

Mauranen, A. & T. Puurtinen 1997. Translation - Acquisition - Use. AFinLAYearbook 1997. Publications de l'Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée 55. Jyväskylä. pp. 23-40.

THE POSITION OF TRANSLATION IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Peeter Torop

University of Tartu

A wide approach to looking at the translation process as the object of translation studies could provide a possibility for developing its methodology. This could be achieved by applying the concept of total translation as a process that includes textual translation, or what is considered translation in its traditional sense, metatextual translation or translation into a culture through all means of metacommunication (commentaries, criticism, advertisements etc), intra- and intertextual translation as an interrelationship of various texts in a culture with various forms of quotations, and extratextual translation as rendering a text through other sign systems (renderings of literary works in screen form etc). Applying an analysis of total translation could paradoxically lead to a new way of comprehending the ontology of translation and to distinguishing a translation from a non-translation.

Keywords: translatability, total translation

The 1990's have meant a widening of horizons in translation studies. One sign of this includes the range of analyses of works of researchers who were not strictly speaking translation scholars, but who either used the concept of translation in its wider sense or whose thinking can be reconstructed along the lines of translation studies. These scholars include Charles Peirce (Gorlee 1993), Mikhail Bakhtin (Robel' 1995) and Yuri Lotman (Kosecki 1992). Another sign of this is the attempts to analyse such phenomena in terms of translation that are not traditionally considered as such, for instance, the process of making films out of literary works (Torop 1989, Cattrysse 1992, Farcy 1993). As a third sign I would like to mention appeals, scattered in various articles on translation studies, to return back to analyzing translational activity, to bring the theory closer to practice and to be more precise in defining the object to be studied. This is all very important, since it requires methodologically defining the essential problems of translation studies and we all know that successful development in any scientific discipline requires a correct definition of its basic problems.

In my opinion, the main object of translation studies should be the process of translation, since the analysis of the translation process (or reluctance to analyze it) gives rise to conflicting views in this field. I would also like in this article to develop further the idea expressed by I. Rezvin and V. Rosenzweig, who maintained that "the types of realisation of the translation process, including the precise translation, are the same for all kinds of texts" (tipy realizatsii protsessy perevoda, v tom chisle i perevoda tochnogo, ediny dlya vsekh vidov tekstov) (Rezvin 1964:173). In his classic work Roman Jakobson divided translation into intralinguistic (interpretation of verbal signs by other signs in the same language), interlinguistic (interpretation of verbal signs by signs in another language) and intersemiotic translation, or transmutation (interpretation of verbal signs by nonverbal signs in another semiotic system), and used linguistics as his starting point (Jakobson 1971:261). I would like to take the interdisciplinarity of translation studies as my starting point. I suggest the concept of **total translation**, which on one hand means a widening of the range of problems and phenomena that form the object of translation studies. On the other hand, the concept of total translation symbolizes the search for a comprehensive methodology and an attempt to methodologically "translate" the findings of other disciplines into one interdisciplinary field of translation studies.

The concept of total translation was used as early as in 1960's by John Catford as a linguistic concept. He made a distinction between full and partial translation, on one hand, and between total and restricted translation, on the other. Full translation means translation of a whole text (of all its components), whereas total translation means a process in which all levels of the source language are replaced by textual material in the target language, but not necessarily a replacement by equivalents on all levels. "By **total** translation we mean what is most usually meant by 'translation'; that is, translation in which all levels of the SL text are replaced by TL material. Strictly speaking, "total" translation is a misleading term, since, though total *replacement* is involved it is not replacement by *equivalents* at all levels" (Catford 1962:22).

Both in analyzing the levels and the content and the expression, the concept of totality should not be considered an absolute but rather a sign of a certain tendency. Making the distinction between the content and the expression that is indispensable in translational activity, and representing them separately and then unifying them in the target text can also be compared to total translation. "The total feeling and the true total value of the poem then must reside in the *total* form and the *total* content, which, as totalities, are inseparable. The value of content in abstraction from form is a reduction of its

total value because the content in abstraction from form is a reduction of the total content" (Robertson 1969:275).

It is also possible to speak about total translatability. Hjelmlev actually spoke about onesided translatability when he wrote: "Language, which itself is content and expression, can even in its totality be made into expression for a new content" (Hjelmlev 1973:116). The ability of language to become an expression for any new content is for Hjelmlev a semiotic problem: "In practice language is semiotics, into which all other semiotic systems can be translated - including all other languages and also any other conceivable semiotic structures. This translatability is based on the fact that languages and they alone can give an expression to any material..." (Prakticheski yazik yavlayaetsya semiotikoy, v kotoruyu mogut byt perevedeny vse drugie semiotiki - kak vse drugie yaziki, tak i vse drugie myslimye semioticheskie struktury. Eta perevodimost osnovivaetsya na tom fakte, chto yaziki i tolko yaziki i tolko oni odni sposobny davat formu lyubomu materialu). (Elmslev 1960:364).

