With apologies to my mother tongue
L2 translation as an exophonic practice

by

Lúcia Collischonn

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies
Warwick Writing Programme
School of Creative Arts, Performance, and Visual Culture
University of Warwick
October 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

For myself,
for my parents, who agreed to raise an iguana like me.
For my fellow gate crashers.

This thesis would not have been possible if it were not for the support from a great number of people and institutions. I am able to be here in this country, translating and writing in English because of the tireless efforts of the teaching staff and researchers at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), a public, free university where I studied my BA and my master's degree, often overlooked by international rankings because of its location in southern Brazil. There I was trained to a high standard in research practices, translation, language, and literature, and I owe this to the many colleagues and professors who crossed my path.

I thank the University of Warwick for funding my research through the Chancellor's International Scholarship, the English department for hosting me in the first year and the Warwick Writing Programme for being a new home for the remainder of my PhD journey. I would like to thank the University of Warwick Library for its strong postgraduate community represented by Aysa Ozcan and Santiago Oyarzabal who provided a safe space to do research and engage with peers. To all my StudyBlog and PhDLife bloggers for being a source of creativity. I would like to thank Tilted Axis Press and the team behind the anthology Violent Phenomena, for giving me a healthy outlet to share my grievances about decolonising translation, and for inspiring me every single day. In fact, this is dedicated to all small presses publishing translation against the grain, for all translators pushing against norms and rules, I salute you.

There are several people I would like to thank separately. My good friends Arianna Autieri, with whom I organised conferences, plans for world domination, and good coffee, Giulia Champion for being everyone's champion and a constant source of support and warmth. Deborah Simionato, for sharing

one terabyte of your brain with me, Eduarda de Carli, for all the late-night zoom calls, Wilgner Silva for the companionship in those late hours at the library, and at home, Melissa Pawelski for being my German sister, Rhiannon Morgan for the cats, the car rides, the swimming and the uphill battles, and to Julia Manzano for everything. to the PhD babes: Esthie Hugo, Harry Pitt Scott, Mantra Mukin, Nora Castle, Amul Gyawali, for your friendship. To my translation and exophony buddy Andrea Bergantino. Thank you as well to Charlie, who made sure I was loved and fed while working on the edits for this thesis. I love you. I would also like to thank my family, the Collischonns and the Abreus, for the obvious.

My supervisors, Chantal Wright and Will Amos: I thank you for your unwavering support and patience with me. Chantal Wright is the very reason I came to Warwick and the best *Doktormutter* I could have asked for; I strive to make you proud every day. Thank you to Will Amos for seeing potential in my thesis and joining this path, making a difference, and engaging with the text with so much energy and curiosity. And for all the other researchers and lecturers who crossed my path at Warwick. No amount of 'thank you' will ever be enough.

This thesis is especially dedicated to my parents. My mother, who I look up to in every single way, who had to give up on a PhD abroad because of me, I am, in a way, fulfilling that dream. My mother loved Portuguese, a language that was her second, and she dedicated her brilliant research career to the many ways Portuguese could sound like. In a way, she was my first exophonic encounter. Thank you for preparing me to live without you, it is the greatest gift. I miss you more each day. To my father, *papups*, who helps me make all my dreams come true, always ready to learn, to take on a new challenge, to talk for hours on end, you are the best of us. Thank you for the music.

And finally, this is dedicated to the fourteen translators who agreed to open their minds to me. This is to all of them, those who feel out of place, discriminated against, silenced. I hope this thesis, which is my love letter to the artistic practice you do so well, does justice to your work.

Declaration

I declare that all the material contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not been published in any form before. This thesis includes interviews, wherein I have procured consent from the subjects and approval from the Ethics Committee.

I also confirm that this thesis has not been previously submitted for a degree at another university.

Abstract

This study focuses on literary translation into a non-mother tongue (the L2 direction), investigating how it has been regarded by Translation Studies, practitioners, and the publishing market, particularly in the anglophone context. L1 directionality (into the translator's L1) remains the norm in the literary translation world, which has a systemic bias against the multilingual subject, and toward the monolingual. To what extent can L2 translation change the way people assess quality and agency in translation? In a post-monolingual paradigm (Yildiz, 2012), the notion of a mother tongue has come to be increasingly problematic. What are the implications of this for directionality in translation? Studies that have broached the issue of L2 translation still focus on and privileged the role and status of the native speaker. Applying the notion of exophony (i.e., writing in a foreign language) to translation (in what I term *exophonic translation*), this project draws on insights from sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, translation history and translator studies. Using phenomenographic interviews with L2 literary translators, the thesis analyses how these translators approach directionality in translation, their ideological stance on issues of bi- and multilingualism, as well as their specific professional contexts, considering the monolingual bias and power structures within translation. These interviews ask what L2 translators think about L2 translation, why they choose to go against the grain of the L1 translation norm and how these language practitioners value/position their own practice. In writing this thesis, I explore the potential for L2 translation to become a force for change, asking to what extent radical ideologies have the power to change prevailing attitudes and practices in the field of literary translation. My project is interdisciplinary and aims to bridge the gap between disciplines for L2 translation, helping this practice become more visible and legitimised in literary translation.

Keywords

L2 translation; gatekeeping; translation sociology; literary translation; exophony; critical multilingualism studies

Introduction

In Translation Studies, there is an often-unspoken preference for a specific direction of translation. A translator is seen as someone who deals with two languages, one of them what is assumed to be the translator's mother tongue, native language, L1. In many theories of translation from before the advent of the discipline until the present state of Translation Studies involve an assumed preferred directionality, one that is, for the most part, the L1 direction. The L1 direction means translating into the translator's first language, from their L2, their second. The L1 translation norm is strongly present both overtly and covertly in the episteme of Translation Studies and has been largely uncontested, with recent studies coming from the peripheries of the Translation Studies empire, showing how frail the L1 translation norm and trying to break the mould. However, before analysing the history of this norm and the practices and prejudices upholding it, we must see the history of this piece of research, stemming from the researcher's own practice and experience with these prejudices.

This thesis consists of a set of synchronic snapshots of a diachronic research process. It is, therefore, a portrait of an ongoing process of discovery about linguistic norms and rules that tie us translators to binaries that do not reflect the reality of our profession. Those who translate know that this reality changes, and that our relationship to the languages we speak and use changes as well. Because of this, it is exclusionary to consider one's L1 or L2 as static, bounded entities, unchanged over time. And yet we still largely bind ourselves by definitions that do not do justice to the complexity of writing and translating literature, in different languages. I was aware of these issues, and felt strongly that something should change, but the process of investigating the building blocks of such delimitations and the varied experiences I came across opened the path to ongoing debates, different points of view, and gatekeeping processes founded on very unsteady grounds. This process took me from a master's student in Brazil studying exophony and how to translate literature written by a non-native speaker, to a PhD candidate exploring a practice also frowned upon by many in academia and in the industry, though celebrated by many L2 translators, heritage speakers and speakers of minority or less widely

diffused languages. Exophony, the initial driving force of this project, and what in fact I considered to be the end-all of my explorations, has taken the form of an accessory. It serves a purpose in my analysis and informs my point of view, but if used to define a group of translators, it serves as yet another linguistic straitjacket, something that became increasingly distanced from the aims and results of this work.

Initially, this project had a strong focus on directionality and exophony. On a practical level, I was aware I would have to either build a corpus or analyse existing L2 translations while interviewing the translators behind these translations. However, as we are dealing with translation, analysing the source texts and being able to access them is important, but it was unclear whether distant reading of such a variety of source texts and languages would be constructive. Examples of L2 translations are spread around the globe and exist in many languages, and even in funnelling the data to only L2 translations into English, the source languages were many, many I could not read. With time, and with access to existing L2 Translation Studies, and reading of the literature in this small but developing field, it became increasingly clear that it was more worthwhile to look at the agents behind these texts, the translators. The texts themselves pass through several levels of control and manipulation until they get to their published form, and many agents in this process will influence the minutiae of these translations. Furthermore, existing L2 translation studies such as the one conducted by Pokorn (2005) have already proven what many strive to understand: that L2 translations are often indistinguishable from L1 translations. If these two different types of translations are the same, the difference may lie in the people behind these practices. The difference may lie in the power structures, political stances, gatekeeping practices, unspoken and untested rules and norms. The difference may lie in who wins and who loses in maintaining such a prevalent norm, that of L1 translation, largely unopposed. The undisputed L1 norm is harmful to both the theory and practice of L2 translation. The invisibility of L2 translation practices is also harmful for any researcher aiming to have a better understanding of L2 translation, and L2 translators themselves often lack a theoretical basis for what they are doing, they lack scholarly and scientific

support for their practice. Throughout the research process, I found constant suggestions for my claim that the literary translation world has a systemic bias against the exophonic and/or multilingual subject, and toward the monolingual, and that this bias stands on several untested and unchallenged norms and systemic structures within the literary translation world and within Translation Studies.

