistakes; 4. Chivalric idioms and archaic terminology; 5. Picaresque or intended meaning of some words and expressions; 6. Historic or local meaning of other; 7. Study of proverbs (My translation).

pages with them. Although specific conventions concerning the use of notations have not been established, translators try to use them sparingly. Following the Martín de Riquer's edition of *Don Quixote,* Edith Grossman explains how she was compelled to use footnotes to clarify certain usage of words, sentences, and phrases. Conversely, Raffel confesses that due to the nature of some "untranslatable" material he had to resort to the use of footnotes and the insertion of square brackets to clarify certain obscure passages. Other translations, like Putnam's version, cannot go without footnotes and so he added over 1,700 endnotes to his rendition, while others, like J. M. Cohen's, only added five footnotes to his entire work.

A common thread running through the notes that precede any translated version of *Don Quixote* is a constant impetus, on the translators' side, to justify the choices that lead them to select one word or phrase versus another. Most scholars seem to agree that translations of *Don Quixote* prior to the twentieth century were rough reflections of the original work and strictly literal. Oftentimes, these translations were based upon other translations instead of the source text. Although translators do not always succeed at it, most of them try to reenact the experience of the "native reader" of *Don Quixote*. For Grossman, her main intention is to transmit the same sense of humor, sarcasm, and irony that was intended by Cervantes when he wrote his book. As she points out in her prologue to *Don Quixote*, if her translation works "the reader should keep turning the pages, smiling a good deal, periodically bursting into laughter, and impatiently waiting for the next synonym … if not, you can be certain the fault is mine" (xx). Priorities change from one translator to the next; Cohen's main task, for instance, was to remain faithful to the text while preserving a contemporary flair.

Authenticity becomes one of the major concerns of contemporary translators of this masterpiece. In the 1995 Norton edition of *Don Quixote*, Burton Raffel reveals his priority to

make his translation sound and read in English as closely to the original as possible. In a more recent rendering of *Don Quixote*, John Rutherford expressed his concern about truly conveying the humorous nature of the book without hindering Cervantes' original intention. Hence, the purpose of his translation was to "persuade readers that laughing and smiling are compatible with seriousness, that profound themes can be treated as effectively in comedy and in humor as in tragedy" (72). When Rutherford's daughter told him that she found *Don Quixote* uninteresting, he realized that no matter how many translations had been released, the need to retranslate this text still existed; especially if what was published was not connecting with its contemporary readers. Rutherford was aware that retranslating a canonical edition of this Penguin classic that had been previously rendered by Cohen would become the ultimate translating challenge for him.

5.2 Multiple Translations of *Don Quixote*

Miguel de Cervantes had no delusions of grandeur. Despite the success of Don Quixote, Cervantes never earned any royalties from his work and never received the support of his patrons. His main aspiration was to earn enough money to support himself and his family. Despite the lack of luck Cervantes had in his life, his legacy is indubitable. After the Bible and a few undisputed works of literature, Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote* has become the most translated work of fiction in the world. When the first part of this book was published it became an instant success both in the Spanish territory and overseas. It pervaded the world. Patricia Finch and John J. Allen synthesize in "Don Quixote across the Centuries" the impact that the novel had throughout the centuries starting with the welcomed reception of English writers immediately after the publication of the novel. To these translations, followed a myriad of

positive reactions from scholars around the globe. Finch and Allen imply that the reason for the novel's instant success was due to the multidimensional nature of its main character, Don Quixote.

> In his foreword to Tobias Smollett's translation, the celebrated Latin American author Carlos Fuentes provides a concise description of the novel and upholds its value across history [as] it is the first modern novel, its debt to tradition is enormous, since its very inception as we all know, is the satire of the epic of chivalry. But if it is the last Medieval romance, then it also celebrates its own death: it becomes its own Requiem. If it is a work of the Renaissance, it also maintains a lively Medieval carnival of game, puns and references not far from Bakhtin's definition of festive humour in the novel, breaking down the frontiers between actors and audience. And finally, if it opens for all the adventure of modern reading, it remains a book deeply immersed in the society and the history of Spain. (xiii)

Despite the successful reception of his novel, Cervantes also enticed a few detractors. In the nineteenth century, Diego Clemencín, called into question Cervantes' inattentiveness and disposition as well as the quality of his work. Clemencín claimed that Cervantes' writing was so careless that he produced constant errors in his prose. There are other twentieth century translators who, like Clemencín, blatantly corrected Cervantes errors and assumed that Cervantes committed them intentionally. In an attempt to "restore" Cervantes' mistakes, some translators added lengthy and explanatory footnotes to excuse what they considered negligent on Cervantes' part. In the preface to his translation of *Don Quixote*, Tom Lathrop draws attention to some of these errors and inconsistencies that many critics have ceaselessly demurred. Lathrop suggests

that Cervantes intentionally made those mistakes due to the satirical nature of the novel. He goes on to say that the characters and the narrators of the novel made these careless mistakes deliberately. With this statement, Lathrop was attempting to redeem the blame that rested on Cervantes while letting us know that novels of chivalry were filled with this kind of errors.

With the 400th anniversary of *Don Quixote*, the world was exposed to many translations of *Don Quixote*. Apart from the Bible, *Don Quixote* has been translated into more languages than any other work in the world. The first translation of *Don Quixote* into English was completed by Thomas Shelton and appeared shortly after the publication of the second part of *Don Quixote*. Published in London in 1615, Shelton's translation "is contemporary with the novel itself, providing examples of both 17th century English, with all its richness of idiom and impression" (112). For centuries, this version of the work was used as the standard translation. But Shelton's is not the only translation that drew attention during the seventeenth century. For the past three centuries, most translations of *Don Quixote* have been regarded as jejune and onerous to read mainly due to the poor judgment of some of its translators. In the seventeenth century, and after Shelton's edition was published, John Philip produced a translation pastiche by combining Shelton's style and a French translation by François Filleau de Saint-Martin.

At the turn of the next century, Captain John Stevens published a revised version of Shelton's translations. During this century most translations comprise a multivariate cluster of complex and highly unstable problems. Eighteenth century translators, just like John Philip, continued to shape their work according to previously written translations. The first translation worth noting was curiously written by a tea merchant called Peter Anthony Motteux. Although his version mimicked that of Shelton, Phillips, and de Saint-Martin, Motteux's translation was highly regarded by intellectuals and scholars at the time of publication. Interestingly enough,

some nineteenth century Hispanists such as Ormsby or Richard Ford considered Motteux one of the worst translations ever written. According to Putnam, most translation problems revolved around the figure of Sancho Panza and were due to "the obtrusion of the obscene where it is not to be found in Cervantes, difficulties through omissions or by expanding upon the text [and] the substitution of English for Spanish proverbs where there is no close correspondence" (xiii). The rendition published by the painter Charles Jervas in 1742 is still known as one of the most faithful English translations of *Don Quixote*. Jervas's edition, nonetheless, was greeted with controversy. While some critics embraced this translation, others clearly favored Motteux's version. Those who criticized Jervas' work classified it as uninteresting and tedious. The many other translations that followed Motteux' and Jervas's were either sheer copies of previously translated works or revisions of other translations. Some of these translators even had the audacity of rendering a translation from works that were written in languages other than Spanish; T. G. Smollett (1775), George Kelly (1769), Charles Henry Wilmot (1774) to name a few. In her article "Don Quixote in English," Carmine Rocco Linsalata mentions how "Smollett's technique consisted principally of plagiarizing, paraphrasing, rewriting, and inverting Jervis' translation" (13). James H. Montgomery claims that the novel reads as if Smollet himself, not Cervantes, had written the novel. Although these eighteenth century translations were all well written, they did not remain loyal to Cervantes' intentions, and almost managed to tarnish *Don Quixote*'s reputation.

In the nineteenth century translations of *Don Quixote* improved their versions in terms of their accuracy, but they still lacked in style. During this century, translators such as Mary Smirke (1818) and J. W. Clarke (1867) simply revised earlier translations. It was not until 1880 that many scholars came together to create translations that, unlike previous renditions of the work,

showed a sense of appreciation for Cervantes' manuscript. Translations by Alexander J. Duffieled (1881), John Ormsby (1881), and Edward Witts (1888) reinstated *Don Quixote*'s significance by restoring it in the canonical list it deserved. The revisited versions of some of these nineteenth century translators continue to be works that attract the attention of twenty-first century readers.

With the twentieth and the twenty-first century, comes a surge of translations in English of *Don Quixote*. In his article "Tilting at Windmills: Don Quixote in English," Michael J. McGrath recapitulates the major translations produced during that century. These translations include those of Samuel Putnam (1949), John Michael Cohen (1950), the edited version of Ormsby's by Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas (1981), Burton Raffel (1999), John Rutherford (2001), Edith Grossman (2003), and Tom Lathrop (2007) among others. The truth is that after the publication of Shelton's translation, subsequent interpretations of the *Don Quixote* have always endeavored to modernize the source text to make it more accessible to a present day reader. For instance, compared to J. M. Cohen's translation, Shelton's "provides more flavor and color of the original, capture's the reader's imagination [but does so] at the expense of accuracy and painstaking attention to detail." Cohen's translation, on the other hand, seeks "to produce a text that was readable, comprehensible and accurate" to assuage modern readers (112). The Macmillan edition of this book was published in 1900 and, like its antecedent translations, it preserves the original tone of the work.

Ever since the first printed version of *Don Quixote* by Juan de la Cuesta in Madrid (1605) this book has been translated into multiple languages. According to Lathrop, many translations derived from the Cuesta edition (English, 1612; French, 1614; Italian, 1622-25; Dutch, 1657; Portuguese, 1794; Russian, 1789). These translations bring to light diverse interpretations of the

text both in the American and the British market (Shelton, Burton, Raffel, Lathrop, Rutherford, and Grossman). The other factor that contributes to unusual interpretations of the original source is what original edition the translators used to base their translation upon. The most preferred text among translators seems to be Martín de Riquer's edition. Translators such as Lathrop wrote footnotes that were arranged in the same fashion as Riquer's. The majority of these translators have expressed their outmost concern to find words that do justice to Cervantes' style and that fit the needs of contemporary readers. This quest for balance and harmony hinges almost entirely on the translators' work.

5.3 Brief Account about the Translation Excerpts Selected for this Chapter

The following constitute the three excerpts chosen for my proposed methodology:

1. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote.* Trans. Burton Raffel. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.
2. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote.* Trans. Edith Grossman. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005.
3. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. Samuel Putnam. New York: Vining Press, 1949.
4. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Trans. J.M. Cohen. New York: Penguin, 1950.

With the exception of Cohen's translation for Penguin, I only selected the renderings of American translators that were released in the twentieth or the twenty-first century. In their respective prologues to their translations, all of the translators justify their choices to the reader and, by extension, what prompted them to make some of their syntactic, stylistic, and semantic

alternatives. In the preface to her translation, Edith Grossman makes clear that she struggled to come to terms with using contemporary language that was loyal to the original while maintaining the essence of a seventeenth century text. Grossman's main concern seems to be readability for audiences who might lose themselves in an anachronistic text that does not relate to their target culture. Her decision to fabricate this scenario creates a conflict between both texts. Another particular aspect about Grossman's work is that she challenges conventional translation methods by publically acknowledging that she did not read previous translations of *Don Quixote* in the hopes of preserving her own voice as a translator and overcome possible biases in her translation.

Of his translation, Burton Raffel said: "I want this translation to sound like it's set in Spain – to feel as Spanish as possible … It's not a book that could have been written in English – or indeed in any other language. Don Quixote's magnificence is indubitably Hispanic" (Wilson xv). Behind all of Raffel's choices dwells a need to "[matching Cervantes'] rhetoric" and preserving its linguistic resonance. In search of a modernized version of *Don Quixote*, translators like Lathrop and Raffel consulted Sebastián de Covarrubias' *Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española* (written between 1606 and 1610 and published in 1611).[52] Grossman, on the other hand, decided not to use this dictionary. Lathrop chose to consult a variety of sources, among them a seventeenth century dictionary, earlier editions of *Don Quixote* like Juan de la Cuesta or Martín de Riquer, past translations of Don Quixote, and the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* (The Royal Spanish Academy Dictionary). Another aspect to be taken into consideration is the source text that translators used for their work. Most of them used Martín de Riquer's (Planeta, 1980), and Luis Andrés Murillo's (Clásicos Castalia, 1978).