I would say that from the point of view of semiotics, translatability can also be seen as two-directional. Hence the intersemiotic translation (transmutation) that was mentioned for the first time as a translational activity by Roman Jakobson can be comprehended within the range of translation studies. Finding adequate scientific tools for research and at the same time assuring the disciplinary unity within translation studies is not only a methodological problem but also provides methodological perspectives. The instructiveness of the concept of totality was understood by George Steiner, who wrote: "A 'theory' of translation, a 'theory' of semantic transfer, must mean one of two things. It is either an intentionally sharpened, hermeneutically oriented way of the totality of semantic communication (including Jakobson's intersemiotic translation or 'transmutation'). Or it is a subsection of such a model with specific reference to interlingual exchanges, to the emission and reception of significant messages between different languages. (...) The 'totalizing' designation is the more instructive because it argues the fact that all procedures of expressive articulation and interpretative reception are translational, whether intra- or interlingually" (Steiner 1992:293-294).

To admit that translation is a total process requires a scientific description of this process, if we want to find a place for totality in translation studies. It requires that analyses of individual translations or types of translation and the analysis of translational activity as such should be brought closer to each other. This can be compared with making a distinction between different readings (models of reading) and total reading as two simultaneous possibilities when analyzing a reading process. "Each model of 'reading' represents one possible

way, but the reading of literature as such is in fact the totality of these ways, plus many other not yet or no longer in practice" (Beaugrande 1992:196; about the relationship of reading and translation see also Shreve et al. 1993).

One basis for describing the totality of translation as well as concrete translations can be provided by developing a universal model for it. However, even a universal understanding of a translation process will always remain concrete in one sense - at the input and output of this process there is always a text in one form or other. The comparison of these texts allows the concrete reconstruction of the translation process. From the methodological point of view the various concrete realisations of the translation process involve the question of comparison and typologisation of various translations on the basis of a common model. For the purpose of training translators, the essential thing is to make the students aware of the possibility of choosing between various strategies and methods of translation. A universal model is also needed for eliminating the opposition between theoretical and historical approaches (see Delabastita 1991), since it allows the comparison and typologisation of translations performed within one period of time as well as between those performed in different periods. I would agree with Kitty van Leuwen-Zwart (1991:43) who maintained that a comparative analysis of the original and the translation provides data for understanding not only the translation process and the specific features of a translated text, but also its functions in the target literature.

The comparison of the original and the translation presupposes the existence of a comparability. A comparison of two texts in two different natural languages differs from the comparison of a literary text and a film. Hence it is necessary to comprehend the text in a sufficiently wide sense of the word and its analysis should be parametrical. A total translation essentially requires a global text. Scholars agree that the concept of text is not easy to define. A concrete analysis of a text requires defining whether the text is studied as one existing in a natural language or as a text in general; whether it is studied in a theoretical or applied framework; whether the aim is to describe or to interpret it (Petöfi 1982:454). The translational approach is complicated by the existence of all the aspects mentioned above - hence it is necessary to understand a text globally. And at the same time it is easy to agree that a concrete analysis requires concretisation of the concept of text. "The term 'text' is only a global indicator of the object of research, it is not suitable for indicating those special objects, which the different fields of text-theoretical research are immediately concerned with" (Petöfi 1982:454).

For the sake of creating a universal model for a translation process it is necessary to start with the assumption that it can be applied to the description

of all forms of translational activity (for further details, see Torop 1995). But at the same time, due to different types of texts taking part in this process and due to teleological (not pragmatic) objectives of this process, it is rational to distinguish between various types of translational semiosis and various parameters of the translation process. Consequently, within the range of total translation, translation can be divided into textual translation, metatextual translation, intra- and intertextual translation and extratextual translation.

Textual translation means translating one complete text into another. This is translation in the traditional sense of the word. Textual translation is the most traditional object of translation studies. The process in which a text is translated into another text is discussed in numerous works in this field, it has been an object of dispute and, from the methodological point of view, textual translation provides material for the most fruitful justification of the general methodology of translation studies. In addition, from the point of view of total translation, textual translation is a key concept, since all other forms of total translation are more often than not processes that can be projected onto textual translation.

