

Session I

Translation Teaching in the 21st Century: Towards a ‘Whole-Person Translator Education’ Approach

- With special reference to Chinese contexts

Tan Zaixi
Hong Kong Baptist University

Tan Zaixi teaches in the Translation Programme of the English Department at Hong Kong Baptist University as a Scholar-in-Residence. He is concurrently an honorary professor and a PhD programme supervisor at the Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, China. He has taught as professor in Shenzhen University and as a Research Fellow at City University of Hong Kong. He graduated from Hunan Normal University in Central China and received his postgraduate education in the United Kingdom at the Universities of Westminster, Cambridge and Exeter where he obtained his Master's degree in General and Applied Linguistics and his PhD in Applied Linguistics. Professor Tan is the author of some 12 books and more than 50 papers on a wide range of topics on language and translation studies topics.

Over the last few decades, especially since China's opening to the outside world in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the teaching of translation in Chinese universities (including universities in Hong Kong) has been developing with ever increasing momentum. However, as we progress in the 21st century, we are still faced with some of the fundamental issues that seem to underlie the successful teaching of translation as a tertiary education programme. First of all, we need to decide what hidden agenda we have in store for the development of a university programme in translation. We may then need to ask ourselves: What general principles are there that we must follow in teaching translation to university students? How differently should we treat the teaching of translation as a Major/Minor programme and that as a mere subject as part of a foreign language programme? How differently should we manage a translation programme on the undergraduate level, and one on the master's and doctorate levels?

As a special course or subject for language students at the advanced college level, the teaching of translation is no doubt aimed at the skills training of the students, providing them with a deeper understanding and a fuller command of language skills. Recent calls for translation courses to be given to all non-language majors in Chinese universities have been a reflection of the realisation that translation courses are indeed important for the training of the students' language skills.

Likewise, in the translation programmes in the newly established schools of translation and interpretation in China's key foreign language or international studies universities in Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou, as well as in many of the older translation departments of other universities, translation is also mostly skills- and translation training-oriented. The same is true of translation programmes elsewhere in the world.

But is this the right model of translation teaching for university translation programmes? Our answer is both yes and no. Yes, because translation students must be trained to translate with enhanced skill; and no, because a university translation programme is far more than just that. It is not and cannot be the same as a translation programme in a training school or a translation subject

for a non-translation major programme at university. In other words, just as a fundamental distinction should be drawn in language pedagogy between training and education (Widdowson 1984), a clear distinction must also be drawn between translation teaching as training and that as education (Bernadini 2004). To a large extent, our proposal for a new model of translation teaching is based on this very concept of translation teaching as both training and education.

What then is the most distinctive feature of teaching translation as both training and education? Our answer is found in the ‘whole-person education’ concept. We will thus term our new model as a ‘Whole-person Education Approach to Translation Teaching’. To understand this whole-person education approach to translation teaching, there are two crucial elements about the approach that need specifying, namely the ‘whole-person education’ concept and the ‘developmental pyramid’ concept. The core element in the model, the ‘whole-person education’ concept is a borrowed concept from the general missions and goals of higher education adopted by many universities across the world in the new millennium, HKBU included. In its general missions statement, HKBU defines the features of its whole-person education model as being a holistic approach, broad-based, creativity-inspiring, inculcating in all who participate a sense of human values, and maintaining strong links with the community. However, this is not the main idea of what is meant by our ‘whole-person education’ model for translation teaching. What is central to our model is that translation teaching in a university translation programme should aim at educating its students in an all-round manner. By ‘all round’ is meant that in addition to educating students as a whole person in the general sense, they should be educated as a well-rounded translation specialist in the particular sense. Such a specialist is not only specialised in special areas of knowledge and expertise on translation, but more importantly, he/she should develop more general abilities to meet all kinds of challenges in translation. In other words, they should have a broad translation-knowledge and skills base, be able to think critically and creatively about the process and product of translation, have command of the basic translation competence and techniques, and be equipped with general occupational skills in addition to job-specific techniques.