[52] According to Cash and Murray, this dictionary contained the key to all of the terminology and etymologies of seventeenth century Spanish language; including neologisms and foreignisms.

The analysis of different excerpts of *Don Quixote* in English, or for the same matter other works of literature, is something that many critics have discussed throughout the years. In 1979, Allen, for example, claims that "it is advisable, in courses involving *Don Quixote* in English, to have at least one student read another translation – preferably Ormsby – so as to provide a check in the classroom on any key passage which might not be adequately rendered. One can then check the original in cases of significant divergence." Allen goes on to say that critics who are willing to make comments about *Don Quixote* should at least read "three to four translations for any quotation they are using, and consult someone on the original in reference to any discrepancy" (12). Contrary to Allen's views, our students will not refer back to the original in search of meaning, as they will uniquely contextualize and analyze the reading of the translated excerpts without the help of the original text.[53]

5.4 Case Study II: *Don Quixote*

5.4.1 Analysis of Titles from Don Quixote's Chapter Eight (Volume 1)

Taken from Chapter eight of the first volume, the excerpts selected for this case study illustrate one of the most discussed and well-known passages from the entire book. In this selection, Don Quixote and Sancho are travelling when they see windmills sitting in the middle of a field. Upon seeing them, Don Quixote immediately informs Sancho, his squire, that the windmills are giants who are waiting to attack them both. After engaging in a short, but highly humorous squabble with Sancho (who is in a state of total disbelief), Don Quixote charges at one of the windmills full speed and falls along with his horse Rocinante on the ground, leaving both

[53] When comparing these different translated passages, readers should pay special attention to translation techniques, such as omission and addition, and how these mechanisms affect the readability of the text.

of them badly injured. Broadly speaking, the lines of these excerpts in English should be able to replicate the wit and humor of the Spanish author. The first thing that particularly grasps my attention is the significant differences among the titles of these passages. In three or four sentences, the title synthesizes the events that followed after Don Quixote's adventure of the windmill. The first pronounced differences among the titles are the formatting and punctuation of the passage, a choice that could be attributed to the contribution of the translators' respective editors. From the very beginning, Raffel's text stands alone for its domesticating strategies. While the other three translations opt to include the foreignized Roman numeral "VIII" to indicate the number of the chapter, only Raffel's translation retains a domesticated "eight;" thus, recognizing those audiences who are not familiar with this numeric system. Within just a few lines, I also noticed how Raffel's choice of punctuation is unusual for a text that is supposed to emulate that of Cervantes' time. To open his title, Raffel uses a dash (a punctuation mark that is usually used to informally set off or emphasize the content of a passage) to open the title of the chapter, thus, giving his title a modernized style. In terms of his semantic choices, Raffel's ethos also succumbs to domestication as he manages to avoid peppering his translation with archaic adjectives or gnarled syntax. While other translators use lexicon such as "valorous" and "fortune" (Putnam, Cohen, and Grossman), "never-before-imagined," (Putnam), "never before imagined," (Cohen); and "never imagined" (Grossman), Raffel creates a lexicon that matches with rhetorical situation of contemporary audiences and that radically differs from the higher register of the other three: "success," "brave," "unimaginable." Other examples that contribute to Raffel's domestication of the passage could be seen in his sentence "plus other honorable events worth remembering," a passage that differs significantly from Putnam's "along with other events that deserve to be suitably recorded," Cohen's "with other events worthy of happy record," or

Grossman's "along with other events worthy of joyful remembrance." First, Raffel's preference for the more modern "plus" contrasts with Putnam's, Grossman's and Cohen's more conventional choices "along," and "along with." Ironically, it is clear from the reading of the other passages that, whereas Putnam's translation is the oldest, Grossman's most modern edition of *Don Quixote* seems to have adopted a foreignized position that gives the narrative a literary and rather pompous undertone. While Grossman tried to emulate the vocabulary of Cervantes' era, her translation radiates a sense of confusion and ambiguity that unfortunately continues to happen throughout the rest of the passage and that I will further discuss when analyzing the rest of the passages. Of all titles, Putnam's and Cohen's certainly fall within the category of highly foreignized texts. Compared to the other translations, Putman's ethos produces a syntax that almost seems to bring the text in line with the language of the Golden Age and that contributes to the exaggerated and humorous vein of the title. Some of the instances where Putnam achieves this sense of foreignization include a passive sentence "along with other events that deserve to be suitably recorded," a hyphenated epithet "never-before-imagined," both options seem to resonate with Cervantes' time, adding to the archaic flavor of the text. Lastly, I would like to address that, in the analysis of the *implicature* of these titles, I found a significant difference between Raffel's translation and the other three. Once again, Raffel resorts to domesticating strategies, this time making use of rhetorical practices, like amplification, to develop aspects of the foreign text to guide and help nonacademic readers. In his rendition of the title, Raffel adds the sentence "two windmills;" a choice that contrasts with Putnam's and Grossman's "adventure of the windmills," and Cohen's "Adventure of the Windmills." Raffel's addition should not have passed unnoticed as this seems to be an attempt on his behalf to inform and allow readers to virtually imagine the situation by placing them there as it was lived by Don Quixote and Sancho. Also worth noting is

Cohen's preference for capitalizing this adventure, a move that differs from the foreignizing ethos of the passage. When capitalizing "Adventures of the Windmills," but not capitalizing the rest of the words in the title, Cohen is bringing awareness to the canonical status of this worldwide known episode. Lastly, in the analysis of the *remainder*, I noticed how all translators seem to have different takes on the interpretation of the events that followed in the adventure. With the exception of Putman's title, the rest of the translators make the narrative of the title itself more suspenseful. Putnam's sentence "along with other events that deserve to be suitably recorded," is at variance with the other translations: "with other events worthy of happy record" (Cohen), or "other honorable events well worth remembering" (Raffel), or "along with other events worthy of happy remembrance" (Grossman). The avoidance of using words such as "worth," "worthy," and "happy," leaves Putnam's translation with an informational void, as readers of his work do not know what is coming.

5.4.2 Analysis of Excerpts from Don Quixote's Chapter Eight (Volume 1)

The analysis of the following excerpts will serve as a bridge to the conclusion of this dissertation as I will compare my interpretation of these lines with the answers provided by students of an English Composition class at Georgia State University who were asked to implement my methodology. Raffel's inclination for domesticating the text extends beyond the title of the chapter itself. Throughout his excerpt, Raffel's choices continue to match the taste of contemporary audiences through an emphasis on integrating domestication in his prose; however, he fails to convey the humorous pathos of the narrative. Raffel's disruptive use of pathos lacks the archaic dynamism present in both Putnam's and Cohen's translations. Some of the examples where Raffel shows this highly domesticated tone include lexicon and sentences

such as “wild giants,” “saw them,” “kill each and all of them,” “have such an evil race wiped from,” “’obviously’, replied Don Quijote, ‘you don’t know much about adventures.” When compared to Putnam’s “lawless giants,” “laid eyes upon them,” “shall deprive them of their lives,” “remove so accursed a breed from,” “’it is plain to be seen,’ said Don Quixote, “that you have little experience;” or Cohen’s “monstrous giants,” “saw them,” “take all their lives,” “wipe such a wicked broom from;” or Grossman’s “enormous giants,” “caught sight of them,” “whose lives I intend to take,” “to remove so evil a breed from,” Raffel’s choices are more familiar to modern readers. The first thing that catches my attention upon reading Putnam’s rendition is the directness, simplicity, and fluidity of his lexicon; a technique that makes the narrative flow organically in the domesticating realm. Generally speaking, Putnam’s translation draws noticeably on colloquialisms and offers clarity for his modern readers. For the sake of readability and accessibility, Putnam eliminates most traces of foreignness, ironing out some of its idiosyncratic characteristics and flattening the text. Interestingly enough, while the narrator in Putnam’s account aims for clarity and conciseness of speech, I cannot say the same for Don Quixote’s register, which at times seems to struggle between the domesticating and the foreignizing realm. For instance, when Don Quixote is imitating chivalric adventures his language is that of the chivalric romance; otherwise his register is much lower. The following sentences reflect that polarity in Don Quixote’s speech: From the highly foreignized “flee not, oh cowards and dastardly creatures, for he who attacks you is a knight alone and unaccompanied,” “those are giants – and if you’re frightened, take yourself away from here and say your prayers, while I go charging into savage and unequal combat with them,” to domesticated elements we mentioned above, Don Quixote’s ethos is lost in an ideological schism between two completely different time periods. With the exception of Grossman, who also seems to struggle within

domesticating and foreignizing strategies, Putnam's and Cohen's translations are highly consistent in their efforts to foreignize their texts. Both Putnam and Cohen team up to convey a meaning that thoroughly attempts to echo the elevated tone, exuberance, and grandeur characteristic of seventeenth century Spanish novel. Hence, both of them situate the narrative, and in turn their audience, in the context where the novel was written. In their efforts to foreignize their translations, we find sentences filled with syntactic inversions and anachronistic lexicon such as "'do not seek to flee, coward and vile creatures that you are, it is but a single knight with whom you have to deal,'" "he thereupon commended himself with all his heart to Lady Dulcinea, beseeching her to succor him in his peril" (Putnam); or "'do not fly, cowards, vile creatures, for it is one knight alone who assails you," and "saying this, he commended himself with all his soul to his Lady Dulcinea, beseeching her aid in his great peril" (Cohen). In short, both of them grace their passages with discourse that comes closer to the language of another time, but yet does not hinder the readability of the passages.

When analyzing the *remainder* of these passages I noticed divergent variations among them. While dramatically changing meaning and/or the register of some of these structures and phrases ultimately constitute a choice on the translator's behalf, I will focus on illustrating those examples that contribute to either the domestication or the foreignization of the passages. When reading Putnam's, Cohen's, and Grossman's excerpts, I observed how the three of them opted to use the word "Fortune," instead of "Destiny" (Raffel). In Putnam's, Cohen's, and Grossman's account they say "fortune is guiding our affairs," while Raffel opts for something like "destiny guides our fortunes." In altering the meaning of this passage, Raffel is obviating a chivalric allusion of knights who commended themselves to Lady Fortune before embarking on any of their endeavors. Another example that encapsulates a different approach to the essence of the

passages can be seen in the following sentences by the translators: Putnam's "Sancho upon his donkey came hurrying to his master's assistance as fast as he could, but when he reached the spot, the knight was unable to move. So great was the shock with which he and Rocinante had hit the ground," Cohen's "Sancho Panza rushed to his assistance as fast as his ass could trot, but when he came up he found that the knight could not stir. Such a shock had Rocinante given him in their fall," Raffel's "Sancho Panza came rushing to his aid, as fast as his donkey could run, but when he got to his master, found him unable to move, such a blow he been given by the falling horse," and Grossman's "Sancho Panza, hurried to help as fast as his donkey could carry him and when he reached them he discovered that Don Quixote could not move because he had taken so hard a fall with Rocinante." Although the premise of all these sentences remains the same, the first thing I observed was Cohen's choice of the word "ass," and attributing to Sancho, not his donkey, the ability to change the course of the adventure like the other translations do. With his account, Cohen is offering his audience a much different visual of the story. By using this lower and plausible register that could very possibly match the language of Sancho Panza himself, Cohen's pathos conveys humor just like I would have anticipated in *Don Quixote*. Another significant variation when analyzing the *remainder* can be observed in the following choices: Putnam's "two leagues in length," Cohen's "six miles long," Raffel's "two leagues long," and Grossman's "two leagues long." While three of these translators use the foreignized word "league" without resorting to any footnotes for clarification purposes, Cohen's text (ironically one of the most foreignized text) convert this measurement into modern units and thus engenders a closer approximation to modern standards. Also in tune with this modernization of the text is the usage of the words "fields" (Raffel), "countryside" (Grossman) versus "plain" (Putnam and Cohen). The implication behind Putnam's and Cohen's choice gives their audience a different

visual account. Another difference can be seen in Cohen's choice to use single quotations. The use of single quotation marks is usually preferred in England and South Africa whereas double quotes are often used in the United States. Upon reading Cohen's translation, readers should notice immediately that he is probably British and that, by using single quotation marks, he is tailoring his translation to the expectations of British readers.