Metatextual translation implies translating a whole text into a culture, not so much into a whole text. I admit that there is a certain terminological ambiguity in this definition, since a textual translation is also a metatext, but as specific forms of translational activity they can be kept apart. A textual translation is often accompanied by a metatextual translation, but they can exist autonomously. By metatextual translation I mean the penetration of an original into a foreign culture in various forms of metacommunication: articles about the author in encyclopedia and textbooks, critical articles about the translation, advertisements, annotations about the translation in radio and TV, publications of extracts or quotations from a translation etc. As a whole these metatexts create the image of the original and provide a preliminary, complementary or new reading of it. The nature of metatexts reflects the relationship of literary life, literary culture and literary politics in the target culture (in case of a literary translation) (see Torop 1990). The various metatexts of one prototext (original) should naturally be analyzed as complementary. A combination of a textual and metatextual translation is also possible when the publisher or the translator provides the translation with a foreword, commentaries, illustrations, glossaries, etc.

Intra- and intertextual translation is related to the fact that there are practically no "pure" texts in a culture. The author, the translator and the reader have their own textual memory. The definition of the relationship between what is native and foreign in the structure and the concepts of a text creates a problem both for understanding and translating a text. In both cases there is a

need to establish the extent to which the foreign elements (quotations, paraphrases, allusions, etc) are marked in it, whether they can be detected or not and whether they are concrete or not. In an intratextual translation it is important to see various intratexts as a part of the author's poetics, and from the point of view of the translation into another language each intratext requires a specific way of looking at it, whereas in an intertextual translation it is important to understand the author's strategies in dealing with several sources simultaneously. Intra- and intertextual translation present first and foremost a translation by the author of a foreign word or a complex of foreign words into his/her own text, i.e. it is interlingual or interliterary translation. What the translator considers dominant in his/her work will define whether the foreign word will be represented or not in the translation of the text into another language.

Extratextual translation involves the transfer of a text written in a natural language by means of verbal and nonverbal codes into another text. The text is taken out of its environment and presented by various channels and the comparison of the original and its translation (e.g. a novel and its rendering as a film) requires the use of various parameters in order to assure comparability. In an extratextual translation not only the text but also its nature is changed. Extratextual translation has been studied mostly by applying Peircian semiotics (see e.g. Plaza 1987:89-93).

While these problems appear to present different phenomena, they can be studied under a methodologically common model which reveals in a better way the ontology of a text in general and the specific ontology of a translated text. Furthermore, by applying a theoretical model of the translation process, it is possible to typologize, to compare several different renderings of a text as films and to describe the virtual although nonexistent renderings of a certain text as films. An analysis of a film as a translation allows us to look at a written translation from a different point of view.

Methodological translation will also allow a fruitful and smooth introduction of semiotic analysis into translation studies. Traditionally, semiotics has been used in translation studies when dealing with problems of literary history, for identifying its cultural signs. Recently, however, semiotics has also been considered useful for analyzing nonverbal communication in translation, and also for studying the relationship between the reader and the translation (Gentile 1991:347; Gorfée 1993).

In recent years, interest in translation studies has been diverted from the source culture to the target culture. Gideon Toury does not consider translation even from the teleological point of view as the communication of verbal messages across the cultural-linguistic barrier, but as "communication in

translated messages within a certain cultural-linguistic system" (Toury 1980:17). This approach has produced the concept of a literary polysystem as an expression of systemic interrelationships within various spheres of literature. This means that children's literature cannot be analyzed without taking into account its relationship to adult literature, and translated literature cannot be isolated from the indigenous literature (Even-Zohar 1990:13). Consequently, translational activity is part of a larger system of textual production and to a significant extent predetermined by this system. Hence the target culture with its literary polysystem becomes more important than the relations between the translation and the original. "...not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position within the polysystem, but the very practice of translation is also strongly subordinated to that position. And even the question of what a translated work is cannot be answered *a priori* in terms of an a-historical out-of-context idealized state: it must be determined on the grounds of the operations governing the polysystem. Seen from this point of view, translation is no longer a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system" (Even-Zohar 1990:51).

This approach involves the methodologically very important problem of translation as an autonomous text functioning in a foreign culture but tied to the original work. Some researchers using this approach underline the necessity of taking into account all displaced texts, such as commentaries, quotations, paraphrases, surveys and other metatexts (Pym 1992:173-174). Others, however, oppose it as being "sociological" and present a hermeneutic approach with interpretation as the key concept. "In this approach a translation is viewed upon as a fixed point in the reading process, as the result of a hermeneutic process" (Koster 1994:153). These two approaches are naturally complementary and the rise of polemics reflects the existence of serious unresolved methodological problems within translation studies.