I would be remiss to ignore an important fact for this study: that it is, partly, a work of auto-theory. I am part of my target group. I am a Brazilian translator who is fluent in English and has translated into English in the past, as a translation student and as a professional translator. I also wish to do more literary translation into English but have been constantly faced the L1 norm. Therefore, the motivation behind this work is partly an egotistical one. I was brought up monolingual, at first glance, speaking Brazilian Portuguese, and there is no doubt that this is my L1. However, my mother was a German native speaker born and raised in Brazil. A third-generation German in Brazil, living in the countryside of the South of the country, my own mother had no need to speak Portuguese until the age of ten. For her, Portuguese was a much-beloved second language, one that was also the national language of her country of birth. My own mother raised me speaking Portuguese, but all of the lullabies and nursery rhymes she knew were in German. In my mother's family, both the Riograndenser Hunsrückisch dialect and Standard German were spoken. In my father's family, the more Brazilian of my two halves, any idea of monolingualism would also fail to hold water. My grandmother was trilingual: Portuguese, Spanish and Guarani. More specifically, Paraguayan Spanish and Guarani. As the indigenous language of the three, Guarani lost space, eventually remaining alive in a few words and sentences passed down the generations to me. This is my linguistic background. I would not dare to generalise and say such a background is Brazilian *par excellence*, but the perceived monolingualism of Brazilian culture, through its national language of Portuguese, hides many similar or even more pronounced multilingual

experiences.[1] However, my initially egotistical drive to defend my practice and the multitudinous reality of my linguistic background was soon met with a need to give voice to other gate crashers like me. Slowly, I would discover more and more translators whose linguistic backgrounds were truly constellations of languages, whose lives could not fit the national monolingual expectations often thrown in their direction. As multilingual studies have already established: the monolingual is not the norm. Yet many of these multilingual, exophonic translators and their practices were hidden by the cloak of the L1 norm.

This varied linguistic background that I described encompasses the initial years of my life and of some of the subjects of this research. However, when higher or postgraduate education is experienced in a different language, the linguistic plot thickens, and different domains of language use come to the fore. My education in Translation Studies was in my L1 and my higher education in the field of literature and linguistics was conducted in a mix of Portuguese, English and German. However, in the specific fields of multilingualism and L2 translation, for example, the vast majority of my reading has been in English for the last four years, thus in these language domains my fluency in English is much higher than my fluency in Portuguese, at least at the present moment. According to Steven Kellman, poet George Santayana, who produced poetry in English but was raised in Spanish, declared that "no poets can be great who do not use the language in which their mothers sang them lullabies." (Kellman, 2000:2). If that were true, I could never have dared write poetry in Portuguese, as the language in which my mother sang me lullabies was, in fact, German. As Kellman adds "there seems something not only painful, but unnatural, almost matricidal, about an author who abandons the Muttersprache" (ibidem). But what about those who did not hear those lullabies, who did not have a mother? I may start to ask myself to

[1] Brazil is considered by many Brazilian linguists and social scientists as a multilingual country, but the population itself is taught that they are monolingual, or rather that there is only one language of use and function in the country: Portuguese. According to projects such as those by Guimaraes (2005), Brazil has over 300 languages, 200 of those are indigenous languages close to extinction, but also languages of immigrant communities (largely in groups which arrived in Brazil in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries).

what extent have I felt the pain of writing in my non-mother tongue. For the individuals whose mother figures were several, in different languages, whose mother figures did not manifest in the traditional ways heteronormative and patriarchal societies assume for them, matricide does not work in the same way, and abandoning the mother tongue may not feel unnatural. What if, as one of the interviewees mentioned, we queer this term? This is, again, a personal reflection that, however, informs my research and my analysis of the data. In a way, as this research is also an attempt at an auto-theory of exophonic translation, my experience and that of my subjects will coincide and dialogue with each other on many occasions.

My work then aims to highlight a practice and a linguistic reality which exists, evolves, expands, and extrapolates from its confines. It is a practice already in place, with practitioners that exist, work (or attempt to work), silently and surely. With this in mind, the main research questions of this study are as follows:

1. Do L1 translation norms truly stand up to scrutiny? If not, where do they fail and what similarly ghostlike norms and beliefs help to uphold the dominance of the L1 translation rule?
2. What do L2 translators think about L2 translation? How do these language practitioners see their own practice?
3. What force for change that L2 translation could ultimately become and to what extent radical ideologies have the power to change prevalent attitudes and practices in the field of literary translation?

Question one is largely explored in chapters one to four. In chapter one, I explore in detail existing L2 translation studies and how the practice has been regarded before and after the establishment of the field of Translation Studies. Ending on an overview of cases of translations into Latin in early modern times and the Middle Ages as proof of the ancient nature of such a practice, we start on a timeline to understand how the monolingual became such a prevalent and long-standing idea in thinking about languages and translation.

In chapter two, we explore the ideas and contexts that gave way to monolingualism, the invention and advent of the monolingual ideal which still informs even the study of multilingualism. From the advent of nations and national languages, to changes in attitudes towards language and language loyalties, from native-speakerism, mother tongues to the monolingual bias, finally we arrive at the idea of a post-monolingual paradigm which aims at deterritorialising language.[2] Chapter three then continues the work started in the previous chapter, this time focusing on that which is not mono-: bilingualism, multilingualism, translingualism and exophony. Arriving finally at contemporary views of language and language practices, we explore the sociology of translation. Since this work is for the most part a work of translator studies, it is important to examine the building blocks, central ideas and methodological approaches that inform the study of L2 translators. This overview also offers an analysis of the global polysystemic nature of a sociology of translation and its many agents.

Through interviews conducted with L2 literary translators and the analysis of this dataset we reach research question number two. In chapter five I introduce the methodology, the translators interviewed and some of the process of these interviews. Then the analysis is divided into themes: Approaches to Languages, Directionality, Market and Gatekeeping, Creative Writing and Fluency in Translation; and Training and Professional status. With these analyses I aim to paint a picture of these L2 translators interviewed and the way they see L2 translation, their practice. The different thematic pathways that lead into this research question are built with the awareness that this is not an easy question to answer, and that there is no blueprint to what L2 translators talk about when they talk about translation. To contain this epistemic beast, we need to charge at it from varied perspectives.

Finally, as I attempt, throughout the chapters, to answer the research questions one and two, question number three starts answering itself. When discussing the findings, I aim to prove that L2 translation has, indeed, the

[2] Due to the interdisciplinarity encompassing some of these terms, different areas have differing uses for this terminology, with some of these being neologisms with no agreement on spelling, for example. I will point to these differentiations as I present and discuss these terms.

potential to change prevalent attitudes and practices in the field of literary translation.

Chapter 1 - Translation into a Non-Mother Tongue: L2 Translation pushing boundaries within and beyond Translation Studies

> *Theories cannot merely propose neutral ways of conceptualizing the field, and as is the case with translation theory, on such a basis develop globally acceptable normative concepts for various practices in the field, but rather simultaneously disclose their point of departure as conditioned by a particular situation and its tensions, and thus the inevitable markers of their embeddedness in a given culture, or rather, in a particular translation practice. Though professionally engaged in mediating among cultures and so interested in both intercultural relations and in surpassing the limitations of their own cultural perspective, most translators can still be genuine insiders in one culture only and are, accordingly, outsiders to all other cultures. This also applies to their theories: the limitations of the theories produced within one culture will inevitably show when in contact with different cultures and translation practices in more or less radically different circumstances. […] there is no reason for expecting that cultural differences would not necessitate theoretical paradigm shifts, when we know that such shifts occur regularly because of temporally conditioned change.* (Grosman 2000:21)

1.1 Exophonic translators on their practice: an introductory overview

Although we can find examples of studies dealing with L2 translation within academia, and we must be aware that such studies might arise from personal interest and the experience of the scholars on the topic of directionality (meaning that they themselves have done L2 translation in their practice), there is value in seeing how exophonic translators who are not necessarily speaking to an academic audience write about their practice in essays and translator commentaries. Not all literary L2 translators have written, or rather, made public, their thoughts on directionality and exophony. However, we can find a few examples in essay-form which we can use as a jumping-off point to establish a few problematics which will be seen throughout this study. These will dialogue with the analysis of the interviews conducted in this study and analysed in chapter five.