To compensate for the *implicature* of these passages, translators often add footnotes or recur to amplification or reduction techniques. In these excerpts the clearest example of *implicature* can be seen when both Raffel and Grossman add a footnote that attempt to clarify to modern audiences who the "giant Briareus," is. Upon reading these footnotes, I noticed immediately how Grossman's seems slightly more domesticated as it contains far more details than Raffel's. Grossman reads "a monstrous giant in Greek mythology who had fifty heads and a hundred arms," whereas Raffel says "one of the 'hundred-handed' (*Hekatoncheires*) giants, sons of Uranus and Gaia." Unless we are familiar with Greek mythology, Raffel's reference to the giants' parents do not provide a lot of help to those readers who probably want to imagine the scene and do not know anything about this giant. The addition of these footnotes by these two translators "narrows the domestic audience to a cultural elite since footnotes are an academic convention" (*Scandals*, Kindle, section 539).

My concluding chapter will illustrate some of the main issues and challenges that a Rhetoric and Composition instructor and I faced when we implemented this methodology with in an English Composition class at Georgia State University.

6 CONCLUSION: A RHETORICAL THEORY OF TRANSLATION. THE FUTURE FOR A NEW TRADITION OF UNDERSTANDING

Si las culturas estuvieran hechas de silencio, querríamos saber los secretos del silencio; y si de ruido, los secretos del ruido. Pero las culturas están hechas de traducciones. Una cultura no sería lo que es si los hombres y mujeres que la integran no hubieran tenido acceso, por medio de la traducción, a los textos de otras culturas. – Virgilio Moya[54]

Translation theories and pedagogical practices are in dire need of a radical sense of direction. In *Why Translation Matters*, Edith Grossman evaluates and questions the role of translation in the twenty-first century. Translation, she says, "expands our ability to explore through literature the thoughts and feelings of people from another society [and] asserts the possibility of a coherent, unified experience of literature in the world's multiplicity of languages" (Grossman, Kindle, section 529). With fewer and fewer translated books being published in the United States, Grossman wonders whether some academics will finally achieve what they are searching for: To eradicate Translation Studies from the curriculum of any self-respected university. In *The Scandals of Translation,* Venuti notes that the very choice to translate affirms or transgresses discursive values and institutional limits in the receiving culture; hence the fear to translate occurs. In Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility*, the author claims that, once and for all, translators' work needs to be acknowledged in current scholarly debate of other fields and disciplines. If translators are seen as "intellectuals whose traffic with the foreign can interrogate and change the academic status quo," then their visibility is imperative to embrace cultures other than their own and avoid that sense of ethnocentrism that prevails these days (312). Translated

[54] "If cultures were made of silence, we would want to know the secrets of silence. If made of noise, we would like to know the secrets of noise. But cultures are made of translations. A culture would not be what it is if men and women didn't have access through translation to the texts from these other cultures" (My translation).

texts transgress the boundaries of the ordinary. If we embrace translated texts as an apparatus that enables us to explore the unknown and what makes us feel uncomfortable, our perception and understanding of the text has a chance to be meaningfully enriched. We could also use them to advance stated academic goals for increasing international and global emphases in university curricula and programs.

Should we, professionals within English Departments, decide to recognize translation as a powerful apparatus to analyze language and as a method for cross-cultural communication as well as a rhetorical strategy and activity, we could better understand the intent of the original work and the value of translation, writing studies and pedagogy. If, on the contrary, we opt to consider translation as synonymous with the original text, thus having no intrinsic or inherent significance as an activity or product, we will continue to enforce an invisible or negative view of translation. Without the analysis of the translated texts, we are working against the "polysemy [that] characterizes the language of ideology" that is intrinsic to understanding and appreciating any text, as either an act of communication or a piece of art (Steiner 35). By neglecting to offer further interpretation of translated texts, we are nullifying the interactivity between those texts. When choosing to remain insensitive to the translator's rendering, we become one of the many readers who passively accept the content of the text.

Two years ago the MLA reaffirmed the central role of translation as part of post-secondary education and as contributing scholarship to language and literary studies. On this specific topic, the 2009 MLA President, Catherine Porter, noted that "one of my goals for the 2009 MLA Annual Convention was to bring to the attention of our membership the prospects for Translation Studies in North American higher education" (7). By raising visibility on Translation Studies, she hoped to inspire more undergraduate and graduate programs around the nation to

offer courses or full-blown degree programs allowing for the study, expansion, and assessment of this trans-nationally-imbued field, and position “the range, power, and pertinence of Translation Studies as a horizon of inquiry” (Porter 5). This set of 2009 MLA lectures assembled the most renowned scholars of the field. Most of them agreed on the fact that translation theories should occupy a more relevant place within academia. For instance, in "The Translator's Visibility: Bridging the Gap Between Translation and Translation Studies," Michael Henry Heim urged, on the one hand, that scholars proselytize translation and, on the other hand, that students study translation theory to get a meaningful and closer reading of a text. The senior scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak made a compelling point when she claimed that in the United States “multiculturalism goes deplorably in hand with monolingualism,” and that globalization does not come hand in hand with linguistic diversity (38). In an interview for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Catherine Porter hinted that this country must draw immediate and closer attention to Translation Studies. She went on to say that “in the United States, some of us are rethinking our standing in the world, our ways of relating to others in the developed and developing worlds, learning more about what it means to be among equals” (Howard).

These lectures had Walter Benjamin’s 1923 article, “The Task of the Translator,” at their centers, mainly due to its argument of translatability and the importance of creating a meaningful gap in which translated texts foster relationships among individuals from different cultures. Rather than reflecting on translation as an act that violently transgresses an original text, or one that Steiner would have as a dramatic and exotic confrontation, Benjamin advocates for a translation in which “literalness and freedom must be united in the form of an interlinear translation,” one that alters the language to execute a close rendering of the original (16). Many scholars in translation theories have concentrated upon the antithetical nature of translation. For

example, in "Translation and the Figure of Border: Toward the Apprehension of Translation as a Social Action," Naoki Sakai notes that

> this foundational ambiguity of translation derives from the ambiguity of the positionality generally indexed by the peculiar presence of the translator, who is summoned only when two kinds of audiences are postulated with regard to the source text: one for whom the text is comprehensible, at least to some degree, and the other for whom it is incomprehensible. (32)

The truth is, and as David Bellos observed, that most people simply do not think about the value within the translated text. In fact, unless a translation has the potential to become a bestseller, the market for translated books continues to struggle in a declining printable world. It is within this worldwide mindset that translators' voices remain confined in a secluded place where all their art lacks the fitting recognition. Peter Bush and Susan Bassnett address the latter notion that focuses on the centrality of the translators' works in literary translation: "when we go to the cinema, we probably will not sit through the long list of credits at the end of the film to find out who was the carpenter or stuntman or sub-titler if it was a foreign language film" (1). As a matter of fact, the prevalence and preference for publishing exceedingly domesticated translations have made translators' work even more untracked. Most scholarly journals that review translated texts rarely address translators' work and, when they do, they usually praise their work insofar as it reads with fluidity and sounds free-of-foreign constructions. Of the excerpts published in these periodicals, Venuti claims that "their brief comments usually focus on its style, neglecting such other possible questions as its accuracy, its intended audience, its economic value in the current book market, its relation to literary trends of English" (2). Venuti goes on to name a few examples that reflect a domestic directionality that emphasizes the use of

fluidity. I concur with Venuti when he says that there is an upward trend toward the domestication of the texts in the United States and in England. However, as I showed in the second case study, Grossman's translation of the text adopts a strategy that does not seem to agree with this current view. It is ultimately a translators' choice whether they want to defy prevalent domesticating strategies or subscribe to foreignizing techniques. It is also their choice to take their readers on a domesticating or a foreignizing journey; an experience that could either mar or enhance their perception of the text.

With both of my case studies, I have demonstrated how the interpretation of translated texts needs to be an imperative application in the Arts and Sciences curriculum. I was in the middle of writing my methodology chapter when I decided to implement it in a Composition class at Georgia State University. So when I asked one of my fellow graduate instructors if she would not mind trying out my in-progress methodology in her class, she assented right away. I was aware of the many challenges that the application of a half-written methodology would encompass, but I wanted nevertheless to see how these English composition students would respond to reading and interpreting translated texts. This class had a rather eclectic group of students; from their age group, to their ethnicity, and their cultures and backgrounds. Both the teacher and I concurred that it would be a good idea if I were present during those two days when the students were going to work through the translated texts. We also thought that it would be best for her to be in total control of the methodology and that I would only participate when needed. In that way, I would be able to determine the level of comfort of a teacher who was somewhat familiar with the methodology, but who had never taught it before. We decided to use four different excerpts from *Don Quixote*; these being the exact same texts that I used for my case study: Putnam, Cohen, Raffel, and Grossman. To those texts, we decided to add, at the very

last minute, a fifth excerpt from Thomas Shelton's English translation, which was published around 1608, and shortly after the publication of *Don Quixote* in Spanish. So for the first day of class, she briefly introduced the concepts of the methodology to the students and provided a brief account of Cervantes' background and his work. With the exception of one student, none of the others knew who Cervantes was, and were not familiar with his work, and while some of the students claimed to have heard about the "adventure of the windmills," none of them tied Cervantes to this passage. Finally, the texts were given to the students the day before the first class; however, I realized that it would probably have been a better idea to ask for the students to read these texts in class. What I did not take into consideration was that, when taking these excerpts home with them, they could look up any part of the texts online and find out who translated them. On the second day, when the instructor asked the entire class if anybody had done any sort of research about the author and the translated texts, they all said they had not. It is important to note that these students were already familiar with the basic rhetorical appeals and tools (ethos, pathos, logos, and the rhetorical situation) that we were going to discuss; the teaching of these rhetorical components being an essential component of most English composition classes. After giving the students some time to re/read the excerpts, the instructor introduced the translation tools to the students (domestication, foreignization, and amplification.) Then she divided them in groups of four, gave them the chart on which they were to record their answers, and allotted time to brainstorm ideas about the passages. About thirty minutes later the students were eager and ready to share their thoughts. Because we gave the students a fifth translation without typing it out first, all students pertinently classified Shelton's as the most foreignized version. Interestingly enough, most of them thought that Grossman's, a translation written in 2005, was the second oldest translation and, consequently, the most foreignized. They

were all thrown off by one of Grossman's sentences "thou art not versed." One student pointed out the difficulty lay with the limited usage of "familiar language in the text." Most students concur that Cohen's translation (1968) was more modern and easy to read and classified it as the most domesticated version. When they read the word "miles," they immediately thought that the translator was translating for an American audience. One of them noted how Cohen also used an apostrophe in one of his sentences, "what you see over there aren't giants, but windmills," or used colloquialisms such as "all battered and bruised to the ground." In addition, one of the groups mentioned how Cohen used the word "ass" in a sentence, a word that made them immediately place the text within the domesticated category. When asked about the genderlect of the translations, the students displayed a wide range of opinions. The most intriguing aspect of this question is how only a few students categorized Grossman as a feminine translator. For the most part, they all classified feminine translation as one that placed more emphasis on "romanticizing" the language and offered a "dramatic pull towards the knight's love interest" in their passage, and masculine as a translation whose tone and descriptions focused more on portraying "the weapons and the fight with the windmill." Before ending the class, both the instructor and I realized that the students would not have time to address all the questions provided in the chart, and that we needed to start unveiling when these translations were published and who translated them. Some of their reactions were unexpected. They were all in awe to hear that Cohen's translation was British. Almost the entire class was shocked to hear that Grossman's translation was the most contemporary one and that she was a female translator. And right about when we were addressing other translation devices, the class was over. Although we barely touched the surface of some of the concepts behind those translated texts, we managed to discuss key elements about translation and rhetoric in the classroom. While the students' answers

differed from the results of my case study; a study in which I classified Cohen as the most foreignized translation and Grossman's as a hybrid, all of the students engaged in a fluid discussion that led to incredibly insightful answers on their part. What constituted their level of *Transglobal Literacy* was put to the test with this methodology.