In this connection it is worthwhile to mention one of the basic assumptions of semiotics: "A semiotic approach to studying literary relationships and - subsequently - any metatextual relationships reveals their principal typological uniformity with intratextual processes and relationships" (semioticheskij podkhod k probleme literaturnykh svyazej i - shire - lyubikh mezhstekstovykh otnoshenij vskryvaet printsipialnuyu odnotipnost ikh s vnutritekstovymi protsessami i otnosheniami) (Lotman 1982:3). This has been understood by many translation scholars, among them James Holmes: "My point, then, is that if the emerging generation of scholars working with translations are to avoid the errors of their intellectual forebears, they must

develop an adequate model of the translation process before they can hope to develop relevant methods for the description of translation products" (Holmes 1988:81-82).

Consequently, the problem of analyzing the relationship between the translation and the target culture is tied to the analysis of the translation process. But a specific problem also involves the relationship between the language and the text and as a result the relationship between the language and the culture.

It is worth considering the apparently paradoxical thought, formulated by A. Kasher, that declaring natural language to essentially be a system of communication cannot be seriously justified: "Often, subscription to the view that natural language is in essence a system of communication is nothing more than an expression of some pre-theoretic, uncritical intuition" (Kasher 1991:383).

Language competence can exist without cultural competence, when a text does not aim at communication (Agar 1991:174), i.e. a text in one's own and in a foreign language can be received identically. This can be illustrated by the example of making films out of literary works. In this case a literary text is, on one hand, decomposed into parts and recomposed into a film. One part of a book is preserved in natural language in the dialogue, whereas another other part is visualized. The author's voice can also be emitted as a dictator's speech; author's emotions can be expressed by colours, light, music, etc., and the plot through montage. On the other hand, making a film out of a literary work can be compared to reading a book, since the characters speak their own language, the descriptions of the environment can be written in another language, the author's views written in a third, etc. The problem of translations becoming outdated demonstrates that the lingual unity in a translation is much less than that of the original. The reader of a translation approximates the viewer of a film. If the translation or the film stimulates the fantasy and releases the channels of perception creating a visual and acoustic unity, the language itself plays a minor role. This means that coherence in translation is achieved not only on the language level, but presupposes a visual unity, the very same thing that is required for making a film out of a literary work. Both translators and directors, not only scholars, mention this visual unity. The main thing in a translator's work is the visual perception of the text to be translated, even before starting the work (Schulte 1980:82). Consequently, a great threat to translation is caused by the loss of the visual perception of the text (Caws 1986:60-61).

Naturally, it is hard to study visualization and even more so perception. Still, in translational activity, both at the stage when the text is born and when it is received, perceptual unity is more important than linguistic. Perceptual

unity can be achieved on the language level, it can be achieved by comments inside or outside the translated text. A text can be multilingual in a linguistic or semiotic sense of the word, but this multilinguality must be subordinated to the laws of semiotic, not linguistic, coherence in the text. An example is provided by the use of Russian and French in *Vojna i mir* by Leo Tolstoy, by the blending of English and French in modern Canadian literature or in a film based on any literary text.

If the film director is forced to present the literary text in parts to be transmitted and received by various channels, we can say that it has only recently been acknowledged in translational activity that a literary text reaches its readers not simply by means of language. The translator has the possibility and sometimes even the need to cut the text into pieces in order to understand the semiotic multilinguality of the text as a coexistence, not as blending of different languages. In the semiotic sense of the word, the translation of a text always means a simultaneous translation of several languages. The essential question is: how can we preserve the coherence without blending these languages?

The synchronism of the author's original cannot be achieved by the translator, rather s/he - like the director of a screen version of literary work - must concretize the nonconcrete and explicate the implicit, understand the languages of the text each by itself in order to reunify them in translation. Thus it is necessary to study the world structure in the text along with the structure of the text, to analyze the chronotopes of the author's way of describing reality, the artistic conceptualizations of the work to be translated and the characters' chronotopes. The fact that they appear simultaneously and can still be distinguished provides the necessary basis for translational analysis and for understanding the techniques of achieving coherence, even if the syncretism of the original is destroyed and the semiotic multilinguality is explicated.

The textual unity is created in the process of weaving together the inter- and extratextual, the expression and meaning. On the other hand, the textual levels create a polylogue: "A poetic (literary) text is principally polyphonic" (Poeticheskij / khudozhestvennyj / tekst v printsipe polifonichen" (Lotman 1972:110). Consequently, a text is a dynamic whole and its analysis requires special operational means. Even the most detailed description is not sufficient for a translational analysis of a text. The translational analysis seeks to determine the dominant of the text, that level or element that assures its coherence. It is also important to note that the dominant that is achieved as a result of an intertextual (immanent) analysis may need a redefinition when compared with the results of an extratextual analysis. Furthermore, the results of the inter- and extratextual analysis need to be compared with an analysis of

the parameters of different textual levels, i.e. architectonic, compositional and narrative levels.