This above core element of a whole-person education in translation is then materialised through a ‘healthy’ way of operation and practice. The reason why we use the word ‘healthy’ is that the way in which a ‘whole-person’ translator or translation specialist is developed is very much like the way in which a healthy diet is composed of for the development of a healthy body. Basing ourselves on the dietary guidelines created by U.S. nutrition officials in the form of the Food Guide Pyramid, we will call our model the Whole-person Translator Education Pyramid, or rather the Whole-person Translator Education Inverted-Pyramid, because the development model we will present is in fact in the shape of an inverted pyramid and not exactly the same as the nutrition officials-provided Food Guide Pyramid. Just as eating foods from the Food Guide Pyramid will help children grow healthy and strong, providing a balanced scientific ‘diet’ for the benefit of students in a translation programme, from undergraduate through postgraduate to doctorate levels, will also be the right way to make the students grow ‘healthy’ and ‘strong’.

By applying this model, we should be better able to handle such issues as what to teach, why to teach, when to teach and how to teach in a translation programme. We should, for example, be better able to answer questions like: Is the teaching of translation theory essential, and how can it be taught and taught effectively in relation to the teaching of translation practice? In what way can general progress in translation studies benefit the teaching of translation? and so on.

Translating Beyond Frontiers

Louis Jolicoeur
Université Laval, Quebec, Canada

Louis Jolicoeur is a professor of translation at Université Laval (Quebec city, Canada), where he is as well assistant dean of the Faculté des lettres. His research and recent articles deal with globalization and translation. He is currently setting up at Université Laval a research group called the Canadian Literary Translation Observatory. He has published various works of fiction : Le Siège du Maure (2002), Saisir l'absence (1994), shortlisted for the Governor General's Award in 1995, Les virages d'Émir (1990), and L'araignée du silence (1987), short listed for the Prix Adrienne-Choquette in 1987. He has also published a non-fiction work on literary translation : La sirène et le pendule - attirance et esthétique en traduction littéraire (1995), and translated into French (from Spanish and English) various authors from Ireland, Spain, Mexico, Argentina and Uruguay. He is also a professional interpreter.

The periphery

Periphery does not mean sub-culture. Rather, it is a position from where one can look at the center, perhaps intervene in it, but always from a distance. A distance that reflects the dynamism of a potential center as well as the possibility of reaching towards other peripheries. A distance that also creates the perspective one needs to think, to view and eventually to reproduce an object. Periphery is thus a geographical concept, but as well a literary one, the act of translating being in fact a process peripheral to that of writing.

Is Canada, and Quebec especially, really on the periphery? No doubt it is. Geographically, socially, culturally and even historically, it lies on the periphery of the Western World. This being said, one should be happy to be on the heterogeneous periphery, because a better perspective is often achieved from afar and because there, one more easily finds a vital force that is too often absent at the center. And it is this force, this potential for struggle and creation, that makes for interesting parallels between one peripheral place and another, beyond exoticism, apparent differences and voyeurism.

Arms outstretched, eyes that meet, a sudden captivation, the desire to know all the worlds around us : the impulses are there. One way or another, they must take shape in reality. And translation, particularly the translation that goes into anthologies of short stories, is a very good way of realizing this goal. But any attempt to bridge gaps, or to find where cultures meet or may heed each other's call must be preceded by a look at the context in which they are developing. The moment we do this, we easily see just how and why ties are so naturally created, in spite of geographical differences.

The striking fact is that certain social and literary referents are fundamental to literature from all horizons and must be taken into account when compiling and translating an anthology. Each time I have worked on selecting and translating contemporary stories, whether the authors were from Argentina, Mexico, Canada or Ireland, I have noticed that the themes are generally similar. With respect to social context, they include urban life, solitude, derision, violence, the struggle to survive, the crisis in values, the despondency of youth, unemployment, nationalism, identity, liberalism, and the new world order (which, more and more, gives everyone the impression of being on the periphery of some indefinable center). With respect to literary context, they include **active art** (the reader's involvement in the text and dialogue with the author, akin to the listener's participation in a musical work or the role played by the observer while consenting to be seduced by a work of art), psychoanalysis, deliberate ambiguity, the

apparent absence of the author, minimalism, and lastly, an element that commands attention, the strong influence of Latin American literature in today's fiction (particularly in the short story).