I encourage educators of all fields to consider the possibility of including this activity in their academic curriculum. In future research, I plan to create ancillary material for textbooks that include translated texts.[55] This additional material will incorporate the basics of this methodology as well as my own interpretation and analysis of translated passages, which will serve as an explication and discussion guide for instructors.[56] I also plan to create workshops to show educators the wide range of possibilities of this methodology; a method that increases students' engagement in reading related activities and that promotes Reading Across the Curriculum. During these workshop sessions, I will go through this exercise with instructors and prove that the open-ended process of this activity is crucial to foster students' ability to think critically. Additionally, I will create a syllabus of "great books" for a class that will revolve not only around the teaching of the history of rhetoric and translation, but that will also include a variety of translated texts that students will be able to analyze during the course of the semester. The inclusion of reading activities in the classroom should become routine parts or our educational practices. The opportunities for further research of this pedagogy are limitless. Other venues of investigation include the analysis of different types of texts, such as political

[55] I will solely include those texts that have been rendered into English at least three to four times by different translators.
[56] In view of the multiple interpretations of these texts, the content of my answer key is subject to change.

speeches[57], consumer-oriented literature[58], and literary theory excerpts. I strongly believe that the implementation of this *Transglobal Literacy* in the academic curriculum would produce a rich harvest of finds revealing the complex dynamic between these two disciplines.

The wandering nature of translation will always allow us, as instructors, to direct and instruct this methodology in ways that fits our students and us best. The most important aspect behind this approach is to ensure that we guide our students to a path that crosses the cultural transglobal boundaries of translated texts. This methodology attempts to show alternative means to engage them in a unique approach to reading critically and exposing them to the teachings of literacy. Moreover, it reexamines connections across disciplines and contravenes current traditional pedagogies that explore translated texts from a merely linguistic standpoint. With this pedagogy, students learn to listen to a text by expanding both their conceptual and procedural knowledge. In the following passage from *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*, Paulo Freire notes how this fluidity that words carry within themselves is unavoidably transferred to the reading as process, something that requires effort in decoding, analyzing, synthesizing, and understanding the translated text.

> Reading the world always precedes reading the word, and reading the word implies continually reading the world … this movement from the word to the world is always present; even the spoken word flows from our reading of the world. In a way however, we can go further and say that reading the word is not

[57] We should particularly focus on persuasive modes of political speeches, first spoken and then rendered into written texts, which are translated and distributed, to the public. The translation approaches and tools ultimately affect the textuality of each speech act and its reception.

[58] According to Zaro and Truman, consumer-oriented literature includes, but is not limited to, user guides (such as leaflets for machines or appliances), manuals (like books on do-it-yourself and recipe or cookery books) tourists' brochures, travel guides, directions, instructions, signage, advertisements, menus, flyers, and even political propaganda (58). Within rhetoric, these texts fall under the area of Technical and Professional Writing, and within Communication Studies, and include Advertising and Mass Media Communications.

> preceded merely by reading the world, but by a certain form of writing it is rewriting it, that is, of transforming it by means of conscious, practical work. For me, this dynamic movement is central to the literacy process. (35)

If reading texts in our own language is challenging, the complexity of reading translated texts is intensified. Even Gregory Rabassa has pointed out that the act of "reading is already translation [as] readers are transplanted into the atmosphere of a situation that does not build just one clearly defined reality, but rather possibilities of various realities." He goes on to say that "translators in the act of reading, interact in a particular way with words" (qtd. in Biguenet and Schulte, *Craft* x). John Dryden in his essay "On Translation," writes that "translation consists in adding new beauties to the piece, thereby to recompense the loss which it sustains by change of language, I shall be willing to be taught better, and to recant" (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 21-2). While evaluating the importance of literary translation, Baker states that "given that translation is a culture-bound phenomenon, it is essential that we study the way in which it varies through time and across cultures" (132). The act of re/constructing the translated text depends on our ability as instructors to build a contextual reference and situation for our students that would remain foreign to them otherwise. This interpretation cannot be possible without embracing the "polyvancies" or "plurivocities" of the text (Biguenet and Schulte, *Theories* 18).

Some people may argue that perhaps it would be easier to obviate the ethos of translators, or it would be easier to adopt Ronald Barthes' "death of the author['s]" premise, and think about the translator as dead as well. It would certainly be easier to continue to read translation without the hassles that presuppose an active and conscious interpretative act. Perhaps, as Peter Bush noted in "The Writer of Translators," it would be "simple to accept the death of the translator, his or her name adorning the back flap as a bleak epitaph to the months of labor that selflessly,

naturally and most economically secreted the new spread of words" (Bassnett and Bush 24). I argue, however, that the celebration and understanding of the original text would not be possible without these very same translators. In teaching readers how to approach translated texts we are teaching them to "uncover the invisible world that resides in written words." To accomplish this task there is a need to establish a "dialogue between learner and teacher … to promote the processes that lead to fully formed expert reading in our citizenry." In sum, teaching students to become "bitextual or multitextual reader[s]" who are able to "analyze texts in flexible ways, with more deliberate instruction at every stage of development on the inferential, demanding aspects of the text" is the ultimate goal of this methodology (Wolf 226). By engaging students in an activity that is anchored in situational thinking, they will become more sophisticated readers, as they will manage to investigate the dynamics of intercultural collaboration in translation. Despite the fluidity and instability of words that I mentioned in my Introduction, we need to guide our students to realize how those very same words are not a bi/product of a reductive view of the world, but rather they are intrinsically linked to a larger context that only makes sense through a closer reading of translated texts in a *Transglobal* sense.

WORKS CITED

Apter, Emily. "Philosophical Translation and Untranslatability: Translation as Critical Pedagogy." *Profession* (2010): 50-63. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Aristotle. *On Rhetoric*. *A Theory of Civic Discourse.* 2nd ed. Trans. and Ed. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford U Press, 2007. Print.

Ascham, Roger. *The Scholemaster.* London: Edward Arber, 1570. Digital. 20 May 2011. http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/1844/pg1844.html

Baker, Mona. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 1st ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

---, and Gabriela Saldanha. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Balmer, Josephine. "What Comes Next? Reconstructing the Classics." *The Translator as Writer*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. New York: Continuum, 2006: 184-195. Print.

Banerji, Sures Chandra. *A Companion to Sanskrit Literature*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1989. Print.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1980. Print.

---, and Peter Bush, eds. *The Translator as Writer.* New York: Continuum, 2006. Print.

Bean, John C., Virginia A. Chappell, and Alice M. Gillam. *Reading Rhetorically.* 3rd ed. Boston: Longman, 2004. Print.

Bellos, David. *Is That a Fish in Your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything.* New York: Faber and Faber, Inc., 2011. Kindle eBook file.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator," Trans. Harry Zohn. *Theories of Translation*. Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1992: 71-82. Print.

Berman, Antoine. *Toward a Translation Criticism.* Trans. and Ed. Françoise Massardier-Kenney. Kent, OH: Kent State UP, 2009. Print.

Bermann, Sandra. "Teaching in—and about—Translation." *Profession* (2010): 82-90. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Biguenet, John and Rainer Schulte, eds. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992. Print.

---, and Rainer Schulte, eds. *The Craft of Translation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago P: 1989. Print.

Binns, James W. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age.* Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990. Print.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy of Rhetoric* 1.1 (1968): 1-14. Print.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.*2nd ed. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's, 2000. Print.

British Council. Digital. 20 May 2012. http://literature.britishcouncil.org/susan-bassnett

Broeck, Raymond van den. "Introduction." *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. By James S. Holmes. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988: 1-5. Print.

Burton, Gideon O. "Amplification." and "Copia." *Silva Rhetoricae*. 2007. Brigham Young University. Digital. 31 May 2012. www.rhetoric.byu.edu

Cadiero-Kaplan, Karen. "Literacy Ideologies: Critically Engaging the Language Arts Curriculum." *Language Arts* 79.5 (2002): 372-381. Print.

Carlos, Claudia. "Translation as Rhetoric: Edward Jerningham's 'Impenitence'." *Rhetoric Review* 28.4 (2009): 335-351. JSTOR. Digital. 11 October 2011.

Cash, Annette G. and James C. Murphy. *Teoría y técnicas de traducción: primeras etapas*. Newark: Linguatext Ltd,, 2008. Print.

Caws, Mary Ann. "Listening to George Steiner, After Babel," Rev. of *After Babel* by George Steiner. *Boundary* 2 5.1 (Autumn 1976): 285-292. Print.

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote.* Trans. Burton Raffel. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999. Print.

---, *Don Quixote.* Trans. Edith Grossman. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005. Print.

---, *Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. Samuel Putnam. New York: Viking Press, 1949. Print.

---, *Don Quixote*. Trans. J.M. Cohen. New York: Penguin, 1950. Print.

Cicero. *On the Best Style of Orators*. Trans. C.D. Yonge. "Peitho's Web." Digital. 27 October 2011. http://classicpersuasion.org/

---. *On the Ideal Orator*. New York*:* Oxford University Press*,* 2001. Print.

Conley, Michael. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996. Print.

Conley, Verena. "Living in Translation." *Profession* (2010): 18-24. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages.* New York: Cambridge U Press, 1991. Print.

Crellin, Sarah. "Anglo-Saxon Study of Language." University of Toronto, 2001. Digital. 10 April 2012. http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercy/courses/6361Crellin.htm

Crowley, Sharon, and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students.* 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999. Print.

Culler, Jonathan. "Teaching Baudelaire, Teaching Translation." *Profession* (2010): 91-98. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Derrida, Jacques. "From *Des Tours de Babel*." Trans. Joseph F. Graham. *Theories of Translation*. Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 218-27. Print.

Dixon, Peter. *Rhetoric.* London: Methuen, 1971. Print.

Dryden, John. "On Translation." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 17-31. Print.

Eco, Umberto. *Experiences in Translation.* Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 2001. Print.

Enos, Richard Leo. "Ancient Greek Writing Instruction." *A Short History of Writing Instruction*. 2nd ed. Ed. James J. Murphy. NY: Routledge, 2001: 9-34. Print.

---. "When Rhetoric was Outlawed in Rome: A Translation and Commentary of Suetonius's Treatise on Early Roman Rhetoricians," *Speech Monographs* [now Communication Monographs] 39 (1972): 37-45. 10 April 2012. Print.

France, Peter. "The Rhetoric of Translation." *Modern Language Review* 100 [Supplement] (2005): 255–68. JSTOR. Digital. 20 May 2011.

Fuentes, Carlos. Foreword. *The Adventures of Don Quixote de la Mancha.* By Miguel de Cervantes. Trans. Tobias Smollett. New York: Macmillan, 1986. Print.

Gaillet, Lynée Lewis, and Winifred Bryan Horner, eds. *The Present State of Scholarship in the History of Rhetoric. A Twenty-First Century Guide*. Columbia: U of Missouri Press, 2010. Kindle eBook file.

Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What is Literacy?" *Literacy. A Critical Sourcebook.* Eds. Ellen Cushman, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry M. Kroll, and Mike Rose. Boston: Bedford, 2001: 525-544. Print.

Gordon, Phyllis Walter Goodhart. *Two Renaissance Book Hunters: The Letters of Poggius Bracciolini to Nicolaus De Niccolis*. New York: Columbia U Press, 1974. Print.

Grandbois, Peter. "Lost in Details: Translating Master Peter's Puppet Show." *Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*. 27.2 (2007): 59-79. JSTOR. Digital. 15 October 2011.

Grossman, Edith. "Translator's Note." *Don Quijote*. By Miguel de Cervantes New York: Ecco/HarperCollins, 2003. Print.

---. *Why Translation Matters*. Orwigsburg, PA: Yale U Press, 2010. *Kindle* eBook file.

Hawhee, Debra. "Bodily Pedagogies: Rhetoric, Athletics, and the Sophists' Three Rs." *College English* 65.2 (Nov 2002): 142-162. 12 April 2012. Digital. http://myweb.fsu.edu/jjm09f/RhetoricSpring2012/Debra%20Hawhee%20Bodily%20Pedagogies.pdf

Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric. An Introduction*, 3rd ed. Boston: Pearson Education, 2005. Print.

Holmes, James S. "Introduction to la manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre." *Modern Poetry in Translation*, 41-2 (March 1981), 53-6, from *Translation: Theory and Practice*. Eds. Daniel Weissbort and Astradur Eysteinsson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

---. *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies.* Atlanta: Rodopi BV, 1994. Print.

Holy Bible. 2nd ed. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2004. Print.

Horace. *Ars Poetica*. Trans. A. S. Kline. Digital. 15 May 2012. http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceArsPoetica.htm

Howard, Jennifer. "Translation Has Its Moment at MLA." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Digital. 28 December 2010. http://chronicle.com/article/Translation-Has-Its-Moment-at/63275/

Ingarden, Roman. "On Translations." *Ingardeniana III*. Trans. Jolanta W. Wawrzycka. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. (1991): 139-192. Print.