It is not my desire to describe all possible ways of analyzing a text. As an example I would mention an intersemiotic translation, e.g. making a film out of a novel. In this case it is possible to start with a compositional and narrative analysis, since a film is also narration. But the filmmaker can make use of several technical means of expression (montage, use of perspective, light, colour, plane, etc.), which are excluded when applying a mere analysis of narration. However, another parameter - the chronotopical levels - can be used both for literary analysis and for analyzing films. My way of looking at chronotopes differs slightly from that of Mikhail Bakhtin, who distinguished several chronotopes but never formulated an integral theory of the chronotope. However, from the point of view of total translation it is worth remembering what Bakhtin said about the typologisation of chronotopes: "Chronotopological typology is based on the binary 'native world - otherworld', the typology of utterances on the opposition 'native language - other language'" (Tipologiya po 'khronotopu' stroitsya na oppozitsii 'rodnoy mir - chuzoj mir, tipologija ze po 'vyskazivaniyu' - po oppozitsii 'svoj yazik - chuzoj yazik') (Kori 1993:17).

Hence it is important to differentiate between the principal chronotopical levels of a text. They are interrelated and placed inside one another like the Russian 'matryoshka' doll, but they can always be abstracted. The starting point can be a thematic analysis. When a literary text reflects reality, historical or contemporary, this reality can be analyzed in the text. Moreover, it is possible to analyze the author's attitude towards this reality. The possibility that these two analyses provide the basis (depending on the text-type) for a literary or merely a conceptual description of this reality, its literary or conceptual deconstruction and the creation of a literary or conceptual model:

1. The objectified textual world (factual analysis)
 - an analysis of the sources (history, social psychology etc.)
 - a reconstruction of the historical reality and language
 - discovery of types and prototypes

2. The subjectified textual world (literary analysis)
 - emotional facts (emotional memory)
 - individual facts (autobiographicality),
 - a. factual,
 - b. emotional
 - c. mythologized or mythified
 - individualisation

3. The abstracted world
 - a. achronisation

- b. neomythologism
- c. archetypisation
- d. artistic model

A chronotopical analysis presupposes the existence of three levels of chronotopes: **the topographical chronotope**, which is related to the fabular time and place, **the psychological chronotope**, which is related to the subjective world of the characters (or of the author, if s/he is one of them), and **the metaphysical chronotope**, or the author's conceptual chronotope, his/her worldview or mentality. A chronotopical analysis offers a way of distinguishing between the depicted world, the experienced world and the conceptualized world. An analysis of these worlds allows us to avoid conflicting the word and the image.

It is unnecessary to determine a certain number of recognizable parameters. A need for parametrical analysis, to analyze one text from different positions arises only in the most complicated cases of translational activity. A chronotopical analysis is the most semiotic way of looking at a text and, at the same time, it is the least dependent on the material the text is made of. In my opinion, the most important thing in analyzing a text from the point of view of its translation or in analyzing a translation of a text is to define its optimal translatability, which is dictated by the dominants of the text and corrected by the diversity of the textual materials. An understanding of any text is made easier by a comparison of the author's way of dealing with language (intertextual analysis of the levels of the text) and the features of the textual world (chronotopical analysis), which characterize the author's individual poetics. The objective of a textual analysis for translation purposes - i.e. the detection of the dominant level or dominant elements - can be achieved by a verbal analysis (analysis of language and stylistics) as well as by a chronotopical analysis (a conceptual-poetic analysis). Combining the results of these analyses with the historico-literary and biographical data allows us to make a distinction between a text in general and the unique (individual) text and to analyze translational activity not only as a pragmatic activity of creating verbal textual messages but as a total intermediatory activity.

Peculiar to the totality approach to translational activity is the possibility of making a distinction between different levels of translatability and searching for possibilities of creating cohesion and internal textual unity on various inter- and extratextual levels. A translation is not just a result of verbal activity. It is difficult to imagine verbal activity without interpretative activity. In modern semiotics this idea has led to the introduction of the concept of extracoding in addition to the traditional concepts of coding and decoding. It means the deviation of the interpretation of the source text within the process of

communication. Extracoding includes the concepts of undercoding, which denotes the growth of a plurality of meanings and indetermination, and the concept of overcoding, which means concretisation as far as narrowing the range of meanings (Eco 1977:133-136). Consequently, the apprehension (decoding) of a text in any form in the same language or its translation (transcoding, i.e. decoding and a new coding) into another language may lead, instead of revealing its specific meaning, to the creation of a completely new version of the text, i.e. to its extracoding.