In a piece published in *The Linguist* magazine in 2017, translator and editor Marta Dziurosz discusses her experience and her views in "On (L2) Non-native Translation". She chooses to call the practice "Bilingual Translation" and recollects her own personal history with this practice and

what she has encountered regarding it in the literary translation context.[3] Recounting an episode at a literary fair when someone questioned the desire of a member of the audience to translate into their L2, Dziurosz is surgical when she concludes that "This was the first of many instances I witnessed of bilingual translation being treated as whimsical at best, and gross incompetence at worst". I have come across similar instances, and in fact cannot recall a time in which "bilingual translation" was described as something positive. We will see, both in the literature review of L2 translation studies as well as in the analysis of the interviews that will come, that there are many advantages to this practice. Dziurosz goes on to discuss this bias inherent in the literary translation world, specifically the facet that puts native speakers on a pedestal. There is plenty of research on Native-Speakerism in EFL teaching (Holliday, 2006; Kubota & Lin 2009; Modiano, 2001, 2005; Wang & Fang, 2020, to name just a few), and Dziurosz mentions a study that she encountered in a plenary in which both native and non-native teachers were deemed acceptable by language learners, and that both had their advantages and disadvantages as well as their specific strengths. She then proposes that a similar research project aiming at uncovering editors' and publishers' implicit bias would be of great interest. Translators I have interviewed point out several instances where they fell victim to this kind of implicit monolingual bias at the hands of publishers and editors. Dziurosz, mentioning an informal survey she conducted and an event she organised on the topic, concludes that categories of native and non-native are, in fact, obsolete, or rather, should be made to become obsolete. She proposes, in fact, that we should "retire" such terminology. The present study will arrive at similar conclusions, discussed at length in chapters 2 and 3.

In a longer piece about her practice, entitled "Neither Here And There: The Misery And Splendor Of (Reverse) Translation", Bulgarian translator Ekaterina Petrova (2020) goes into detail on her process of both coming to terms with translation in both directions and how she sees her own

[3] When discussing the terminology around L2 translation in Chapter 1, I mention the term Bilingual Translator and present more reasons as to why I choose not to adopt it. When we see the linguistic backgrounds and realities of the translators interviewed in this thesis, it becomes clear that bilingual is inadequate to cover the multiplicity of their complex language relations.

relationship to this practice and the practice of translating multi-directionally itself. As we can see from her title, she names this practice Reverse Translation. Interestingly, she places the word 'reverse' in parentheses, alluding to the possibility of it just being called 'translation'. This is something that Dziurosz broaches in her essay, when she mentions that "A large number of my respondents did not define themselves as bilingual translators – just as translators". Explaining her choice of word, Petrova elucidates how the practice is:

> colloquially known [in Bulgarian] as *obraten prevod*, which literally means "reverse translation." As an adjective, *obraten* carries the negative connotation of something abnormal or backward, something that goes against the grain, or something that simply isn't right. As a noun, *obraten* is used as a derogatory slur for a queer person.[4]

In here, as we will also see in chapter 1, the very choice of terminology to describe L2 translation can bring with it a value judgement. Petrova's essay revolves around some of the assumptions that lie behind the L1 norm, which I paraphrase here as, firstly, that monolingualism is the norm; secondly, that language ownership and national identity are conflated; thirdly, that language is a discrete, monolithic entity; finally, that an individual's relationship with their language, whatever that may be, is fixed and unchanging. Petrova, in fact, sums up a great deal of what can be found in this and in following chapters, and what we can see in the interviews with exophonic translators. Claiming to feel at home in both Bulgarian and English, Petrova admits to her Bulgarian being perceived as "fluent" while her English is simply "accented". She then explains further her own experiences with gatekeeping:

> Even if I could erase the accent, the cold, clingy, non-negotiable facts of my name, my place of birth, and my nationality are enough to make all these intricacies, complicated relationships, and my own particular biographical details vanish into thin air. The mere, usually unavoidable, mention of these facts, either together or separately, often seems sufficient to bring

[4] The fact that *obraten* is a derogatory slur for a queer person and happens to also be, together with *prevod*, the Bulgarian term for L2 translation makes the connection between queer textual practices and exophonic writing and translation a stronger one. I aim to explore this in future work.

> into question not just the quality of my translations and the validity of my approaches or decisions, but also my legitimacy as a translator of Bulgarian into English as a whole. Even in friendly and well-meaning scenarios, I've often had to rationalize it; in less benevolent ones, I've had to actively defend it.

This issue of name and accent was brought up by some of the translators I interviewed and I myself have come across anecdotal evidence for this. When translating into English, some translators whose names are clearly not anglophone-sounding very often face this eyebrow-raising that Petrova speaks of. In the case of Petrova, it helps that she can add to her curriculum vitae an MFA from the renowned Literary Translation programme in Iowa. She credits the programme director, Aron Aji, an exophonic translator himself (although he prefers the terminology Bilingual Translator) as he worked to include more translators who are not L1 translators. T03 and T08 in my pool of interviewees are graduates of the same programme. It seems, therefore, that in some of the hubs of literary translation teaching, like the Iowa MFA programme, and in the UK context the BCLT Summer School and the National Centre for Writing Mentorship programmes, among others, there has been a slow shift towards more acceptance of the practice and having an exophonic/bilingual translator at the helm seems to have helped with this shift.

But it is when reflecting on directionality and target vs. source language in the process of translating that Petrova brings up an especially valid point: that every translator will inevitably have their shortcomings, be it in the understanding of the source language or in creating a text in the target language. In her own words:

> But whether we admit it or not, we all have blind spots—it's just that for some of us, they might be mostly in the source language, and for others, mostly in the target one. As a way to calm down, counteract my occasional sense of impostor syndrome, and avoid getting paralyzed, I tell myself that I might actually be in a more favourable position than my native-speaker peers. This is because, even when I mess up, the kinds of mistakes that I'm likely to make will almost certainly get caught and corrected by the Anglophone editors of my translations. By contrast, mistakes resulting from failing to understand something in the original are much more

> difficult to catch, especially when that original is in a "small" language that is usually completely inaccessible to the English or American editors of the translation.

Here, Petrova mirrors Dziurosz's previously mentioned notion of the inherent strengths and weaknesses we can find in the process of translation, whatever the directionality. It is precisely when talking about the imperfectness of the translation act, and product, that Petrova drives home one of her main points: that by not owing loyalty to either language she is able to detach from them, to not see them as 'sacred', as she puts it. This detachment is similarly found in exophonic literary works, as the ability to see a language from the point of view of a foreigner can have innovative implications for works of literature. I will, however, return to this in detail later on, in chapters 2 and 3. Seeing language as performative, external to the self, is, in fact, one of the interpretative nodes of this work, as we will see in depth in chapter 3. Petrova and Dziurosz are L2 translators who have experienced the L1 translation norm and have faced some of the weaknesses of this translation dictum. Their texts are used here to introduce some of the problematics brought forth by the L1 translation fiat. They also help us understand that there is a systemic bias against bilingual subjects in Translation Studies, and an untested and unquestioned preference for monotopic ideas of language.

1.2 L2 Translation and Directionality in Translation Studies

The practice of translation into a non-mother tongue, or L2 translation, has not received enough attention in Translation Studies as a whole.[5] Translation Studies in general, as a discipline, is largely Western and anglophone, thus many of the authors within it have been fortunate enough to be able to ignore this issue, since this is not a challenge they have had to face. Coming from a Global South country, or less hegemonic language (Brazilian

[5] There is no terminological consistency when it comes to this practice, and perhaps this is due to it being under-researched and underappreciated in traditional Translation Studies. A discussion around the terminology will find its place in this work. For practicality, however, I will use the term L2 translation in this first chapter and explain my reasons for using different terminology further on.

Portuguese), it is easier for me to see the relevance of L2 translation, for a number of reasons. L2 translation is taught in the context of less hegemonic countries and languages almost as much as L1 translation, and both practices find their place in translators' professional lives. Of course, this is much more common in technical and scientific translation, as the demand in these fields is much more dynamic than in literary translation. According to Beeby (1998):

> Directionality only began to be studied at the end of the twentieth century when some scholars in countries where A→B translation is common practice questioned the assumption (particularly widespread in English-speaking countries) that B→A translation was the only viable professional option. (Beeby, 1998:84)

Even so, the study of L2 translation specifically is not comparable in quality and quantity to the studies and theories centring on L1 translation, both technical and literary. However, from the 1990s onwards, there has been a stronger focus on L2 translation and its differences to the practice of L1 translation into English specifically, and within several frameworks and different fields in Translation Studies.