Jeffcoat, John L. "Timeline of Bible Translation History." Digital. 19 January 2012. http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/

Kelly, L. G. *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979. Print.

Kennedy, George A. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric.* NJ: Princeton UP, 1994. Print.

---. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Press, 1999. Print.

---. *Quintilian.* New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1969. Print.

Kumar Das, Bijay. *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism.* Google Book Search. Atlantic Publishers and Dist., 2005. Digital. May 31 2012.

Lanham, Carol Dana. "Writing Instruction from Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century." *A Short History of Writing Instruction*. 2nd ed. Ed. James J. Murphy. NY: Routledge, 2001: 79-121. Print.

Lee, Ezra Yoo-Hyeok "Globalization, Pedagogical Imagination, and Transnational Literacy." CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 13.1 (2011). Digital. 30 February 2012. http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss1/1

Lefevere, André. "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites." *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985. Print.

Levine, Suzanne Jill. *The Subversive Scribe. Translating Latin American Fiction*. Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1991. Print.

Lloyd, Keith. "A Rhetorical Tradition Lost in Translation: Implications for Rhetoric in the Ancient Indian NYĀYA SŪTRAS." *Advances in the History of Rhetoric.* 10 (2007): 19-42. JSTOR. Digital. 10 November 2011.

Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition.* Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh P, 1997. Print.

---, ed. *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies.* Los Angeles: Sage, 2009. Print.

Malone, J. L. *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation*. Albany: State U. of New York Press, 1988. Print.

Miller, Frank Justus. "Translation Plus." *The Classical Journal* 29.7 (April 1934): 494-506. JSTOR. Digital. 02 January 2012.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies Theories and Applications.* London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

---, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies.* London: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Murphy, James J., ed. *A Short History of Writing Instruction. From Ancient Greece to Modern America*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras Press, 2001. Print.

---, and Richard A. Katula. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric.* 3rd ed. New Jersey: Hermagoras Press, 2003. Print.

---. *Quintilian. On the Teaching of Speaking and Writing. Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of Institutio Oratoria.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.

Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1964. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On the Problem of Translation." Trans. Peter Mollenhauer. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 68-70. Print.

North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1987. Print.

Olmsted, Wendy. *Rhetoric: An Historical Introduction*. UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. Print.

Ortega y Gasset, José. "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation." Trans. Elizabeth Gamble Miller. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 93-112. Print.

Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." 1946. Digital. 10 December 2011. http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/politics/english/e_polit

Paul, Gill. *Translation in Practice. A Simposium.* Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 2009. Print.

Paz, Octavio. "Translation: Literature and Letters." Trans. Irene del Corral. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 152-162. Print.

Penguin Classics. "About us." Digital. 18 February 2012. http://www.penguinclassics.co.uk/static/penguinclassicsaboutus/index.html

Plato. *Gorgias.* Trans. Robin Waterfield. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. Print.

---. *Phaedrus*. Trans. Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co, 1995. Print.

---. *Protagoras*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. The Project Gutenberg eBook of Protagoras. Digital. 18 February 2012. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1591/1591-h/1591-h.htm

Pliny the Younger. *The Letters of Pliny the Younger*. Vol. 2. Google Book Search. Digital. 30 May 2012.

Porchia, Antonio. *Voices*. Trans. W. S. Merwin. Port Townsend, Washington: Copper Canyon Press, 2003.

Porter, Catherine. "Presidential Forum: The Task of Translation in the Global Context." *Profession* (2010): 5-8. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Pound, Ezra. "Guido's Relations." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 83-92. Print.

Pym, Anthony. "Venuti's Visibility." Rev. of *The Translator's Invisibility*. *Target* 8.1 (1996): 165-77. JSTOR. Digital. 15 December 2011.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1980. Print.

---. *Institutionis Oratoriae: Volume I: Books I-VI; Quintilian*, Oxford Classical Texts: 1970. Print.

---. *The Orator's Education*. *Books 1-2.* Trans. and Ed. Donald A. Russell. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2001. Print.

Rabassa, Gregory. *If this be Treason. Translation and its Dyscontents.* New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation, 2005. Print.

---. "No Two Snowflakes are Alike." *The Craft of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 228-238. Print.

Raffel, Burton. "Translating Medieval European Poetry." *The Craft of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 28-52. Print.

Ramanujan, A. K. "On Translating a Tamil Poem." *The Collected Essays of A. K. Ramanujan*. Ed. Vinay Dharwadker. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Rappaport, Uriel. "The *Letter of Aristeas* Again." *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 21.3 (March 2012): 285-303.

Rée, Jonathan. "The Translation of Philosophy." *New Literary History* 32.2 (Spring 2001): 223-257. JSTOR. Digital. 18 February 2011.

Rener, Frederick M. *Interpretatio Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler.* Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989. Print.

Robinson, Douglas. *Becoming a Translator. An Accelerated Course.* London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Rutherford, John. "Translating Fun: Don Quixote." *The Translator as Writer*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. New York: Continuum, 2006: 71-83. Print.

Sakai, Naoki. "Translation and the Figure of Border: Toward the Apprehension of Translation as a Social Action." *Profession* (2010): 25-34. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Sbarbi, José María *Refranero Español: Intraducibilidad del 'Quijote.'* Madrid: A. Gómez Fuentenebro, 1876. Print.

Scheleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Trans. Waltraud Bartscht. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago P: U of Chicago, 1992: 36-54. Print.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. "On Language and Words." Trans. Peter Mollenhauer. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 32-35. Print.

Sellers, Susan, ed. *The Hélène Cixous Reader.* New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Smart, C., and E.H. Blakeney. *Horace on the Art of Poetry*. London, UK: Scholartis Press, 1928. Web. 04 November 2011. www.poets.org

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Teaching for the Times." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 25.1 (1992): 3-22. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 20 July 2011.

---. "The Politics of Translation." *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.

---. "Translating in a World of Languages." *Profession* (2010): 35-43. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 20 July 2011.

Steiner, George. *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP: 1998. Print.

Struever, Nancy S. *The History of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of History*. Burlington, VT: Variorum, 2009. Print.

Taylor, Christopher. *Language to Language. A Practical and Theoretical Guide for Italian/English Translators.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. Trans. and Ed. *The Letter of Aristeas*. Jewish Historical Society of England. London, UK: Macmillan, 1904. Print.

Theoi Project. 25 April 2012. http://www.theoi.com/

"The Art of Translation." Rick Kleffel. NPR. Web. 01 December 2008. http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=97002969

"The Borges Papers." Norman Thomas di Giovanni. Web. 05 February 2012. www.digiovanni.co.uk/borges.htm

Tolliver, Joyce. “Rosalía between Two Shores: Gender, Rewriting, and Translation.” *Hispania* 85.1 (March 2002): 33-43. JSTOR. Digital. 15 May 2012.

Tompkins, Jane. "The Reader in History: the Changing Shape of Literary Response." *Reader-Response Criticism: from Formalism to Structuralism.* Ed. Jane Tompkins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980: 202-253. Print.

Turner, Allan. “Translation and Criticism: The Stylistic Mirror.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36.1 (2006): 168-176. JSTOR. Digital. 15 January 2011.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser Woodhouselee. *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. London: J. M. Dent & co., 1797. CDL. Web. 30 May 2012. http://ia600508.us.archive.org/9/items/essayonprinciple00woodiala/essayonprinciple00woodiala.pdf Digital.

Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *Rethinking Translation. Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology.* London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

---. *The Translators´s Invisibility. A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

---, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

---. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference.* London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

---. “Translation, Empiricism, Ethics.” *Profession* (2010): 72-81.

Vickers, Brian. *Rhetoric Revalued.* Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982. Print.

Von Humboldt, Wilhelm. “From the Introduction to his Translation of *Agamemnon*.” Trans. Sharon Sloan. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 55-9. Print.

Walter, Benjamin. “The Task of the Translator.” Trans. Harry Zohn. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 71-82. Print.

Weaver, William. “The Process of Translation.” *The Edinburgh Journal of Gadda Studies* (EJGS). Digital. 31 May 2012. http://www.gadda.ed.ac.uk/Pages/resources/babelgadda/babeng/weavertranslation.php

Weissbort, Daniel and Astradur Eysteinsson eds. *Translation –Theory and Practice. A Historical Reader.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

Wolf, Maryanne. *Proust and the Squid. The History and Science of the Reading Brain*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2007. Print.

Wiktionary. *The Free Encyclopedia.* Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 22 July 2004. Web. 10 May 2012.

Zaro, J. J. and M. Truman. *Manual de Traducción. A Manual of Translation. Textos españoles e ingleses traducidos y comentados.* Alcobendas, Madrid: SGEL-educación, 1998. Print.

Zwaneveld, Agnes Maria. *A Bookseller's Hobby-Horse and the Rhetoric of Translation*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996. Print.

WORKS CONSULTED

Abbot, Don Paul. *Rhetoric in the New World: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in Colonial Spanish America.* U of South Carolina Press, 1996. Print.

Abu- Mahfouz, Ahmad. "Translation as a Blending of Cultures." *Journal of Translation*. 4.1 (2008): 1-5. Digital. 20 November 2011. http://www.sil.org/siljot/2008/1/51140/siljot2008-1-01.pdf

Anderman, Gunilla and Margaret Rogers. *Translation Today. Trends and Perspectives*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2003. Print.

Atwill, J. M. "Contingencies of Historical Representation." *Writing Histories of Rhetoric*. Ed. V. J. Vitanza. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U Press, 1994: 98-111. Print.

Axelrod, Rise B., Charles R. Cooper, and Alison M. Warriner. *Reading Critically Writing Well. A Reader and Guide,* 9th ed. Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2011. Print.

Baker, Mona. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Barilli, Renato. *Rhetoric*. Trans by Giuliana Menozzi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 1989. Print.

Bassnett, Susan, and Andre Lefevere. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990. Print.

Benson, Thomas W., Michael H. Prosser. *Readings in Classical Rhetoric*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1972. Print.

Bentley, Michael, ed. *Companion to Historiography*. London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Berlin, James A. "Revisionary Histories of Rhetoric: Politics, Power, and Plurality." *Writing Histories of Rhetoric*. Ed. Victor J. Vitanza. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994. Print

Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy.* Trans. Patrick J. Walsh. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Borges, Jorge Luis. "Pierre Menard, Autor del Quijote." Digital. 20 November 2011. http://www.libreriahispana.com/borges/pierre.html

Bradford, Lisa. *Traducción como cultura.* Argentina: Beatriz Viterbo Editora, 1997. Print.

Brioschi, F. and C. Di Girolamo. *Introducción al estudio de la literatura.* Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1996. Print.

Brittenham, Rebecca, and Hildegard Hoeller. *Key Words for Academic Writers.* New York: Pearson-Longman, 2004. Print.

Campbell, Kermit E. Rev. of *Comparative Rhetoric: A Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction* by George A. Kennedy. *Rhetoric Review* 17.1 (Autumn 1998): 170-174. Print.

Catelli, Laura. "Los hijos de la conquista: otras perspectivas sobre el 'mestizo' y la traducción a partir de la nueva crónica y buen gobierno de Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 4.4 (2010). Digital. 15 July 2011. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/catelli.htm

Child, Jack. *Introduction to Spanish Translation.* Lanham, MD: U Press of America, 1992. Print.

Conley, Tom. "Translation on the Line.'" *Profession* (2010): 9-17. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Cook, Guy. *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford U Press, 2010. Print.

D'Angelo, Frank J. *A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1975. Print.

De Bary, Brett. "Practicing and Theorizing Translation: Implications for the Humanities." *Profession* (2010): 44-49. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Demetrius. *On Style.* Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Peitho's Web. Digital. 10 February 2012. http://fxylib.znufe.edu.cn/wgfljd/%B9%C5%B5%E4%D0%DE%B4%C7%D1%A7/pw/demetrius/index.htm

Donawerth, Jane, ed. *Rhetorical Theory by Women Before 1900: An Anthology.* Rowman and Littlefield, 2002. Print.

Eco, Umberto**.** *Mouse or Rat. Translation as Negotiation.* London: Phoenix, 2003. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *El orden del discurso*. Trans. Alberto González Troyano. Capellades, Barcelona: Tusquets Editores, 1970.

Fouces, Oscar Díaz. "LaTeX en la formación de traductores: ¿y por qué no?" *Redit* 4 (2010): 1-22.