When analyzing the history of translation or the present practices, it certainly becomes obvious that linguistic data can provide only one of the parameters for understanding translational activity. The functioning of translations in a culture is not always dependent on the verbal qualities of the text, and even a translation of low lingual and stylistic quality can acquire great cultural value. The important thing is what is translated, what is the place of translations in the literary culture and what is the ontological status of a translated text.

It is often repeated that poor language in translations will destroy the reader's language. The role of the book in shaping the reader and the literary culture is much less an object of concern. However, it is worth quoting Osip Mandelstam: "A book does not tolerate demoralisation: its sicknesses are adhesive. One should not be allowed to fill the market with hundreds of thousands of unidentifiable, unrespected or just half-respected books, even if they sell well and are published in several editions" (*Kniga ne terpit demoralizatsii: bolezni ee prilipchivy. Nelzya vypustit na rynek beznakazanno sotni tysyach neuznavaemykh, nepochtennykh i polupochtennykh, khotya by prodaznykh, khotya by tiraznykh knig*) (Mandelstam 1987:238-239).

Moreover, translatability is always a virtual concept, it may be undertaken or not undertaken for some reason or other, i.e. it may exist only as a theoretical possibility. Besides, it is expedient to make a distinction between two possible approaches to translatability: first, the translatability of an original as culture into a text as culture, and secondly, the translatability of an original as culture into a culture understood as a sum of texts functioning in it. On the border between these two approaches it is possible to see within a translated text its possible functioning in the target culture as a manifestation of "signs of translational behaviour" (Toury 1991:186-187), which means that some of the elements of the text will undergo socialization or culturalisation within the process of translation, acquiring signs of a new system of texts: "In translation, textemes tend to be converted into repertoremes, where a TEXTEME is any sign, irrespective of its rank and scope, which is subordinated to textual relations and hence carries textual functions, and a REPERTOREME - any sign

(again, regardless of rank and scope) which forms part of an institutionalized repertoire" (Toury 1991:187).

In both cases translational activity is understood in cultural frames: in the first case it relies on a parametrical analysis of culture (parameters of the translatability of culture), and in the second case on the basis of its metatextual and intertextual relations within the target culture. Both approaches reveal the relationship between the adapted and the specific (individual and social) functions of translational activity. Complementarity of the parameters of the translatability of culture allows us to avoid a simplistic approach in detecting culture in a text. "Culture has not to be studied as *part* of the translation phenomenon, since the *entire* phenomenon is culture-bound: translation has rather to be investigated as part of culture" (Lambert 1992:25).

The following conclusions can be drawn about understanding the totality of translation. Primarily **textual translation** in its totality means being aware of the principal channels through which a text flows into another culture and becomes a **new text**. **Metatextual translation** in its totality represents an awareness of the innumerable channels through which a text flows into a culture and becomes an intertext. In the first case the concretisation of a text takes place by means of another kind of text, since in spite of the possible existence of several translated versions of a text in a culture or even films or theatrical plays based on it, they all present concretisations of one and the same text and at the same time they are all independent works of art. In the second case the text is dissolved in a culture, it is transformed into several metatexts (written or oral), and they collectively do not replace the unity of the authentic text. In each culture alien texts exist that have taken a textual form, as well as alien texts that have not, but are replaced by metatexts (articles in newspapers, advertisements, literary criticism, presentations in lectures, etc.). Naturally, it is also common that both forms of text exist simultaneously.

Intertextual space means the duality of all forms of art. A work of art is born in one intertextual space. Its relationships with this space can be of two kinds: either the regular relationships of tradition may continue or more casual (and more subjective) relationships of genesis (in the sense that Yuri Tynjanov used this concept) may be established. When entering the second intertextual space a text is received and will develop more or less casual relationships with other texts, and it is likely to acquire new and often lose original meanings.

A translation can end up in combining these intertextual spaces and being transferred to a third space. Thus scholars have paid attention to the specific quality of translations in acquiring exceptionally intensive forms of intertextual relationships. "Die literarische Übersetzung stiftet eine besonders intensive und problematische Form des intertextuellen Bezugs. Sie will über diachrone

(geschichtliche und synchrone (kulturgeographische) Distanz hinweg national sprachliche Grenzen überschreiten und dabei in hybriden Anspruh nicht nur das im Prätext gesagte, sondern auch eine einmalige Art des Sagens nachbildend bewahren und erneuern" (Koppenfels 1985:138).