In approaching the practice of translation into a foreign language, there seems to be a lack of terminological consistency. "L2 translation" (Pavlović, 2007), "inverse translation", "service translation" (cf Newmark, 1988:3), "translation into a non-mother tongue" (Pokorn, 2005), are some of the many terms used to define this practice.[6] All of them focus on a hierarchy of languages and on direction in translation. As we have seen in the introduction to this chapter, in other languages such as Bulgarian, terms used to define L2 translation are often derogatory. In Brazilian Portuguese as well as in some Francophone contexts, for example, an L2 translation is a 'version' of something, not even deemed a translation. According to Stewart, in one of the earliest articles to review the L1 translation norm:

> The disparaging connotations of terms adopted in the literature to describe L2 translation would appear to confirm the general impression that this activity constitutes some sort of deviation from the norm. The

[6] The term 'inverse translation' is widely used in texts about directionality, there is no agreement on who coined the term.

> relevant nomenclature includes: 'indirect translation', 'inverse translation', 'marked translation', 'service translation', and, possibly the unkindest cut of all, 'pedagogical translation' (i.e., no more than an academic exercise, of no value beyond the walls of the classroom). (Stewart, 2001:207)

These recent studies have contributed to the field immensely, by clarifying different but converging issues around the practice and helping to deconstruct pre-conceived and prejudiced ideas around translation into a non-mother tongue. They have fed on each other, and this mutual dependence is unsurprising given that not enough has been said on the topic. This situation, in turn, means that only a small group of researchers has delved into this under-researched and undervalued area. Such a state of affairs both helps and at the same time makes the translator and/or researcher interested in this topic shy away from probing into it: there is so much to be said, but there is almost no existing theory about it. To make this claim, however, it is necessary to present these studies and how they have contributed to not putting L2 translation in a corner. That is what I aim to do below.

1.2.1 (In)visibility of L2 Translation Studies

Not only the practice of literary L2 translation, but also the study of it is obscure both in the market and in academia. For that reason, and because of the lack of a coherent terminology for the practice, finding these translations and studies proves a challenge. At this juncture, I would like to point out that there are obvious limitations of scope and access to see how directionality is viewed in other contexts, including when those studies are written in a language I cannot access, or when these studies are not easily found due to access constraints, different use of keywords, etc.

In the real world, translation contracts or codes of good practice and translation ethics often spell out a preference for L1 translation, especially, but not exclusively in relation to, literary translation. One example here would be the Nairobi declaration. At the beginning of the declaration, one can find the following definition of translation: "the term "translation" denotes the

transposition of a literary or scientific work, including technical work, from one language into another language" (1976:39). Here we cannot find a directionality. Further on, however, we encounter the following statement: "a translator should, as far as possible, translate into his own mother tongue or into a language of which he or she has a mastery equal to that of his or her mother tongue." (1976:42). It seems then that even in legal documents pertaining to the act of translation and translation as a profession there is the need to explain that what one means by translation is specifically the translation from a foreign language into the translator's mother tongue. The mother tongue bias shows itself here as it will repeatedly in translation norms.

The L1 translation preference is reflected in many uncontested norms and in implicit views on directionality in the history of Translation Studies. These implicit views and norms must be unpicked, and this implicit discourse that naturalises the norm of L1 translation ends up forming our ideas about what is natural and what is expected in translation. Within Gideon Toury's proposal of norms in translation, we could consider the L1 translation norm as extratextual, in that it is not contained within the actual translated text or the source text, it is a prescriptive rather than descriptive norm.[7] In this respect, it might be useful to view the L1 translation norm as a 'translation meme', as defined by Chesterman in *The Memes of Translation* (1997). Taking the definition of a meme as the cultural equivalent of a gene and, therefore, as a unit of cultural transmission, of mere replication or imitation (Dawkins 1976), memes, in this context, can be viewed as ideas that spread like genes. According to Chesterman, "ideas that turn out to be good ideas survive; i.e. those that are conducive to the survival of their carriers" (Chesterman, 1997:6). If we take the norm of L1 translation as a translation meme, this idea would have to be a good idea for someone, that is, conducive to the survival of a specific practice or a standard. It is not that difficult to make the connection between the L1 translation meme and the survival of the hegemony of the English language

[7] I will go into more detail on Toury's conceptualisation of translation norms in chapter 4, where I will explore the field of translation sociology.

and those who are considered its native speakers.[8] This resistance and open adoption of the L1 translation meme may come from an inability to conceive of a different state of affairs, or even a defensive move. Those who benefit from this meme are not necessarily consciously doing so with an aim to uphold this practice. Therefore, studies that either defend or propose to make visible the practice of L2 translation, which is a reality that has been invisible for too long, are trying to break the L1 translation meme.[9] With it, perhaps the idea of L2 translation is conducive to the survival of minor linguistic communities and turns out to be a good idea after all.

1.2.2 L2 Translation Studies, an overview

It is not difficult to understand why, among scholars of L2 translation, and Translation Studies scholars in general, there are so many academics living a life between languages and cultures. Many of these scholars are non-native speakers of English who, however, work in English-speaking countries and universities or head English-language undergraduate and postgraduate programs in their native countries (such as Pokorn, Marmaridou, Zahedi);[10] others, even though native speakers, talk from the point of view of the periphery, the periphery of the empire (such as the Australian scholar Campbell) or even other non-hegemonic languages and cultures (Grosman, McAlester, Kelly, Lorenzo, Pavlović). All these scholars have experienced translation into a non-mother tongue. They try to understand why L2 translation, especially of literary texts, has been considered a second-class citizen in the world of translation. Native or non-native speakers of English alike, they all write in English, and have studied translation into English from the most varied languages. This small club of L2 translation researchers and

---

[8] This hegemony of the English language, as I put it, is within the context of anglophone translation studies and the publishing market in the UK and US, mainly since institutions in these countries are still responsible for judging global speakers of English on their proficiency in standardized English language tests, for example.

[9] They are also trying to break the monolingual *habitus*/bias, which I will discuss more thoroughly in the next chapter.

[10] Ironically, exophony, that is, writing in a foreign language (Wright, 2008), is heavily present in Translation Studies. English, being the dominant academic language, especially in this field, is the medium through which many non-native academics write their theories of translation.

the many linguistic and theoretical variations and approaches within the group show that this is a rich area of Translation Studies.

It is important to name the studies that deal with translation into a non-mother tongue and place them in context. The texts in this cluster have different goals, and this is maybe one of the reasons why there is not as of now a unified theory of L2 translation. Some, like Campbell (1998), talk about L2 translation with the aim of looking at the development of translation competence but also to argue for a more open definition of mother tongue and to render visible the practice of L2 translation on the outskirts of the empire (in his case, Australia).[11] Others, like McAlester (1992, 2005), use it to look for improved translation assessment criteria for student translators. Marmaridou (1996), one of the first to talk openly about translation out of the mother tongue, presents a study which focuses on understanding and proper translating of conceptual metaphors by native and non-native translators, comparing these two groups. Zahedi (2013) offers a literature review of the different studies on L2 translation, relying heavily on Allison Beeby's definition of directionality in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998) and Beeby's overview of the status of the practice in Translation Studies.