Friedrich, Hugo. "On the Art of Translation." Trans. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 11-16. Print

García-Ruiz, Jesús. "El misionero, las lenguas mayas y la traducción," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 1.1 (2007). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/esc/america/garciaruiz.htm

Gargatagli, Marietta. "La traducción de América," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 1.1 (2007). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/gargatagli.htm

Garsten, Bryan. *Saving Persuasion. A Defense of Rhetoric and Judgment.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2006. Print.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory.* London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Gile, Daniel, Gyde Hansen, and Nike K. Pokorn, eds. *Why Translation Studies Matter.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. Print.

"Gorgias' Encomium of Helen." Trans. George A. Kennedy. Aristotle: On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse. "Appendix I: Supplementary Texts." NY: Oxford U Press, 1991. 283-87. Print.

Halloran, S. Michael. "Tradition and Theory in Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 62 (1976): 234-41.

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg, eds. *Keywords in Composition Studies.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1996. Print.

Hervey, Sándor, Ian Higgins, and Louise M. Haywood. *Thinking Spanish Translation. A Course in Translation Method: Spanish to English.* London: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Ijsseling, Samuel. *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Conflict.* Trans. Paul Dunphy. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976. Print.

Jaka, Aiora. "El discurso de la traducción en la historia de la traducción vasca," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 3.3 (2009). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/jaka.htm

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 144-151. Print.

Johnston, David. "Mapping the Geographies of Translation." *Betwixt and Between: Place and Cultural Translation*. Eds. Stephen Kelly and David Johnston. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2007: 254-68. Print.

Kamuf, Peggy. "Passing Strange: The Laws of Translation." *Profession* (2010): 64-71. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Kennedy, George A**.** *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction.* Oxford UP, 1997. Print.

-----. "Comparative Rhetoric." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Ed. Thomas O. Sloane. NY: Oxford UP, 2001: 137-143. Print.

Kenny, Dorothy, and Kyongjoo Ryou. *Across Boundaries International Perspectives on Translation Studies.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007. Print.

Kloepfer, Rolf. "Intra- and Inter-Cultural Translation." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (Summer-Autumn 1981): 29-37. JSTOR. Digital. 11 October 2011.

Krummrich, Philip. "Acerca del papel de los traductores," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 1.1 (2007). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/krummrich.htm

Lanham, Richard. A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1991. Print.

LaRusso, Dominic A. "A Neo-Platonic Dialogue: Is Rhetoric an Art? An Introduction and a Translation," *Speech Monographs*, 32 (Nov 1965): 393-440. JSTOR. Digital. 20 October 2011.

Lipson, Carol S, and Roberta Binkley, eds. *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics.* West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press, 2009. Print.

---. *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks.* SUNY, 2004. Print.

Long, Lynne. *Translating the Bible.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co, 2001. Print.

López, Jorge Fernandez. "Rhetorical Theory in Sixteenth-Century Spain: A Critical Survey." *Rhetorica* XX.2 (Spring 2002). 15 April 2012. http://caliber.ucpress.net/doi/pdf/10.1525/rh.2002.20.2.133

López-Guix, Juan Gabriel. "Tras la sombra de Babel," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 1.1 (2007). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/lopezguix.htm

---, and Jacqueline Minett Wilkinson. *Manual de traducción.* Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa, 2003. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Lahoucine Ouzgane eds. *Crossing Borderlands. Composition and Postcolonial Studies.* Pittsburgh, Pa: U of Pittsburgh Press, 2004. Print.

Lyons, Scott Richard. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" *College Communication and Composition* 51.3 (Feb 2000): 447-68. JSTOR. Digital. 15 October 2011.

Magennis, Hugh and Mary Swan eds. *A Companion to Ælfric*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2009. Print.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison: U of Wisconsin Press, 1982. Print.

Metcalfe, Mike. *Reading Critically at University.* London: Sage Publications, 2006. Print.

Miller, Susan. *Trust in Texts. A Different History of Rhetoric.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.

Morton, Stephen. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Moya, Virgilio. *La selva de la traducción*. 3rd ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2010. Print.

Nabokov, Vladimir. "Problems of Translation: *Onegin* in English." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 127-143. Print.

Newmark, Peter. *About Translation.* Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters, 1991. Print.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden, Netherlands: United Bible Societies, 1969. Print.

Ning, Wang. *Globalization and Cultural Translation.* London: Marshall Cavendish International, 2004. Print.

Nossack, Hans Erich. "Translating and Being Translated." Trans. Sharon Sloan. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 228-238. Print.

Perloff, Marjorie. "Teaching Poetry in Translation: The Case for Bilingualism." *Profession* (2010): 99-106. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. Digital. 15 June 2011.

Pym, Anthony. "Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories." *Livivs*. 1 (1992): 1-11. JSTOR. Digital. 15 December 2011.

Robertson, E.H. *The New Translations of the Bible.* London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959. Print.

Robinson, Douglas. "The Ascetic Foundations of Western Translatology: Jerome and Augustine." *Translation and Literature*. 1 (1992): 3-25. JSTOR. Digital. 30 May 2012.

---. *What is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions.* Kent, OH: Kent State UP, 1997. Print.

---. *Western Translation Theory*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002. Print.

Ross Amos, Flora. *Early Theories of Translation.* New York: Columbia UP, 1920. Print.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel." Preface to *The Early Italian Poets*." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 64-67. Print.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Émile. Or On Education.* Trans. Allan Bloom. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991. Print.

Ruiz-Casanova, José Francisco. "Los comienzos de la historia de la traducción en España: Juan Antonio Pellicer y Saforcada, entre el humanismo áureo y el humanismo moderno," *Revista de Historia de la Traducción* 3.3 (2009). Digital. 15 April 2012. http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/ruizcasanova2.htm

Saint Augustine (Bishop of Hippo). *Confessions*. Trans. Henry Chadwick. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.

Samuelsson-Brown, Geoffrey. *A Practical Guide for Translators.* 5th ed. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2010. Print.

Schilb, John L. "The History of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of History." *PRE/TEXT* 7 (1986): 11-34. JSTOR. Digital. 06 November 2011.

Schmidt, Dennis J. "The Hermeneutic Dimension of Translation." *Translation Perspectives IV. Selected Papers, 1986–87*. Binghamton, NY: SUNY-Binghamton, 1983: 5–17. JSTOR. Digital. 04 September 2011.

Schogt, Henry. "Semantic Theory and Translation Theory." *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 193-203. Print.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet and Miriam Shlesinger. "Introduction." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 4.2 (2009): 123-134. JSTOR. Digital. 10 September 2011.

Sloane, Thomas O., ed. *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. NY: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

Sofer, Morry. *The Translator's Handbook.* 3rd ed. Rockville: Schreiber Publishing, 1999. Print.

Spalding, Roger and Christopher Parker. *Historiography. An Introduction*. Manchester, UK: Manchester UP, 2007. Print.

Steiner, Eric and Colin Yallop eds. *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001. Print.

Strauss, Mark L. *Distorting Scripture. The Challenge of Bible Translation and Gender Accuracy.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity P, 1998. Print.

Vázquez-Ayora, Gerardo. *Introducción a la traductología. Curso básico de traducción.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown UP, 1977. Print.

Vitanza, Victor J., ed. *Writing Histories of Rhetoric.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1994. Print.

---. "Historiography and the Histories of Rhetorics, I: Revisionary Histories." *PRE/TEXT* 8 (1987): 1-2, 63-125. JSTOR. Digital. 15 September 2011.

Waisman, Sergio. *Borges y la traducción.* Trans. Marcelo Cohen. Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo editora, 2005. Print.

Walker, Jeffrey. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. NY: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Walzer, Arthur E. and David Beard. "Historiography and the Study of Rhetoric." *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies.* Eds. Andrea A. Lunsford, Kirt H. Wilson, and Rosa A. Eberly. Los Angeles: Sage, 2009: 13-33. Print.

Wechsler, Robert. *Performing Without a Stage. The Art of Literary Translation.* North Haven, CT: Catbird Press, 1998. Print.

Wilson, Norman J. *History in Crisis? Recent Directions in Historiography*, 2nd ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005. Print.

Wolfgang Von Goethe, Johann. "Translations." Trans. Sharon Sloan. *Theories of Translation.* Eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992: 60-3. Print.

Worth Jr., Roland H. *Bible Translations. A History through Source Documents.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co Inc., 1992. Print.

* Works in Spanish reflect Spanish conventions that require the capitalization of the first letter of the title.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Exegesis of the Translated Texts

Pre-reading questions

1. Which translations are more contemporary?
2. In which texts are the characters and the narrator domesticated and/or foreignized?
3. Can you identify the translator's ethos?
4. Can you pinpoint significant stylistic variations in the texts?
5. Which translator is providing more information and who is providing less?

Chart

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4
Dates				
Gender (a)				
Most domesticated Ethos (b)				
Analysis of the remainder and implicature. Most foreignized Ethos (c)				
Pathos: Closeness or distance Which text is more accessible and which do you understand better? (d)				

Rhetorical Situation: Audience and Constraints. Target audience Who is the translator trying to reach? Ideological implications of the text. (e)				
Context of the Situation. Field: note any terminology that strikes you as odd. Tenor: Register Indicate whether it's high or low) Mode: Did you notice any significant differences in the way the information was conveyed? (f)				
Amplification/ reduction/reordering. Which text contains more or less significant syntactical variations? (g)				
Analysis of the remainder: What word choices are radically different in each translation? What do you think they seem to imply? (h)				

Collection of Examples: Follow-up Questions

(a) Gender. Does one translation seem more masculine or feminine, or does it seem written to appeal to an audience of male readers vs. female readers?

(b) Domesticated ethos. Is any translator adding footnotes or any sort of additional information? Why do you think that is?

(c) Foreignized ethos.

(d) Who conveys humor and/or message better and why? Provide examples.

(e) Rhetorical Situation:

-Target Audience (Who is the translator trying to reach?)

-Constraints: ideological agenda of the translator, if any.

(f) Context of the situation:

-Field: Jot down examples of high and low register.

-Tenor: Is the language used in any of these passages more archaic or modern; formal or informal; technical or non/technical?

-Mode: Is there any particular text whose language seems to be organized differently?

(g) Pathos: Which text is more accessible? Which translation do you understand better? Why? Does one translation seem more detached or pushing the reader away and another more engaged or drawing the reader in?

(h) Does one translation seem more aware of the moves it makes and its "art" than another, or do they all make the act of translation seem invisible or taken for granted?

*List a number of stylistic variations that you've noted while reading the texts (amplification (addition of words or information), reduction (of words or information), or reordering (inversion

of basic syntactic structures.) What is the intention behind these syntactical choices? What sort of information is implied?

Appendix B: Glossaries of Rhetoric and Translation

Glossary of Translation

Amplification: Addition of lexicogramatical elements and/or footnotes, endnotes, or bracketed or parenthetical information in a translation.

Bottom-Up Processing: In translation, this process stands for the comprehension of the translated text beginning with words, sentences or paragraphs, and proceeds gradually toward the analysis of the context.

Context of the Situation: Refers to the situational context in which any communicative undertaking occurs. The production of every text takes place under specific situations of time, context, place, purpose, reason, etc. The main three components of the context of situation are field, tenor, and mode.

Chunk: A portion of a text that corresponds to a portion of meaning for translating reasons.

Domestication: In Translation Studies, domestication denotes an attitude toward the translated text. In terms of the reader's cognitive ability to process the translated text, domestication refers to the reader's cognitive ability to process and recognize a translated text as fluent.

Ellipsis: The exclusion of any words, sentences, or phrases because they can be understood without being mentioned.

Field: this component of the context of the situation refers to what is happening in any given situation.

Genderlect: A specific mode of language used by either men or women.

Implicature: The ways through which a listener or a reader manages to infer precisely what the speaker or the writer meant to say. The concept of implicature as developed in linguistic-oriented theorists is defined as one that analyzes and embraces the differences among foreign texts and its domestic culture. When the meaning of the text is hard to convey, translators recur to footnotes or endnotes as ancillary material to compensate for that implicature and/or difference.

Foreignization: Happens when a translation acts as a form of resistance against a prevalent hegemony of the recipient culture.

Les Belles Infideles: A Term coined by Gilles Menage in 1654 to express his preoccupation between the marriage of translation and fidelity. As in marriage, translation has nothing more to offer than a promise of fidelity; however, this promise does not guarantee the legitimacy of the translated text.