Effect and ambiguity

Translation, when seen as the final act in the play with mirrors that is the essence of literature, is much more than a tool for discovering others. In its own way, it constitutes a periphery, for it must draw near, not collide; explore, not lay bare; touch, not alter. It is born of an attraction that, unceasing, sustains its course; it seeks the effect beyond the meaning; it listens to someone, more than to words. And translation is playful — more faithful to movement, hiatus and tension, than to appearances — and it is seduced, almost in secret, by the fragile presence, unpredictable and ethereal, of ambiguity. It lives happily in this presence, which it feeds while being fed from it, whose company it prefers to seek rather than flee. And this company is its destiny, for not only is ambiguity at the heart of the trembling passage from one language to another, but it is in reproducing ambiguity that the translator truly draws near to the author. And this leaves unsaid that to translate ambiguity, to dwell in the contours of the text, to consider what lies beyond the immediate (even when translating a text of one's own — the ultimate challenge), is to skirt around its essence, true enough, but all the better to capture and express it.

The art of literary translation, in this context, is clearly not only a question of writing. It involves social and anthropological issues, as well as philosophical aspects linked to the fields of aesthetics and ethics. The objective of the literary translator is thus not only to respect a work of art (with its beauty, its ambiguity, its effect), and through it an author (with a culture, a history, an intention), but also to create links between cultures. In fact, when dealing with cultural differences, the literary translator should try to see, beyond the exotic appeal, the potential for a rapprochement between peripheries, be they geographical, social, literary or, could we say, imaginary, that is, the periphery of reality, most important, there again, in the Latin American context in particular. In this context, it is easy to see, along the lines of what Lawrence Venuti and others (in particular, more recently, Michael Cronin) have sketched, the difficulty for smaller cultures, in particular in the context of the Americas — this is true for Quebec of course, but also for many other cultures of the Americas —, to be diffused to a broader public.

This is in great part why we are currently setting up at Université Laval a research group called l'Observatoire canadien de la traduction littéraire (the Canadian Literary Translation Observatory), where we wish to explore the modes of diffusion of Canadian literary culture through translation worldwide, in a context where globalization of markets and cultures makes translation more important than ever. The presentation will conclude with a few words about this research group.

**Think Aloud Protocols (TAPs) and Figurative Language Translation :
Investigating the academic vs the professional approach**

Elena Xení

University of Cyprus, Department of Education

Elena Xení is a Teaching Assistant (Department of Education, University of Cyprus) and a free-lance translator. She holds a Master's Degree in Translation Studies with specialization in Translating Literature for Children and Young Adults (Department of Linguistic, Cultural and International Studies, University of Surrey, UK), a Bachelor's Degree in Primary Education with literature and language teaching as a specialized area (University of Cyprus) and a Diploma for Writing for Children and Young Adults (Institute of Children's Literature, West Redding, Connecticut, USA). Her research interests focus on the translation of literature for children and young adults, humor translation and didactics of translatology, whereas her teaching activities are mainly focused on language instruction. Throughout the years 1997-2004, Elena, worked as a primary school teacher in public schools in Cyprus, a Head Teacher in Greek Community Schools in England and an MA Thesis in Translation Studies supervisor at the University of Surrey, UK.

The present paper is concerned with the gap between the academic approach of student-translators (traditional language courses training) and the professional translators' approach ("real-world" demands) while translating figurative language.

Some reasons for this phenomenon are suggested and a report on a think-aloud study is discussed. The strategies a graduate student of an English-Greek translation course follows when translating particular figurative language extracts from a novel are contrasted with the strategies of a professional translator specialized in English-Greek translation.

Since the researcher's experience in translation has been primarily in the Translation of Literature for Children and Young Adults the examples are taken from that realm. Texts are extracted from a well-known British novel for Teenager's and Young Adults which is too culture bound. This paper discusses the strategies employed for the translation of figurative language -in particular idioms and fixed expressions, in the framework of TAPs as a methodological tool.

The present work concludes with implications for policy and practice in the fields of interest, as well as relevant fields that should be benefited from attempts as such.