One of the most ground-breaking studies, and one which has received a great deal of attention, is Pokorn's (2005) study of L2 literary translation in the specific case of Slovenia. Like Zahedi, although lengthier and with a practice approach as well, Pokorn delves deep into the problematic of the

[11] Australia belongs, in linguist Braj Kachru's definition (1992), to the inner circle of World Englishes. In the three circles of English model, the diffusion of the English language is focused on three concentric circles, from the inner to the outer circles ending on the expanding circle. Belonging to the Inner circle are Englishes that were diffused through a first diaspora: Australia, New Zealand, and North America, but also including the crib of the language, the United Kingdom. The outer circles comprise those Englishes that were the result of the second diaspora, more specifically the Imperial Expansion of Great Britain in Asia and Africa. In these countries, English may or may not be considered a native tongue, but it is either one of the official languages and/or a useful lingua franca. In the expanding circle you find those countries where English does not play any official role in government or policy, but where it is widely used and learned as a means of communication. The inner circle is norm-providing, meaning they establish the rules for standard English in their varieties, whereas the outer and expanding circles are norm-dependent, as they rely on native speakers from the inner circle to establish the norms for the use of the language. The different colonial processes and timelines of the USA and Australia/New Zealand and these countries' current role in geopolitics might explain why at time Australian English, even though belonging to the inner circle, still sees itself in the outskirts of the empire.

mother tongue. Her study is divided into different parts. The first part can be seen as a manifesto and offers many good arguments for the adoption of a more flexible, open view of literary L2 translation. The second part, less theoretical and more methodological/practice-based, is specific to existing cases of translation of Slovene literature into English. In Pokorn's own study, which follows her review, native speakers of English were shown these translations. They looked for inaccuracies, unnaturalness and lack of fluency and tried to guess which texts were translated by native speakers and which were not. The study proves that L2 translators performed equally well; most readers could not spot the non-native translations. The problems with this study are mainly that these are existing translations, and therefore it is not possible to analyse directionality from a procedural point of view, nor can one ask the translators for their attitudes and opinions towards the practice of translating into a non-mother tongue. Pokorn also focuses a great deal on a translator's status as native or non-native, and on the acceptability of the translated text to native readers of the target language, that is, English. It would be interesting to see texts translated from English into Slovene to see if the perceived naturalness would be the same when received by Slovene native speakers. However, Pokorn makes convincing points that are advantageous when proposing that L2 translation should not be second class.

There have been two conferences and consequently two sets of conference proceedings dedicated entirely to the topic of translation into non-mother tongues, namely in May 1997 in Ljubljana, and the 2002 Forum on Directionality in Translating and Interpreting in Granada. The two conferences generated two books: *Translation into Non-Mother Tongues in Professional Practice and Training* (2000), and *La direccionalidad en traducción e interpretación. Perspectivas teóricas, profesionales y didácticas [Directionality in translation and interpreting. Theoretical, professional, and didactic perspectives]* (2003). The fact that L2 translation has only explicitly been the topic of a few studies in the last two decades goes to show that it is a theme of growing interest, but also that scholars in minority, peripheral or less-widely diffused language communities have been able to slowly start breaking the mould of Translation Studies in a context which

opens more possibilities for the study of cultures, multilingualism, and displacement.

Kelly et al (2003), the outcome of the 2002 forum in Granada, provides a good number of studies around directionality, specifically translation into a second or third language, concluding that there is a call for deeper and more empirical knowledge concerning directionality in translation. In the second part, the authors point to a need for more empirical studies backing these findings, as well as a closer connection between directionality and the concept of translation competence. The authors question the obvious distinction between general and specialized translation, arguing in counterpoint for a more general approach to teaching translation sub-competencies that can articulate between one another and so do not end up forming overly specialized translators but rather subjects with a more general competence in translation (Beeby; Rodriguez & Schnell; Narvaez, among others). The authors also call into question the fact that, traditionally, directionality is only thought of when dealing with inverse translation, whereas it is an important component of every act of translation. Part five of Kelly et al. focuses specifically on translation teaching and the multilingual classroom. In thinking directionality in the traditional, strict way, a multilingual translation class is viewed as presenting many problems. The studies in this part try to test this view. Tsokaktsidu concludes that the presence of exchange/international students in translation classes is positive overall. In Lucas's study focusing on legal translation, he agrees with Tsokaktsidu in concluding that in a multicultural classroom, with multiple counter-directionalities in the group, the diversity of linguistic profiles is positive. Galiano, with a more methodological approach, asserts, however, that the presence of a variety of different mother tongues in a translation class makes it necessary to adapt the methodology of directionality to the reality of the classroom.

In the collection *Translation into a Non-Mother Tongue* (2000), the proceedings of the 1997 conference in Ljubljana entirely dedicated to L2 translation, we find a varied number of studies on the practice. More theoretical than the works found in Kelly et. Al (2003), this volume focuses more on the status of the practice in theoretical translation studies and in the

contexts of multiculturality and plurilingualism in Eastern Europe, among others. The studies range from the issue of translation competence, sub-competencies and the teaching of genre literacy in translation (Prunč; Kiraly; Bretthauer, Geiser, Roiss), Lingua franca English or international English as a target language for translation (Snell-Hornby; Orel Kos; Kovacic), translation teaching and L2 translation (Wussler, Mackenzie and Vienne, Koberski, Pedersen) to the importance of decision-making and confidence for translation teaching and practice (Kralová). Grosman argues that translation is a central instrument of intercultural communication. The impact of translated works in a dominant receiving culture, according to him, is often perceived as negative. In conclusion, he states that non-mother tongue translation from less widely disseminated languages could help preserve cultural diversity. Similarly, Pokorn argues that the advantage of fluency in the target language that TL natives have can often be counterbalanced by their insufficient knowledge of the Source Culture or Source Language, so L1 translation is not automatically superior to L2 translation.

In his study, Dollerup talks about the score of proficiency in a target language on a scale. When dealing specifically with the translation of literary texts, he argues that shortcomings of the non-native speaker translator are obvious, because reading literature is an aesthetic experience and only those speakers who move within the 90-100% of the spectrum can reach this level of stylistic perfection. One could argue, just as well, that stylistic perfection is an idealized view of style, and fails to account for style as an idiosyncratic feature of translation and literature. The idea of 100% fluency can also be argued against, but this I intend to do further on. Among the existing L2 translation studies, it is possible to see a general refusal of this ideal of fluency and style.

All the studies found in Grosman et al (2000) therefore conclude that translation teaching should include L2 translation because it is a reality, especially in settings of less widely diffused languages. The reality of the profession calls for better training in specific skills for translation into a non-mother tongue, and this training will provide a necessary base for the practice. Therefore, the mother tongue of the translator is not as important as sufficient and holistic training in different directions of translation, and fluency in genre-

specific styles is more important than fluency in the language in general. The majority of the studies in the collection point to the positive outcome of L2 translation teaching activities, and thus to a positive outcome for L2 translation carried out by properly trained professionals and users of the languages in question. It is also a trend within all the studies mentioned that the specific translational context is the key to analysing translation performance.

Saber Zahedi, in the article "L2 Translation at the Periphery: A Meta-Analysis of Current Views on Translation Directionality" (2013), puts forward a review of literature around the topic of L2 translation. Carrying out such a review is often seen in studies which deal with the topic of L2 Translation, which is lacking in theorization and is, in general, excluded from translation theory. What is most interesting in this is how he differentiates between implicit and explicit views on translation directionality. It is Zahedi's aim to show how implicit views that can be found in the scholarly literature about translation have created L1 translation as the norm.

Zahedi (2013), Pokorn (2005) and Beeby (1998) are some of the L2 translation scholars who provide an overview of how L2 translation has been received in texts dealing with theorizing translation, both before and after the advent of Translation Studies as a discipline. They divide these assumptions around L2 translation into explicit and implicit. The explicit views are usually found in recent Translation Studies texts, where an author may completely disregard or deny the worth of translating into a non-mother tongue. The implicit views are usually seen in older translation theory, and hint at a preference for L1 translation, thus making the reading audience internalize the idea that translation should ideally be carried out from a L2 into a L1. This distinction proves useful to see how ingrained these ideas are in our thinking about the practice of translation. Therefore, I chose to adopt this division between explicit and implicit ideas and expand them with other examples, which I will explore below.

1.2.3 Explicit views on Translation Directionality

The L1 translation norm is explicit in some writings and implicit in many others. The way these implicit claims deny the value of L2 translation is

largely through ignoring the practice altogether, and only when criticising, or comparing the translator's ability in their "own language" and the "foreign language" can these ideas be seen. Pokorn (2005), argues that:

> The most common approach to the problem of directionality in translation theory is, however, a silent acceptance of the "traditional" conviction of the necessity to translate into one's mother tongue. Most translation theoreticians do not discuss openly the possibility of choosing one's TL in translation; however, they do covertly express their conviction that only translation into one's mother tongue guarantees a good translation. (Pokorn 2005:30)

This claim is based on the idea of the infallibility of the native speaker, and of a perfectly bilingual translator. Such an idealised translator is always the inferred translator in these theories. At the same time, if a translator is a perfect bilingual, then directionality would not be an issue. Further on in this study, we shall explore the issue of bilingualism and bilanguaging, and it will become clearer how the idealised perfect bilingual of translation theory does not hold water. Some Translation Studies scholars such as Anthony Pym have discussed at length on defining translation competence, translation teaching and the tendency of Translation Studies to rely on an idealised translator, in his defence of a minimalist approach to translation competence (Pym, 2003). Pym also questioned the concept of the ideal translator often involved in discussions around translation expertise (Pym, 1996). In a defence of a translator-centred view of translation, Zaliwska-Okrutna (2008) postulates that

> Since translation involves human minds, real or ideated, but not idealized, the theory of translation cannot confidently depend on postulates and requirements for an ideal translator or ideal translation, with no provisions made for individual mistakes, lack of skill or expertise. (2008:111).