Mode: Another component of the context of situation that refers to the way a language is conveyed and what it is used to do.

Omission: A translation strategy through which the translator decides to leave out information that was present in the original text.

Register: Specific type of language used in particular texts (e.g. scientific texts, legal texts) or in specific contexts (e.g. language used with your family, at school, at work). It is marked by a particular choice of words, specific forms, and expressions.

Remainder: A term defined by Venuti as the possibility of variation in a translated text. The remainder allows readers to move past the multiple challenges established in the conventions of writing and encountered by the translator. Venuti introduces the notion of the remainder to allude to the many aspects of a foreign text that makes it visible to its readers. He defines it as "the collective force of linguistic forms that outstrips any individual's control and complicates

intended meaning" (108). The remainder "allows for the disturbing and stimulating effects of translation. It accounts for the productive nature of translation" (Venuti, Kindle, *Scandals*, section 2500).

Skopos: In the field of translation, *skopos* pertains to the aim of the translated text. The decision to translate a text was motivated by a specific reason and circumstances. Ascertaining the *skopos* of a translated text, allows us to better understand what led the translator to take some of his or her decisions.

Tenor: A component of the context of situation that alludes to the existing relation between the people involved in a situation.

Top-Down Processing: In a translation context, it refers to the mental production of a particular text obtained from an understanding of the context of that specific situation.

Transparency: Happens when the text reads smoothly. The translated prose contains no awkward phrasing, unidiomatic structures or tangled meaning.

Glossary of Rhetoric

Amplification: In rhetoric studies, there are two types of amplification: vertical amplification and horizontal amplification. Vertical amplification happens when the author aggrandizes or maximizes the purpose of the subject in question. Horizontal amplification refers to the enlargement of specific elements in the structure of a text to intensify its rhetorical effect.

Audience: This term first appeared in the fourteenth century and it was referred to as hearing. With the passage of time, it developed to represent a community of listeners. With the advent of electronic media and digital communication in the twentieth century, the term has evolved into referring to a group of individuals who come into contact with radio, the Internet, and television. The term audience is also considered as a synonym of readers. Therefore, it refers to an

individual engaged in the act of reading. Also an element of Bitzer's rhetorical situation, audience refers to the way people interpret, mediate, and construct the message of any act of communication.

Constraints: A component of Bitzer's rhetorical situation that refers to the ideological agenda that could affect the way a text is received and perceived by an audience.

Ethos: Pertains to the author's intention and appeals to the author's character and credibility.

Exigence: An element of the rhetorical situation that pertains to the series of obstacles, issues or problems that prompts a person to write or speak.

Hypotyposis: A rhetorical device by which one tries to suggest visual effects through words.

Logos: According to Aristotle, *logos* denotes any of the arguments as they are discussed and addressed by an author. It is an appeal to the author's logic.

Kairos: Implies that a truth cannot be separated from a particular moment and, by extension, from its rhetorical situation. According to Quintilian, it refers to a specific time, place, and circumstances of a rhetorical situation.

Modern Appropriation: Attempts to understand an original text from a modern standpoint while remaining truthful to the meaning of the original.

Pathos: A Greek term that refers to an author's power to move the emotions and ideals of his or her audience.

Rhetorical Context: Pertains to the context of a rhetorical act. It combines aspects pertaining to audience, genre, and purpose. Within the context of this study, being able to determine and analyze these factors in a text, will allow readers to better understand the reasoning behind the author's intentions and choices.

Rhetorical Situation: First described by Lloyd Bitzer's pivotal essay "The Rhetorical Situation" (1968). Bitzer holds that rhetoric dwells in a context that is historical, cultural, and situational and that influences the way an audience receives and understands the text.

Spot Reading: Is a process that provides a quick overview of the nature of any given text.

Textual Cues: Are style, format, and terminology. These textual cues can either hinder or facilitate the reader.

Worldview: A writer's set of underlying beliefs, presuppositions, and values.

*Some of these terms have been conceptualized in disparate ways. The following glossary solely defines and reflects upon those terms that are pertinent to this methodology.

Appendix C: Case Study I: Quintilian

Passages from Case Study I: Quintilian

Passage 1: Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. *Books 1-2.* Trans. and Ed. Donald A. Russell. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2001.

Chapter Five "The rhetor should read oratory and history with his pupils."

Indeed, reading the text out to ensure that the boys follow the written word easily and clearly, and even the sort of reading which is meant to explain the force of any unfamiliar word, are both to be judged far beneath the rhetor's proper office. On the other hand, it certainly is part of his profession and claim as teacher of eloquence to point out merits and, where necessary, faults –all the more so because I am not of course imposing on teachers the task of calling the pupil up to stand at their side, and helping him in reading any book he may choose! It seems to me both easier and much more profitable to call for silence and appoint one boy as reader (it is best to do this by giving each a turn), so that they accustom themselves also to speaking in

public. Then the Cause for which the speech to be read was written should be explained, because that will enable the spoken words to be better understood. Nothing must pass unnoticed: every noteworthy point of Invention or Elocution is to be observed – the way in which the judge is conciliated in the Prooemium; the clarity, brevity, and credibility of the Narrative; the speaker's plan and hidden artifice (in this business the only art is that which can only be seen by an artist!);[59] the wisdom shown in dividing the materials; the delicate and dense argument; the vigour that stirs and the charm that delights; the sharpness of the invective, the wit of the jokes; and how finally the orator reigns over the jury's emotions, forces his way into their hearts, and makes their feeling reflect his words. As for Elocution, he will point out the exact use, elegance, or sublimity of each word; where Amplification is to be praised, and where the opposite quality is to be seen; the brilliance of the metaphors, the Figures of Speech, and how the Composition is smooth and well-formed while remaining masculine. It can also be useful sometimes to read aloud bad or faulty speeches, but of the kind that many admire out of bad taste, and to point out what a lot of expressions in these are inexact, obscure, turgid, low, mean, extravagant, or effeminate. These expressions are not only praised just for their badness. For straightforward, natural speech is judged to owe nothing to talent; we admire things which are in some way distorted as being more sophisticated –just as some people set a higher value on human bodies which are crippled or somehow deformed than on those which have lost none of the blessings of normality, [60] while others again, who are captivated by appearances, fancy that there is more beauty in those who have had their hairs plucked and skin smoothed, who singe their hair and

---

[59] Compare 1.11.3 Q. runs through the various parts of the speech, enumerating the various qualities which the teacher is to point out.

[60] Compare [Quintilian], *Declamationes minors* 298f.: "one pleases by weakness, another by the wretched condition of a crippled body." Plutarch (*Moralia* 520c) tells us of a market at Rome in abnormal or monstrously deformed slaves.

keep it in order with pins, and whose complexion is anything but their own, than in anything that uncorrupted nature can confer: thus beauty of body seems to come from depravity of character. [61]

The teacher will not only be required to give instruction on these things himself, but to ask frequent questions and test his pupil's judgment. This will get rid of inattentiveness while they are listening, and ensure that what is said does not go in at one ear and out at the other; at the same time they will be led to form their own ideas and to understand, which is the object of the exercise. After all, what else do we aim at by teaching them except to ensure that they do not always need to be taught?

Passage 2: Murphy, James J. *Quintilian. On the Teaching of Speaking and Writing. Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of Institutio Oratoria.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

Such lecturing, indeed, as is given, so that boys may follow the writing of an author easily and distinctly with their eyes, and such even as explains the meaning of every uncommon word that occurs –this is to be regarded as far below the profession of a teacher of rhetoric.

But to point out the beauties of authors, and, if occasion ever presents itself, their faults, is eminently consistent with that profession and engagement, by which he offers himself to the public as a master of eloquence. I do not require such toil from teachers, however, that they should call their pupils to their laps, and labor at the reading of whatever book each of them may fancy. For to me it seems easier, as well as far more advantageous, that the master, after calling for silence, should appoint some one pupil to read (and it will be best that this duty should be

[61] This second error is to take artificial elegance (of complexion or hair) for real beauty. Translated into literary terms, this means that some (11) like the deliberately uncouth, others (12) excessive polish. A similar argument is found in Seneca, *Epistulae* 114.

imposed on them by turns), so that they may thus accustom themselves to clear pronunciation. Then, after explaining the cause for which it is important to be remarked, either in the thought or the language: he should observe what method is adopted in the exordium for conciliating the judge; what clearness, brevity, and apparent sincerity is displayed in the statement of facts; what design there is in certain passages, and what well-concealed artifice (for that is the only true art in pleading which cannot be perceived except by a skillful pleader); what judgment appears in the division of the matter; how subtle and urgent is the argumentation; with what force the speaker excites, with what amenity he soothes; what severity is shown in his invectives, what urbanity in his jests; how he commands the feelings, forces a way into the understanding, and makes the opinions of the judges coincide with what he asserts. In regard to the style, too, he should notice any expression that is peculiarly appropriate, elegant, or sublime; when the amplification deserves praise, what quality is opposed to it; what phrases are happily metaphorical, what figures of speech are used; what part of the composition is smooth and polished, and yet manly and vigorous.

Nor is it without advantage, indeed, that inelegant and faulty speeches –yet such as many, from depravity of taste would admire – should be read before boys, and that it should be shown how many expressions in them are inappropriate, obscure, timid, low, mean, affected, or effeminate. Such expressions, however, are not only extolled for the very reason that they are vicious. Straightforward language, naturally expressed, seems to so some of us to have nothing of genius; but whatever departs, in any way, from the common course, we admire as something exquisite; as, with some persons, more regard is shown for figures that are distorted and in any respect monstrous, than for such as have lost none of the advantages of ordinary conformation. Some, too, who are attracted by appearance, think that there is more beauty in men who are

depilated and smooth, who dress their locks (hot from the curling irons) with pins, and who are radiant with a complexion not their own, than unsophisticated nature can give: as if beauty of person could be thought to spring from corruption of manners.

Nor will the preceptor be under the obligation merely to teach these things, but frequently to ask questions upon them, and try the judgment of his pupils. Thus carelessness will not come upon them while they listen, nor will the instructions that shall be given fail to enter their ears. Thus, they will at the same time be conducted to the end which is sought in this exercise, namely that they themselves may conceive and understand. For what object have we in teaching them, but that they may not always require to be taught?

Passage 3: Quintilian. *Institutionis Oratoriae: Volume I: Books I-VI; Quintilian*, Oxford Classical Texts: 1970.

And I admit that the form of lecture which this requires, designed as it is to make boys follow the written word with ease and accuracy, and even that which aims at teaching the meaning of any rare words that may occur, are to be regarded as quite below the dignity of the teacher of rhetoric. 5 On the other hand it is emphatically part of his profession and the undertaking which he makes in offering himself as a teacher of eloquence, to point out the merits of authors or, for that matter, any faults that may occur: and this is all the more the case, as I am not asking teachers to undertake the task of recalling their pupils to stand at their knee once more and of assisting them in the reading of whatever book they may select. 6 It seems to me at once an easier and more profitable method to call for silence and choose some one pupil – and it will be best to select them by turns – to read aloud, in order that they may at the same time learn the correct method of elocution. 7 The case with which the speech selected for reading is concerned

should then be explained, for if this is done they will have a clearer understanding of what is to be read. When the reading is commenced, no important point should be allowed to pass unnoticed either as regards the resourcefulness or the style shown in the treatment of the subject: the teacher must point out how the orator seeks to win the favour of the judge in his *exordium*, what clearness, brevity and sincerity, and at times what shrewd design and well-concealed artifice is shown in the statement of facts. 8 For the only true art in pleading is that which can only be understood by one who is a master of the art himself. The teacher will produce further to demonstrate what skill is shown in the division into heads, how subtle and frequent are the thrusts of argument, what vigour marks the stirring and what charm the soothing passage, how fierce is the invective and how full of wit the jests, and in conclusion how the orator establishes his sway over the emotions of his audience, forces his way into their very hearts and brings the feelings of his jury into perfect sympathy with all his words. 9 Finally as regards the style, he will emphasize the appropriateness, elegance or sublimity of particular words, will indicate where the amplification of the theme is deserving of praise and where there is virtue in a diminuendo; and will call attention to brilliant metaphors, figures of speech and passages combining smoothness and polish with a general impression of manly vigour.