Speech etiquette formulas in translation (English ↔ Russian)

*Anastasia Koralova,
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

Anastasia Koralova got her MA degree in Moscow State University and her PhD degree at Moscow Linguistic State University. She taught English-to-Russian translation at Moscow Linguistic University for about 20 years. She is currently working at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, teaching Russian courses from elementary to intermediate to advanced level, as well as Civilization and Culture of Russia course. She is an author of over 20 publications; most of them deal with various problems of translation, including three books.

Speech etiquette formulas are words or clichés which serve many recurrent typical situations of everyday life: addressing someone, greeting and saying goodbye, giving thanks or saying words of encouragement, expressing sympathy, etc. Our speech is framed or interspersed with such formulas, they form a kind of a scaffold supporting the communicative act. Trite and empty as they often seem, they can vary significantly from language to language, which may turn the intercultural contacts into a virtual mine field.

The paper is devoted to translation problems arising from such differences and looks into possible solutions and choice of strategies by the translator. It also aims at drawing attention to this area, understudied in lexicography, translation studies, and linguistics in general.

I. Social & Cultural Aspects of Speech Etiquette

Speech etiquette is a socially constructed product. We follow certain conventions in using its formulas, thus demonstrating complete conformity with the rules, and if we don't, we are considered rude or eccentric or even mad. In order not to be pragmatically deviant, the translator should follow these rules as well.

Speech etiquette formulas reflect norms, values, and mindset of a certain language community. Many of them bear a heavy cultural imprint which comes to the fore when contrasted with a different language. When cultural norms encoded in SL and TL routine units differ or even clash, the translator is up to a hard task.

II. Bilingual Dictionaries' Limitations

Unfortunately, bilingual dictionaries often ignore this language material or give incomplete or misleading translations. No English-Russian dictionaries register such common phrases as "Have a good day," "Have a good evening," "Have a good night," and "Have a good one." Another good-bye-cliché "Take care!" is translated as "Осторожно!" and "Берегись!" which Russians would say to someone they know very well and/or in case of possible danger. Perhaps, a generic formula "Всего хорошего!" would work better for all of the above cases acting as a superordinate* for its more specific English counterparts.

III. Translation of Speech Etiquette Formulas: Most Common Techniques

It is natural to assume that in rendering speech etiquette units the **situational model of translation*** would suit best. Simply put, it confines to the following: whatever the original word or expression literally means, say what is customarily said in the identical situation in the TL. It looks like it doesn't require a great deal of ingenuity on the part of the translator, but this is not the case when speech formulas have a cultural tint. Here are a few examples.

When Silence is Better

1. Silent Reactions: Omissions in Translations

Zero-translating can be provoked by the silent reaction (verbal gap) in the TL in a situation requiring verbal reaction in the SL. Omissions can be partial or complete.

The classic example of ‘partial omission’ is translation of a two-tiered English greeting “*Hi! How are you?*” which can be addressed to a complete stranger who in his turn is expected to say “*Fine, thank you,*” even if his mother died on this day. Unfortunately, no dictionaries take into account this cultural peculiarity of English, and many professors of Russian overlook it too. As a result, well-meaning Americans who are fluent in Russian often greet Russians with “*Как дела?*” or “*Как вы поживаете?*” These are real questions in Russian, unlike their English dictionary counterparts, and if asked by a stranger, can be perceived as an unexpected intrusion into private life. The best strategy here is to limit the whole exchange in Russian to the word “*Здравствуйте!*” in order to avoid a possible cultural shock.

A case of complete omission can be illustrated by not-translating the phrase “*thank you for asking*” which can be a reaction to a question, say, about your ailing relative. Such a polite follow-up to the answer will not be verbalized in the identical situation in Russian, (except for short positive “*Спасибо, хорошо*”), since a ‘silent gratitude’ is taken for granted. Unless your purpose is to show English-speaking people’s ‘otherness,’ you’ll resort to the ‘situational equivalence’ which in this case is omission.

2. Differences in Frequency/Place and/or Intensity of Meaning

The Russian language abounds in words of endearment, and of course and there are exact equivalents to phrases “*I love you*” or “*I am proud of you,*” but in contrast to English, they are commonly reserved for private life and almost never said in public. Non-verbal signs of affection are not restricted, though.