Linguists such as Sydney Lamb also pointed out that each individual's cognitive system is unique and that understanding these systems must consider the real individual and not the ideal one (Lamb, 1992:26). An idealised translator also reflects an idealised view of fluency. This unrealistic view of fluency and the status of languages in the translator's mind makes it harder to

understand translation in non-hegemonic contexts. Such a point of view is somewhat detached from the reality of translation, it fails to hold its truth in the real world. Translation is happening every day, every hour, carried out by native and non-native speakers alike, and so the practice is not exclusive to the context of the perfect bilingual. In fact, according to Pokorn again:

> Since the claim that native speakers have an infallible ability to distinguish native speakers from non-native speakers used to pass unchallenged in applied linguistics, the majority of translation theorists accepted it and consequently demanded that texts be translated only into the translator's mother tongue. (Pokorn 2005:114)

The issue with the idealised translator or native speaker who always, infallibly, is capable of distinguishing nativeness and naturalness in a target text is also raised by Meta Grosman (2000). Such an issue highlights the correlated issue of who the translation is being done for, and why naturalness is so desirable, which are also constant debates in Translation Studies in general. One important thing to notice, however, is that a translation can and might not be focused solely on the target readership. The studies that dismiss the practice of literary L2 translation seem to assume that the target text is all there is to it. On that, Grosman argues:

> This view has been given further support by recent translation studies laying emphasis on the importance of the translator's thorough knowledge of the target culture as prerequisite for translations that can really function in the target culture in accordance with the commonly accepted opinion that translations belong to a target culture only. (...) Native speakers involved in translating, on the other hand, are assumed automatically to be highly proficient in their language and well acquainted with their own culture. (Grosman 2000:21)

This view is closely related to the idea of native-speaker authority, or native-speakerism, a topic which will be discussed more in the next chapter. In summary, native-speakerism assumes that any and all native speakers are better at all usages, genres, and contexts of their native language than a second-language speaker. Such a view is very common in those studies that assume a directionality and a perfect bilingual subject, and which deny the variety of proficiency among speakers of any language, and more strongly, genre- and

context-specific proficiency. Many Translation Studies scholars have dismissed the practice of L2 translation on the grounds that it does not sound natural, or that the results fail to read like a native text. These scholars, however, do not offer a definition of nativeness in the use of a language or in the interpretation of a text.[12] That seems to be the problem with many theorists who claim the unacceptability of the practice. Pokorn criticises this lack of definition when she concludes that:

> Since the supporters of native superiority do not define the concept of the native speaker, despite the central position they grant to this notion in their theoretical works, their categorical claims seem more than suspect. They do not provide in support of their views any proofs concerning the greater competence and proficiency of native speakers compared to those of near-native speakers and they often ignore or downgrade the possibility of translation pairs, consisting of a native and a non-native speaker of the TL. (Pokorn 2005:27)

In a pivotal thesis on the topic, Pavlović (2007) opens with a statement which helps us to see the researcher's stance:

> The author of this study had been a translator working into and out of her second language (L2), English, and L2 translation teacher for more than a decade before finding out about the "golden rule" followed by translators in major-language settings: You are only ever supposed to work into your first language. The direction of translation that for her and her colleagues was nothing out of the ordinary turned out to be "inverse," wrong, forbidden. This realization was intriguing, spurring the author's initial interest in directionality as a research topic. A questionnaire survey was conducted, which showed that more than 70% of full-time translators and interpreters in Croatia do more than half of their workload into their L2 English (Pavlović, forthcoming). In many other settings around the world that involved a "language of limited diffusion," researchers seemed to be describing similar situations. Clearly, what was unthinkable for some translators was everyday practice for others.(Pavlović, 2007:1)

[12] For more detailed overviews, see Beeby (1998/2009), Zahedi (2013), Pavlovic (2007) and Pokorn (2005).

Coming back to Pokorn, it is this golden rule which kept translation scholars from openly recognizing and encouraging the practice of L2 translation. It is also the rule responsible for the lack of theories and studies focusing on this specific type of translation. These ideas are based on the assumption of an idealised native speaker, as well as a perfect bilingual subject. In fact, Pokorn focuses on these assumptions and their failure to connect with reality. Before introducing the problematic of the perfect bilingual, she concludes, on the topic of an ideal native speaker, that:

> Some contemporary translation practitioners and theoreticians then uncritically accept the concept of an ideal native speaker as an arbiter and model of grammaticality, who masters his/her mother tongue completely and in all its details, who has access to all the hidden channels of unutterable associative connectedness between words and concepts, and can therefore also create linguistically and culturally impeccable translations. This theoretical position, however, also has an additional corollary: it ethnocentrically defends the notion of the superiority of the "natural native speaker", the innate state that can never be acquired, and thus rejects the marginal and peripheral (i.e., translators from immigrant communities and the practice of team translation) as necessarily inferior. (Pokorn 2005:27)

These assumptions of idealised linguistic subjects as L1 translators are not explicitly expressed in Translation Studies. One can see from the very beginning of the discipline that translators have been increasingly asked to be more perfectly bi- or multilingual and multicultural subjects. In his seminal work on the linguistics of translation, for example, Catford claims that "discovery of textual equivalents is based on the competent bilingual informant or translator" (Catford, 1965:27). That is, he does not define this informant/translator as perfect, but it is clear that only a competent bilingual is capable of identifying equivalencies in translation.

With Gutt (1990) and Bell (1991), for example, the translator is not only bi*lingual* but also bi*cultural*, cross-culturally competent in both language in general and specific communicative skills. In contemporary Translation Studies, the ideal(ised) translator is a bi- or multicultural subject. This trend has

continued in more recent theories of translation, such as with the Cultural Turn in Translation Studies, identified/inaugurated by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990), who idealise a high degree of expertise in both cultures involved in the act of translation. This demand for expertise by the translator not only extends to linguistic and cultural knowledge, but also to a knowledge of various fields, registers and discourses (Neubert and Shreve, 1992; Snell-Hornby, 1992; Cao, 1996). In Skopos theory, according to Vermeer (1978), whether such an idealised bilingual and multicultural subject exists is irrelevant. Even if directionality is not openly regarded as an issue (perhaps because it is not an issue at all), would this theory contradict the dominant trend of the L1 translation norm? After all, if the skopos is fulfilled, the direction of translation does not seem to pose a problem, or at least it is not important from this theoretical viewpoint. Twisting the core of the L1 translation norm, if we take Christiane Nord's proposition that "the translator might not even belong to the addressed audience or the addressed culture" (Nord, 2011:24) when performing L1 translation, and this is seen by the scholar as a "drawback", then couldn't we argue that L2 translation works best precisely because the translator is part of the intended audience of the source text?

The rule when opposing or shunning L2 translation has, in general, to do with the concepts of "naturalness" and "authenticity". Translation Studies scholars such as Newmark (1988), Samuelsson-brown (1995), Chesterman (2004), Duff (1989), among others, have all considered L2 translation to be on the unnatural side of the spectrum or even blamed the interference of the translator's native language for the negative aspects of the target text. Newmark, for example, in his *Textbook of Translation* is categoric: "Translating into your language of habitual use is the only way you can translate naturally and accurately and with maximum effectiveness" (Newmark, 1988:3). The author does not further define what he means by language of habitual use, but a positive here is that the words native speaker or mother tongue, which are often applied in this norm, were not mentioned. However, according to Zahedi, none of these scholars:

> provide any objective data or research as proof for making such claims. L2 translators are thought to be unable to grasp the feel of the language into which they

> are translating, thus constantly producing unnatural and unacceptable output (Zahedi, 2013:45)