10 It will even at times be of value to read speeches which are corrupt and faulty in style, but still meet with general admiration thanks to the perversity of modern tastes, and to point out how many expressions in them are inappropriate, obscure, high-flown, groveling, mean, extravagant or effeminate, although they are not merely praised by the majority of critics, but, worse still, praised just because they are bad. 11 For we have come to regard direct and natural speech as incompatible with genius, while all that is in any way abnormal is admired as exquisite. Similarly we see that some people place a higher value on figures which are in any

way monstrous or distorted than they do on those who have not lost any of the advantages of the normal form of man. 12 There are even some who are captivated by the shams of artifice and think that there is more beauty in those who pluck out superfluous hair or use depilatories, who dress their locks by scorching them with the curling iron and glow with a complexion that is not their own, than can ever be conferred by nature pure and simple, so that it really seems as if physical beauty depended entirely on moral hideousness.

13 It will, however, be the duty of the rhetorician not merely to teach these things, but to ask frequent questions as well, and test the critical powers of his class. This will prevent his audience from becoming inattentive and will secure that his words do not fall on deaf ears. At the same time the class will be led to find out things for themselves and to use their intelligence, which is after all the chief aim of this method of training. For what else is our object in teaching, save that our pupils should not always require to be taught?

Appendix D: Case Study II: Cervantes

Titles used for Case Study II: Cervantes

Title 1: Putnam, 1949

Of the good fortune which the valorous Don Quixote had in the terrifying and never-before-imagined adventure of the windmills, along with other events that deserved to be suitably recorded.

Title 2: Cohen, 1950

Of the valorous Don Quixote's success in the dreadful and never before imagined Adventure of the Windmills, with other events worthy of happy record

Title 3: Raffel, 1999

– the great success won by our brave Don Quixote in his dreadful, unimaginable encounter with two windmills, plus other honorable events well worth remembering.

Title 4: Rutherford, 2003

About the brave Don Quixote's success in the dreadful and unimaginable adventure of the windmills, together with other events worthy of happy memory.

Title 5: Lathrop, 2005

Of the excellent outcome that the brave Don Quixote had in the frightening and never-imagined adventure of the windmills, with other events worthy of happy memory.

Title 6: Grossman, 2005

Regarding the good fortune of the valorous Don Quixote in the fearful and never imagined adventure of the windmills, along with the other events worthy of joyful remembrance.

Title 7: Montgomery, 2009

Our valiant Don Quixote's triumph in the frightful and unprecedented adventure of the windmills, together with other incidents worthy of record.

Passages used for Case Study II: Cervantes

Passage 1: Putnam, 1949

Of the good fortune which the valorous Don Quixote had in the terrifying and never-before-imagined adventure of the windmills, along with other events that deserved to be suitably recorded.

At this point they caught sight of thirty or forty windmills which were standing on the plain there, and no sooner had Don Quixote laid eyes upon them than he turned to his squire and said, "Fortune is guiding our affairs better than we could have wished; for you see there before you, friend Sancho Panza, some thirty or more lawless giants with whom I mean to do battle. I shall deprive them of their lives, and with the spoils from this encounter we shall begin to enrich ourselves; for this is righteous warfare, and it is a great service to God to remove so accursed a breed from the fact of the earth."

"What giants?" said Sancho Panza.

"Those you see over there," replied his master, "those with the long arms some of which are much as two leagues in length."

"But look, your Grace, those are not giants but windmills, and what appear to be the arms are the wings which, when whirled in the breeze, cause the millstone to go."

"It is plain to be seen," said Don Quixote, "that you have had little experience in this matter of adventures. If you are afraid, go off to one side and say your prayers while I am engaging them in fierce, unequal combat."

Saying this, he gave spurs to his steed Rocinante, without paying any heed to Sancho's warning that these were truly windmills and not giants that he was riding forth to attack. Nor even when he was close upon them did he perceive what they really were, but shouted at the top

of his lungs, “Do not seek to flee, cowards and vile creatures that you are, for it is but a single knight with whom you have to deal!”

At that moment a little wind came up and the big wings began turning.

“Though you flourish as many arms as did the giant Briareus,” said Don Quixote when he perceived this, “you still shall have to answer to me.”

He thereupon commended himself with all his heart to his lady Dulcinea, beseeching her to succor him in this peril; and, being well covered with his shield and with his lance at rest, he bore down upon them at a full gallop and fell upon the first mill that stood in his way, giving a thrust at the wing, which was whirling at such a speed that his lance was broken into bits and both horse and horseman went rolling over the plain, very much battered indeed. Sancho upon his donkey came hurrying to his master’s assistance as fast as he could, but when he reached the spot, the knight was unable to move, so great was the shock with which he and Rocinante had hit the ground.

Passage 2: Cohen, 1950

Of the valorous Don Quixote’s success in the dreadful and never before imagined Adventure of the Windmills, with other events worthy of happy record.

At that moment they caught sight of some thirty or forty windmills, which stand on that plain, and as soon as Don Quixote saw them he said to his quire: ‘Fortune is guiding our affairs better than we could have wished. Look over there, friend Sancho Panza, where more than thirty monstrous giants appear. I intend to do battle with them and take all their lives. With their spoils we will begin to get rich, for this is a fair war, and it is a great service to God to wipe such a wicked brood from the face of the earth.’

‘What giants?’ asked Sancho Panza.

‘Those you see there,’ replied his master, ‘with their long arms.

Some giants have them about six miles long.’

‘Take care, your worship,’ said Sancho; ‘those things over there are not giants but windmills, and what seem to be their arms are the sails, which are whirled round n the wind and make the millstone turn.’

‘It is quite clear,’ replied Don Quixote, ‘that you are not experienced in this matter of adventures. They are giants, and if you are afraid, go away and say your prayers, whilst I advance and engage them in fierce and unequal battle.’

As he spoke, he dug his spurs into his steed Rocinante, paying no attention to his squire’s shouted warning that beyond all doubt they were windmills and not giants he was advancing to attack. But he went on, so positive that they were giants that he neither listened to Sancho’s cries nor noticed what they were, even when he got near them. Instead he went on shouting in a loud voice: ‘Do not fly, cowards, vile creatures, for it is one knight alone who assails you.’

At that moment a slight wind arose, and the great sails began to move. At the sight of which Don Quixote shouted: ‘Though you wield more arms than the giant Briareus, you shall pay for it!’ Saying this, he commended himself with all his soul to his Lady Dulcinea, beseeching her aid in his great peril. Then, covering himself with his shield and putting his lance in the rest, he urged Rocinante forward at a full gallop and attacked the nearest windmill, thrusting his lance into the sail. But the wind turned it with such violence that it shivered his weapon in pieces, dragging the horse and his rider with it, and sent the knight rolling badly injured across the plain. Sancho Panza rushed to his assistance as fast as his ass could trot, but

when he came up he found that the knight could not stir. Such a shock had Rocinante given him in their fall.

Passage 3: Raffel, 1999

The great success won by our brave Don Quixote in his dreadful, unimaginable encounter with two windmills, plus other honorable events well worth remembering.

Just then, they came upon thirty or forty windmills, which (as it happens) stand in the fields of Montiel, and as soon as Don Quixote saw them he said to his squire:

"Destiny guides our fortunes more favorably than we could have expected. Look there, Sancho Panza, my friend, and see those thirty or so wild giants, with whom I intend to do battle and to kill each and all of them, so with their stolen booty we can begin to enrich ourselves. This is noble, righteous warfare, for it is wonderfully useful to God to have such an evil race wiped from the face of the earth."

"What giants?" asked Sancho Panza.

"The ones you can see over there," answered his master, "with the huge arms, some of which are very nearly two leagues long."

"Now look, your grace," said Sancho, "what you see over there aren't giants, but windmills, and what seem to be arms are just their sails, that go around in the wind and turn the millstone."

"Obviously," replied Don Quixote, "you don't know much about adventures. Those are giants – and if you're frightened, take yourself away from here and say your prayers, while I go charging into savage and unequal combat with them."

Saying which, he spurred his horse, Rocinante, paying no attention to the shouts of Sancho Panza, his squire, warning him that without any question it was windmills and not giants he was going to attack. So utterly convinced was he they were giants, indeed, that he neither heard Sancho's cries nor noticed, close as he was, what they really were, but charged on, crying:

"Flee not, oh cowards and dastardly creatures, for he who attacks you is a knight alone and unaccompanied."

Just then the wind blew up a bit, and the great sails began to stir, which Don Quijote saw and cried out:

"Even should you shake more arms than the giant Briareus[62] himself, you'll still have to deal with me."

As he said this, he entrusted himself with all his heart to his lady Dulcinea, imploring her to help and sustain him at such a critical moment, and then, with his shield held high and his spear braced in its socket, and Rocinante at a full gallop, he charged directly at the first windmill he came to, just as a sudden swift gust of wind sent its sail swinging hard around, smashing the spear to bits and sweeping up the knight and his horse, tumbling them all battered and bruised to the ground. Sancho Panza came rushing to his aid, as fast as his donkey could run, but when he got to his master, found him unable to move, such a blow had he been given by the falling horse.

Passage 4: Grossman, 2005

Regarding the good fortune of the valorous Don Quixote in the fearful and never imagined adventure of the windmills, along with the other events worthy of joyful remembrance.

[62] One of the "hundred-handed" (*Hekatoncheires*) giants, sons of Uranus and Gaia.

As they were talking, they saw thirty or forty of the windmills found in that countryside, and as soon as Don Quixote caught sight of them, he said to his squire:

"Good fortune is guiding our affairs better than we could have desired, for there you see, friend Sancho Panza, thirty or more enormous giants with whom I intend to do battle and whose lives I intend to take and with the spoils we shall begin to grow rich, for this is righteous warfare, and it is a great service to God to remove so evil a breed from the face of the earth."

"What giants?" said Sancho Panza.

"Those you see over there," replied his master, "with the long arms sometimes they are almost two leagues long."

"Look, your grace," Sancho responded, "those things that appear over there aren't giants but windmills, and what looks like their arms are the sails that are turned by the wind and make the grindstone move."

"It seems clear to me," replied Don Quixote, "that thou art not well versed in the matter of adventures: these are giants; and if thou are afraid, move aside and start to pray whilst I enter with them in fierce and unequal combat."

And having said this, he spurred his horse, Rocinante paying no attention to the shouts of his squire, Sancho, who warned him that, beyond any doubt, those things he was about to attack were windmills and not giants. But he was so convinced they were giants that he did not hear the shouts of his squire, Sancho, and could not see, though he was very close, what they really were; instead, he charged and called out:

"Flee not, cowards and base creatures, for it is a single knight who attacks you."

Just then a gust of wind began to blow, and the great sails began to move, and seeing this, Don Quixote said:

"Even if you move more arms than the giant Briareus,[63] you will answer to me."

And saying this, and commending himself with all his heart to his Lady Dulcinea, asking that she come to his aid at this critical moment, and well-protected by his shield, with his lance in its socket, he charged at Rocinante's full gallop and attacked the first mill he came to; and as he thrust his lance into the sail, the wind moved it with so much force that it broke the lance into pieces and picked up the horse and the knight, who then dropped to the ground and were very badly battered. Sancho Panza hurried to help as fast as his donkey could carry him, and when he reached them he discovered that Don Quixote could not move because he had taken so hard a fall with Rocinante.

Appendix E: Works that Relate Translation to Rhetoric

Ascham, Roger. *The Scholemaster.* London: Edward Arber, 1570. Digital. 01 September 2011. http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/1844/pg1844.html

Benito-Vessels, Carmen. "Las prosificaciones de las *Cantigas* como traducciones exegéticas." *La Crónica*. 32.1 (2003): 205-30.

Carlos, Claudia. "Translation as Rhetoric: Edward Jerningham's "Impenitence," *Rhetoric Review* 28.4 (2009): 335-51. JSTOR. Digital. 11 October 2011.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages.* New York: Cambridge U Press, 1991. Print.

France, Peter. "The Rhetoric of Translation." *Modern Language Review* 100 [Supplement] (2005): 255–68. JSTOR. Digital. 20 May 2011.

Murphy, James J., ed. *A Short History of Writing Instruction. From Ancient Greece to Modern America*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras Press, 2001. Print.

Zwaneveld, Agnes Maria. *A Bookseller's Hobby-Horse and the Rhetoric of Translation*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996.

[63] A monstrous giant in Greek mythology who had fifty heads and a hundred arms.