Naturally, the existence of such a number of intertextual spaces requires a differentiated approach in research. In principle it is possible to start with intertextuality, that derives from the text and reflects its features (text-oriented intertextual interpretation). It is also possible to start with its possible associations (reader-oriented approach). Or one can take the author, his intentions and knowledge as a starting point (author-oriented; see Holthuis 1994:85). But we must inevitably acknowledge the intertextuality of any culture and remember that "all members of a certain cultural-linguistic collective exist in a general intertextual space" (vse chleny dannogo kulturno-yazykovogo kollektiva sushchestvuyut v obshchem intertextualnom prostranstve" (Toporov 1993:17). In general, Toporov believes that intertextuality is a category of communication, one that "plays a fundamental role in the structure of human existence, and its meaning far exceeds the limits of creating art out of words - both in the sphere of 'art' and in the sphere of 'words'...(igraet fundamentalnuyu rol v strukture chelovecheskogo sushchestvovaniya, i znachenie ee vykhodit daleko za predely khudozestvennogo tvorchestva v slove - i sfery "khudozhestvennogo" i sfery "slovesnogo" (Toporov 1993:16). He also refers to a universal law in culture that forms the basis for intertextuality: "Culture therefore invariably invites comparison and juxtaposition; it is not only the place where meanings are born, but the space in which they are being exchanged, "transmitted" and seek to be translated from one cultural language into another" (Toporov 1992:30).

Meanings, languages, texts and cultures are translated, and the contacts between texts within one culture or in situations where several cultures are in contact with each other can be described by using the concept of totality of translation. An individual in a culture is both free and unfree. Any book can be read, any film can be seen or any symphony can be listened to in one's own way, and this limitless freedom of reception is a fact of any culture. But culture also exists as education, as readers' or other recipients' memories, and the reception of any new text depends on the cultural experience of the recipient to such an extent that in a sense any text that will be received has already been read, i.e. it is immediately conventionalized. The other extreme is a text that carries in itself the image of its recipients, a possibility of a kind of optimal reception. "Thus every act of reading is a difficult transaction between the competence of the reader (the reader's world knowledge) and the kind of

competence that a given text postulates in order to be read in an economic way" (Eco 1992:68).

If it is possible to define certain frames of optimal understanding of a text, in the case of translation it is necessary to remember that its understanding is not only tied to the original to be translated, but to the fact that translation represents a certain type of text. Within the concept of total translation, when suggesting a wide understanding of translation which in a way blurs its limits, the definition of the ontological features of a translation offers a challenging task. If all products of the process of metacommunication are considered translations, it must be admitted that the key concept of translation studies is eliminated. But at the same time it is worth remembering that this process in itself is analogical to the process of translation since its central feature is that of being secondary - all products of metacommunication starting from textual translations and ending with articles about texts in newspapers are metatexts, i.e. secondary texts. Hence it is more correct to speak about the totality of the translation process; however, not all products of this process can be called translations in the linguistic and semiotic sense of the word. Applying the concept of translation in an extremely wide sense requires dealing with the definition of the limits of translation.

As searching for a definition of the limits of translation has not proved especially successful, I am not trying to find a solution to this problem. It is more convenient to start with the assumption that a translation is a text that is considered a translation in the target culture. In order to be more precise, we can add that a translation is a text that carries the signs (features) of translation. The signs can be intra - or extrastructural. Intrastructural signs include a relationship between the beginning and the end of a text, a title and cultural signs inside the text (culture-specific features, names, etc.) Extrastructural signs include the names of the author and the translator, additional metatexts (comments, epilogue, etc.), i.e. a text that is designed to be a translation. Any translation is a metatext, but not all metatexts are translations. The key question is what the interrelationships are between native and other in a culture. Signs of otherness, difference, foreignness, etc. are expedient for a text that does not aim at being dissolved into an alien environment.

It is very difficult to define the concept of translation in translation studies. I believe that instead of concretization it is worth enlarging the concept and placing the translation process within the process of metacommunication, the total process of translation. This allows us to see the specific features of a translated text from two perspectives - through the relationship between the original and the translation, and through the relationship between the translation and other metatexts.