Marmaridou (1996) is one of the scholars who puts some of these claims to the test, looking at the issue of directionality through the lens of cognitive linguistics. Considering that cognition is the structural categorization of the world in the mind, this means that there are different structures to different languages. Therefore, speakers of different languages see the world and categorise it according to the structures of their mother tongue. Marmaridou considers translation to be the textual realization of the conceptual mechanism of metaphor. Translation is also, according to her, the transfer of conceptual structures from Source Language to Target Language (Marmaridou, 1996:50). In this light, since speakers activate given conceptual structures according to their mother tongue, directionality is an important issue to take into account. Marmaridou assumes that since this is the case, when translating into a non-mother tongue, there is a degree of interference of the mother tongue in the retextualisation of the source text and this interference can be seen in inadequate style in the target text. The author concludes that, indeed, translation into one's mother tongue results in a better text than the opposite direction. This conclusion is supported by the fact that L2 translations were more sign-oriented than L1 translation, which was more sense-oriented.[13] However, her study, one of the first to tackle this issue, is lacking in several areas. One of them is the fact that the students in her study were not allowed to use a dictionary. This approach, which was outdated even then, is nowadays extremely inconsistent with the reality of translators, both literary and technical. The reasons for adopting this approach are understandable, but this renders the study somewhat flawed, because no one, even a native speaker, relies solely on memory when translating a text. Translation scholars who study and debate the topic of translation competence

[13] Marmaridou is using Wolfgang Lörscher's (1992) definition of sense and sign orientation in the translation process. According to Lörscher: "subjects can approach translations in basically two different ways: sign-/form-oriented or sense-oriented. In sign or form-oriented translating, subjects transfer source-language text segments by focusing on their forms (=succession of signs) and by replacing them with target-language forms. This transfer of forms/signs is brought about without recourse to the sense of the two text segments involved"(Lörscher, 1992: 408).

largely agree that translation competence is complex and involves much more problem-solving and similarly extra-linguistic skills than simply having a large lexical repertoire in two languages (Pym, 2003). To put it in simple terms: translators are not walking/living dictionaries. In a classroom context this practice may be more acceptable, but the issue stands. Moreover, a cognitive-semantic approach alone is not definitive in rendering a text acceptable or unacceptable. However, Marmaridou's study proves some worthy points, namely that there is a substantial difference between student/novice and expert/professional translators, no matter the direction. In this, she proves that in a sign-to-sense orientation spectrum, the student translator who translates into a non-mother tongue is at the sign end, while the professional translator who is translating into a mother tongue is at the sense-end. These results assume that sense-oriented is preferred over sign-oriented, which is not necessarily an idea that all translation scholars would agree on.

David Bellos, in a recent foray into Translation Studies for a mixed audience of scholars and the general public, mentions L2 translation only briefly, but sees it in a positive light:

> The passport you hold doesn't have anything to do with your competence as a translator; nor does the language that you learned in your infant environment. What matters is whether you are or feel you are at home in the language into which you are translating. It doesn't really help to call it 'native', and it helps even less to insist you can only translate into a 'mother' tongue. The paths by which speakers come to feel at home in a language are far too varied for the range of their abilities to be forced into merely two slots ('native' and 'non-native'), however broad or flexible the definitions of those slots may be. (Bellos, 2016:63-64)

Some authors, even when talking about translation, multilingualism, and identity, do not mention directionality in their reasoning, probably assuming the natural direction of L2-L1. As an example, in the book *Translation and Identity* (2006), Michael Cronin delves deep into many issues surrounding national language and multilingualism in translation as well as the tension between minority and majority languages. He even goes into detail about the many issues revolving around *lingua franca* and the use of English globally.

Directionality is usually invisible in his discussion. However, in his theorization of the act of translation, there is also a less loaded use of words to define the direction of translation, and no use of phrases like "own language", "mother tongue", "natural language". This could reflect having a theoretical framework and translation ideology that is open to such a practice, even if these scholars do not openly tackle the issue of directionality. This is true for many modern translation scholars. According to Pokorn (2005:33), Lawrence Venuti himself, even though defending the foreignizing approach, never raises the issue of the translator's mother tongue. He also ignores the fact that, among his examples, Lefevere is a Belgian translator who undertook a translation of Goethe into English, neither German nor English being his native language. By wording his theory using the idea of Source Language as "foreign" and the Target Language/Culture as the "domestic", Venuti furthers these hidden assumptions. This, again, could point to either an assumption of a natural direction in translation, or a more open approach which does not deny or acknowledge the specifics of L2 translation. This is the case for the majority of translation scholars. And this is why there are so few examples of scholars who are openly against L2 translation.

The studies I was able to unearth within the framework of this thesis are limited to those that can be found in English, or in any of the languages I am able to access. Some overviews on directionality from contexts other than the European/Western ones include Wang (2009, 2011), who points out the more recent Chinese policy of outward translation carried out by native Chinese translators and the fact that this practice has foregrounded the need for more directionality studies in the Chinese context as well. In the Arabic context, Jamoussi (2015) distinguishes between translation-as-import and translation-as-export, where the latter largely uses L2 translation as a means of fulfilling its export goals. Drawing together the driving forces of visibility, preservation and resistance, results in L2 literary translation as "a socially and culturally plausible modus operandi" as well as "a relatively common practice and, more importantly, a conceptually viable phenomenon in the Arab world"

(2015:173).[14] Within the African context, more specifically in the Horn of Africa (Eritrea and Ethiopia), Di Giovanni & Dirar (2015) offered an overview of how the issue of directionality is seen in African translation history, focusing more on cases of missionary activities in the region. Although not mentioning the term directionality explicitly, they show how Paul Bandia sees the issue of directionality under a postcolonial light:

> European colonization added another dimension to the vibrant intercultural activity on the African continent. In addition to the horizontal translation and intercultural activity among Africans themselves, and to some extent including the Arabic tradition, there was now a vertical translation practice, based on unequal power relations, between European and African language cultures. In this vertical relationship, translation became much more than a mere exchange of cultures or texts, and assumed an ideological basis which determined and influenced the orientation of translation in the recording and transcription of African oral culture in European languages, as well as in the conveyance of Western civilization in African society. (2009:5)

The authors use Bandia's differentiation between horizontal and vertical translation practices pre- and post-colonisation, respectively, as relating to the topic of directionality. We can see here that Bandia claims that in pre-colonial Africa translation exchanges were more horizontal, and that power relations between Europe and Africa caused these exchanges to become vertical. Di Giovanni & Dirar (2015) question the naivety of a claim such as this, as power structures and imbalances also existed in pre-colonial Africa. However, for our purposes it is interesting how specifically the relation between European and African languages was established as a vertical one,

[14] Jamoussi, in his conclusions, draws attention to the often-overlooked practice of collaborative translation or of other agents collaborating in the translation process. As he puts it: "After the typical profile of L2 translators was investigated, the success of translation projects making use of L2 translation was thus found to depend less on the use of this translation direction, atypical though it may be, than on the framework of the relationships between the exporting and importing agents which these projects construct and the locus of the L2 translator within this framework. Thus, within an international context where cooperation between export and import agents is becoming increasingly important, projects that integrate all agents within the export circuit are doomed to failure" (Jamoussi, 2015:183). Wang also points out how collaboration is less frowned upon in the Chinese translation context, which may explain why there are more cases of L2 translation happening in these contexts through collaborative translations between L1 and L2 speakers of the target language.

inevitably influencing the way translation and cultural exchanges happen between the two continents and perhaps also influencing directionality practices in turn. For the moment, these are the academic studies on directionality beyond the European/Western context that I was able to access and consider, but as we can see, from the fact that most of these directionality studies are quite recent, from the last two decades mostly, slowly the academic paths are being paved for more and more diverse studies of directionality. The field of L2 translation is, however, still underdeveloped. The norm against L2 translation is full of unproven claims. It is not that difficult to go back in time to before the establishment of Translation Studies and see how L2 translation is, in fact, more common than we would expect.

1.2.4 Explicit views on Directionality in Translation Process Research

In the field of Translation Process Research (TPR), there has been an attempt to study directionality by empirical means. In the third-ever academic conference entirely dedicated to the topic of L2 translation, a three-day conference held at Charles University, Prague in September 2019, most papers were within the field of TPR and translation teaching. As an attendee and paper presenter, I was, together with three other researchers, the exception in bringing a study about directionality that was both 1) not process-oriented, and 2) dealing with literary translation. However, with time, my thesis evolved towards looking at the translators' process using interviews. This means that my study is found somewhere in between translation process and translation theory. The conference participants were highly international and multilingual, and only one of the researchers was a native speaker of English. These scholars were all writing research in English as their L2 about L2 translation.