The end-of-the-conversation-phrases, like “*It was nice talking with you,*” “*Thank you for calling,*” though easily translated into Russian, are much less heavily employed in Russian than in English. The same is true about some words of encouragement or praise typically interspersing communication in English: “*It’s a good question,*” “*Good point!,*” “*I like your idea!*” Their Russian equivalents are used much more sparingly. As a result they are less hackneyed and have more semantic weight, which almost takes them out of the range of speech etiquette.

In rendering words and phrases which have different weight or frequency of usage in the TL, the translator should practice a balanced approach: to dilute speech etiquette phrases by using them less frequently, if at all.

3. Ask more or don’t ask at all

Another example of cultural difference: an English speaker runs into a friend of hers and after the polite exchange of “*Hi! How are you?*” asks, “*How is your summer going?*” If she happens to hear “*Not very well,*” her reaction most probably will be, “*Oh, I am sorry.*” And that’s it. Chances are that a Russian would have a small shock on hearing an equivalent - “*Мне жаль.*” From the Russian cultural perspective, be polite enough to show some interest in your friend’s troubles, once you bothered to ask the question. Go ahead and ask: “*What’s wrong?*” or omit the inquiry about summer (or holidays, or anything for that matter), if the phrase is inconsequential.

Comparing Equivalents: Types of Transformations

In this section we analyze the semantic and structural differences between some SL and TL formulas which are situational equivalents. Most of well known types of transformations usually observed in translation process are characteristic of compared formulas as well:

- 1. Total Paraphrase:** No semantic connection exists between components of the SL and TL units. The question “Can I help you?” addressed by a bank employee to the first in line, will find a functional equivalent in a Russian command: “Следующий!” (next!)
- 2. Semantic Shift:** The type of paraphrase which is semantically close to a SL unit: “How can I help you?” – “Чем могу быть полезен?” (In what way can I be useful?)
- 3. Antonymous Translations:** The paraphrase which involves a different point of view and is often accompanied by a change of a sentence structure – affirmative to negative and vice versa: “Keep in touch!” – “Не пропадай!”
- 4. Specification or Generalization of Meaning:** Where English speakers tend to specify their gratitude - “Thank you for your time,” “Thank you for understanding,” “Thank for your cooperation,” “Thank you for your business,” “Thank you for having me,” etc., Russians would commonly say “Спасибо!” **It’s interesting to note that although generalization is not common in translations from English into Russian, it prevails in speech etiquette formulas.**

In conclusion we would like to repeat that Speech etiquette formulas reveal lots of socio-cultural specifics which simply cannot be ignored in translation. Many, if not most of them, for various reasons are not included in dictionaries and require a creative approach and decision making on the part of the translator.

Translating *maman* and *papa*
Sarah CUMMINS and Geneviève PARENT
Université Laval

Sarah Cummins is an associate professor of translation at Université Laval in Quebec City and a translator of books for young people. She has a background in linguistics and her research interests include comparative grammar and stylistics of French and English, lexicology, and translation studies.

Geneviève Parent completed her BA in translation at Université Laval in 2004. She worked for several years as a lexicographer and reviser on the Canadian Bilingual Dictionary project and is beginning her MA in terminology and translation at Université Laval this fall. She intends to focus her research on translation and adaptation of children's literature.

In this paper we investigate the choices literary translators have made over the last two centuries when translating the French terms *maman* and *papa* into English. The question is of interest because the choice always requires reflection and evaluation; it is not a matter of learning the 'right' way to translate these terms and then acting accordingly. Many sociolinguistic variables come into play, as well as analysis of the literary characters and their relationships. *Maman* and *papa* are what children call their parents nearly universally throughout *la francophonie*, and this situation hasn't changed over the last several centuries; in the English-speaking world, there is no such uniformity. Thus the French terms exist in a one-to-many correspondence with their English-language counterparts.

Maman and *papa* have been used in French at least since the 13th century. They are not just vocatives but are also used as common nouns (with determiners) and can function almost like a personal name in non-vocative contexts. Moreover, *maman* and *papa* are used in these ways by

both children and adults. Although other terms such as *mère* and *père* are found, *maman* and *papa* represent the unmarked case.