Translated from Russian by Marja Jänis

References

- Agar, M. 1991 The biculture in bilingual. *Language in Society* 20, 167-181.
- de Beaugrande, R. 1992. Readers responding to literature: coming to grips with realities. In E.F. Nardocchio (ed.) . *Reader response to literature. The empirical dimension*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Catford, J.S. 1965. *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cattrysse, P. 1992. Film (adaption) as translation: some methodological proposals. *Target* 4.1, 53-70.
- Caws, M.A. 1986. Literal or liberal: Translating perception. *Critical Inquiry*, 13:1.
- Delabastita, D. 1991. A false opposition in translation studies: theoretical versus/and historical approaches. *Target* 3:2, 137-152.
- Eco, U. 1992. *Interpretation and overinterpretation*: Umberto Eco with Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler, Christine Brooke-Rose. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, U. 1977. *Theory of semiotics*. London: Macmillan 1977.
- Elmslev, L. 1960. Prolegomeny k teorii yazyka. *Novoe v lingvistike* 1. Moskva.
- Even-Zohar, I. 1990. Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today* 11-1.
- Farcy, G-D. 1993. L'adaptation dans tous ses états. *Poétique* 96, 387-411.
- Gentile, A. 1991 The application of theoretical constructs from a number of disciplines for the development of a methodology of teaching interpreting and translating. *Meta* XXXVI:2/3, 344-351.
- Gorlée, D.L. 1994. *Semiotics and the problem of translation: with special reference to the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hjelmslev, L. 1973. A Causerie on Linguistic Theory. In L. Hjelmslev. *Essais linguistiques*. II. Copenhagen, 101-117.
- Holmes, J. 1988. *Translated!* Papers on literary translation and translation studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holthuis, S. 1994. Intertextuality and meaning construction. An approach to the comprehension of intertextual poetry. In J.S. Petöfi, T.Olisi (eds.). *Approaches to poetry. Some aspects of textuality, intertextuality and intermediality*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 77-93.
- Jakobson, R. 1971. On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. Jakobson, *Selected writings*. 2. Word and language. The Hague-Paris.
- Kasher, A. 1991. On the pragmatic modules: a lecture. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 381-397.
- Koppenfels, W. 1985. Intertextualität und Sprachwechsel: Die literarische Übersetzung. In U. Broich und M. Pfister (eds.). *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, Anglistische Fallstudien*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 137-158.
- Kori, S. 1993. Osnovy idei M.M. Bakhtina o khronotope v romane. *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies* 14, 3-20.
- Kosecky, K. 1992. Jurij Lotman's system, cognitive grammar and translatability of poetry: a case study of W.B. Yeats' "Great House" poems. In B.Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, M. Thelen (eds.). *Translation and Meaning*. Part 2. Maastricht: Rijkshogeschool Maastricht, 197-206.

- Koster, C. 1994. The concept of interpretation in descriptive translation studies: first explorations. In C. Robyns (ed.). *Translation and the production of culture*. Leuven: The CERA Chair for Translation, Communication and Culture, 151-165.
- Lambert, J. 1992. The cultural component reconsidered. In M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker, K. Kaindl (eds.). *Translation studies. An interdisciplinary*. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins, 17-26.
- van Leuven-Zwart, K. 1991. Translation and translation studies: discord or unity? In S. Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.) *Empirical research in translation and intercultural studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 35-43.
- Lotman, J. 1972. *Analiz poeticheskogo teksta*. Strukturna stikha. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie.
- Lotman, J. 1982. Ot redaktsii. *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*. XV. Tartu, 3-9.
- Mandelstam, O. 1987. *Slovo i kultura*. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel.
- Petőfi, J.S. 1982. Meaning, text, interpretation, pragmatic-semantics text classes. *Poetics* 11:4/6, 453-492.
- Plaza, J. 1987. *Traducao intersemiotica*. Sao Paulo.
- Pym, A. 1992. The relations between translation and material text transfer. *Target* 4:2, 171-189.
- Rezvin, I.I. *Osnovy obshchego i mashinnogo perevoda*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola 1964.
- Robel, L. 1995. Bakhtin i problema perevoda. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 11, 37-41.
- Robertson, D. 1967. Reply. *College English* 28:8.
- Schulte, R. 1980. Translation. An interpretative act through visualization. Translational agent of communication. A Special Issue of *Pacific Moana Quarterly* 5:1.
- Shreve, G.M., Schäffner, C., Danks, J.H., Griffin, J. 1993. Is there a special kind of "reading" for translation. An empirical investigation of reading in the translation process. *Target* 5:1, 21-41.
- Steiner, G. 1992. *After Babel*. Aspects of language and translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toporov, V.N. 1992. Translation: sub specie of culture. *Meta* XXXVII: 1, 29-49.
- Toporov, V.N. 1993. O "rezonantnom" prostranstve literatury (neskolko zamechanij). In V. Polukhina, J. Andrew, R. Reid (eds.). *Literary tradition and practice in Russian culture*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 16-60.
- Torop, P. 1989. Kirjanduse filmis. *Teater. Muusika. Kino* 5, 15-25.
- Torop, P. 1990. Rahvuskirjanduse ontoloogilisest paradimast. Kõnelusi rahvuskirjandusest. Toim. J. Undusk, P. Viires. Tallinn, 69-74.
- Torop, P. 1995. Totalnyj perevod. Tartu: izd. Tartuskogo universiteta.
- Toury, G. 1980. *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv University, the Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, G. 1991. What are descriptive studies into translation likely to yield apart from isolated descriptions? In K.M. van Leuven-Zwart, T. Naaijken (eds.) *Translation studies: The state of the art*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 179-192.