In English, there is no unmarked case. Informal terms of address for one's parents have been subject to shifts in fashion and wide dialectal variation. The earliest terms for 'mother' recorded in England are *mam* and *mammy*, which date from the 16th century; after the 19th century they persist only in dialects and now are fading fast. *Mamma* (with stress on the final syllable) came into fashion at the end of the 17th century and carried on strong for a couple of hundred years; it has since fallen out of favour. *Mum* became more prominent in the 19th century and reigned supreme in the 20th. *Mummy* is a child's word and *ma* is considered vulgar. As for the terms for 'father', *dad* is the earliest, like *mam* dating from the 16th century; it has shown more staying power and is no longer considered strictly childish. The diminutive *daddy* has a similar long history. *Papa* (with two stress patterns) parallels *mamma*, growing prominent in the 17th and 18th centuries, considered 'genteel' then childish in the 19th, and now largely abandoned.

In North America, *mama* (with stress on the initial syllable) and *ma* (with diverse vowel quality) were common in the 18th and 19th centuries; *mam* and *mum* were also used. By the 20th century, *ma* was already considered old-fashioned and *mum* was largely confined to New England and Canada. *Mom* began to gain prominence and *mamma* (with various spellings) is still common, although it has ethnic and dialectal associations. *Pa* was once widespread but has long been considered old-fashioned or vulgar. *Pap* was used primarily in the southern US, and *papa* in the north and New England. In the 20th century, *dad* or *daddy* began to gradually supplant these terms.

Dad may be the only informal parental vocative that is fairly neutral—not restricted to one period, continent, age-group, or social class. Otherwise, only *mother* and *father* are general. *Mother* must have been the recommendation of Webster's 1934 *New International Dictionary*, which opined “*ma* is colloquial, childish or vulgar; *mom* corrupt; *mommy* dialectal; *momma* illiterate.”

To investigate how translators over the last two centuries have dealt with this *embarras du choix*, we collected and analysed over 500 examples of the translation of *maman* and *papa* from works of French and Quebec literature. The results are summarized in the tables below.

TRANSLATIONS OF *PAPA*

	France		Quebec
	19 th c.	20 th c.	20 th c.
<i>papa</i>	65 %	60 %	53 %
<i>father</i>	16 %	18 %	7 %
<i>dad</i>	6 %	7 %	19 %
<i>daddy</i>	9 %	13 %	17 %
<i>other</i>	4 %	2 %	4 %

TRANSLATIONS OF *MAMAN*

	France		Quebec
	19 th c.	20 th c.	20 th c.
<i>mama</i> , <i>mamma</i>	67 %	39 %	41 %
<i>mother</i>	26 %	45 %	34 %
<i>maman</i>	5 %	2 %	9 %
<i>other</i>	2 %	14 %	16 %

Even from these very summary data, certain trends can be detected. We hypothesize that translators of 19th-century works, who were overwhelmingly British, opted for *mamma* and *papa* (and *mother* and *father*) in imitation of the terms used in their own literature and milieu. As *mamma* faded in Britain, other terms like *mum* and *mummy* gained prominence (although it is not clear why *papa* didn't follow the same evolution).

The use of *papa* and *mama* by translators of Quebec literature, who are overwhelmingly Canadian, must have another motivation, as these terms are not at all frequent in Canada. We hypothesize that translators used them to “foreignize” their texts, as a marker of the characters'

cultural distinctiveness; this strategy is clear when the translator doesn't translate, keeping *maman* in the English text.

A closer analysis of the data reveals many nuances, as translators weigh the stylistic, affective, and social associations of their options. The choices reflect to some degree the linguistic versatility of *maman* and *papa*. If they are viewed as personal names, they are less likely to be translated; as common nouns, more likely. A translator who sees them as primarily indicating a kinship relation may opt for *mother* and *father*; one who considers them a marker of informality and affection will pick choices like *mama/papa* or *mom/dad*. However, in English, the informal terms are used mainly as vocatives, or as personal names only within the family; their use as common nouns often seems childish.

Our case study offers translators-in-training an illustration of the necessity of making a qualitative choice and of the range of factors to consider in motivating it. Regardless of the type of text to be translated, the translator must make an initial assessment, implicit or explicit, of the translation objective: what kind of work he or she aims to produce. This objective is the ultimate guide to the translator's choices.