Translation Process Research is a subfield of Translation Studies which deals with the cognitive processing of translation, and uses research tools such as key-logging, eye-tracking, think-aloud protocols, Machine Translation, and even, in some cases, fMRI screening. Often, TPR triangulates data collected through these tools with other interdisciplinary data, such as cognitive tests (e.g., working memory), textual analyses, surveys/questionnaires, among

others. Topics that are highlighted and prioritised in this subarea include the differences between novice and expert translators, time and structural constraints, decision-making and problem-solving. Directionality is also a topic that can be found in such studies. The neutral way in which directionality is often tested in TPR also means that, in most cases, there is no value judgement on which directionality is better. Maybe Literary Translation Studies could take a leaf out of TPR's book and study directionality with a more neutral outlook, seen as a fact of life and a field for empirical work, for testing hypotheses rather than making general, unbacked claims. The present work is not within Translation Process Research. However, it is with a short overview of L2 translation and directionality studies within the area of TPR that I aim to show how such a practice can be seen explicitly in a more balanced light.

By and large Translation Process Research that deals with directionality does so with the aim of testing potential differences in the translation process between different directionalities, rather than attempting to decide on which direction is the better one. A value judgement between groups or participants is not usually the goal of empirical endeavours, but it is important to point out that most of these studies exist precisely because different translation directionalities are a reality of the profession, something that the L1 translation norm ignores. Directionality studies within TPR, by focusing on cognitive data, are more preoccupied with understanding the different cognitive paths, loads and strategies involved in translating into different directions. Similarly to what happens in Bilingual research (attempts at understanding the bilingual brain and its differences to a monolingual, using psychological studies and neuroimaging, for example), directionality in TPR is tested empirically in order to understand where the differences, if any, lie. As is usual in this type of research, an important attribute to separating the groups under scrutiny is experience: experts vs novice translators. Some studies, like that of Whyatt (2019), concluded that text type had more of an impact on task time than directionality, but that, overall, the latter did not have a statistically significant effect on task time. According to the author, "Directionality effects interplay with text-type effects, and possibly with the translators' individual experience and working style" (Whyatt, 2019:94). Whyatt's findings diverge from other

similar studies in the area, such as Buchweitz & Alves (2006), according to whom:

> Translating from the first language into the second language (Pt-Eng) required timewise approximately 30 percent more of the translators in this study. Hence, it slowed down their rhythm. This result is relevant not only for an academically oriented (or educationally) discussion of translation. It is likewise important for learning the ropes of the profession, considering that time, in terms of deadlines, is a very valuable commodity for the job of the translator. (Buchweitz & Alves, 2006:251-252)

However, as Whyatt contends: "The difference in the findings can be explained by many factors, including the number of participants, language-pair specificity and the length or intensity of professional experience in providing L1 → L2 translation" (2019:94). And, in fact, other studies in TPR reached similar results to those of Whyatt (Silva et al, 2017). Revisiting Buchweitz & Alves, the issue of time and effort in translation, even though a valuable commodity for the daily life of technical translators, would have different meanings for the professional lives of literary translators. Deadlines exist and do govern the work of literary translators. However, literary translation jobs arguably tend to last longer than translation projects of technical texts. Therefore, strict deadlines do not influence literary translations as much as their non-literary counterparts. Even for those studies which concluded that there was a significant time deficit in the L1-L2 direction compared to L2-L1, with reservations, one could argue that the agent affected in this transaction would be the translator, not the final text. Most Translation Process Research dealing with directionality aims to test task time and cognitive effort, some with noticeable differences between what TPR researchers call DT (Direct Translation) and IT (Indirect Translation), L1 and L2 translation, respectively. However, a great number of studies also reach the conclusion that the difference in task time between the two directions is not statistically relevant. In many of these, the conclusion is that more research on the topic is needed, as well as the caveat that such conclusions are limited and influenced by many factors, such as the idiosyncrasies of the translators involved and of specific language combinations. According to Ferreira & Schwieter:

> As the number of studies in translation process research and, most specifically, cognitive translation process research increases, scholars must soon offer more contributions to directionality in translation and shed light on IT specificities as a consequence of its high demand throughout the world. Future work must not forget cultural and identity aspects of the translator as they most certainly shape TT construction. For decades, translation process research has borrowed from theories and methodologies from other disciplines, yet IT has received limited attention. We are optimistic that this interest will change in the very near future. (Ferreira & Schwieter, 2017:102)

There is, however, one last topic to heed upon concluding this section. That is the fact that in the literature of TPR studies dealing with directionality, once again, most of this work has been carried out and written in English, by non-native speakers of English, in countries that do not have English as one of their official languages: Wyatt's work is in Poland, Pavlovic's in Slovenia, Buchweitz & Alves, Ferreira's (2013, 2014) in Brazil, Wang's (2009, 2011) in China, among several others spread around the globe. Directionality being studied and described through exophonic writing seems to be a tried and tested reality in many contexts.

1.2.5 Implicit views

Translation paratexts or commentary can be considered the early form of translation theory. Cicero's ideas on rhetorical translation, St Jerome's Letter to Pammachius and Bruni's *De interpretatione recta*, are some among the age-old discussions around word-for-word or sense-for-sense translation. However, only some of these would mention the languages in question. Following a historical timeline, we start with Renaissance Italy, when Leonardo Bruni states that:

> The translator should therefore begin by ensuring; that he knows the language he is going to translate from as well as is humanly possible and he will never acquire that knowledge without a repeated, varied, and accurate reading of all kinds of writers. Furthermore, he should also know the language he translates into in such a way that he is able to dominate it and to hold it entirely in his power. (Bruni, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:83)

Among the scholars of the northern Renaissance, Erasmus holds a similar view. He states that, in order to turn a text from Greek into Latin with perfection, one needs to be "an exceptional craftsman who has greatly enriched his knowledge of the two languages by accumulating an abundance of material" (Erasmus, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:60). As can be seen, none of these early and well-known examples of translation treatises consider the need for "natural" fluency in any one of the languages involved. One needs to be learned in it, study the language, and have a deep knowledge of it, but the idea of a national language or native-speakerism was still in its infancy. Here we find no reference to an inclination for the mother tongue. However, seventeenth-century English poet John Dryden claimed in a translation preface that "no man is capable of translating poetry who, besides a genius to that art, is not a master both of his author's language, and *of his own*" (Dryden, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:104, emphasis mine).

In the late eighteenth century, we have Johann Gottfried Herder as an example, who claims that "the real translator should therefore adapt words, manners of speaking, and combinations from a more developed language *to his mother tongue*"(Herder, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:74, emphasis mine). In fact, in many of the more modern views on the translation practice, the issue of one's "own language" or the natural language is much more prominent than in early translation theory and history. Victor Hugo, in the preface to a translation of Shakespeare, claims that "to translate a foreign writer is to add to *your own* national poetry" (Hugo, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:18; emphasis mine), while Goethe says that "Every translator is a prophet among *his own people*" (Goethe, as cited in Lefevere, 1992:25, emphasis mine). Friedrich Schleiermacher, in the foundational essay *On the Different Methods of Translating* [*Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens*] (1813), even though in many instances he uses more neutral language to refer to L1 and L2, does employ formulations such as "own language" [eigene Sprache] vs. "foreign" [fremde Sprache] throughout the text.[15] As we can see, theorization about the act of translation and the

[15] "Should he really venture to take two men who are as far distant from one another as his countryman who speaks **only his own language** and the writer himself, and to bring them

languages involved has changed from a more open view of the need for proficiency in two (or more) languages, to an idea of a translator as someone who renders a foreign text into their own national language, to a domestic readership composed of his fellow countrymen.[16] As we can see, a shift occurred sometime around the eighteenth to nineteenth century with regard to the translator's fluency in the languages used and attitudes towards L2 translation. In this part of the chapter, I give a historical survey of directionality in early commentary about the act of translation. The specific links between language and nation and a historical overview of translation into Latin will be presented below, as an attempt to show that the ideas of national language and the L1 translation norm are more recent and arbitrary than we think.

1.2.6 Challenges and tensions in the theorization and practice of L2 literary translation

The scholars whose studies were reviewed in the first part of this chapter all agree on one issue: that directionality is often invisible, ignored by Translation Studies at large. The very fact that a gathering of opinions and studies on directionality in this area does not yield a sufficient number of results and that most of these call for more studies is telling of the current status of L2 translation within Translation Studies. In many cases, the term which draws these studies together is directionality, as there are many differing views on which other terms to use: L2 translation, A-B Translation, Inverse Translation, Non-native translation, etc. A cornerstone in the L1 translation norm, drawing from Petrova's essay at the beginning of this chapter, is that a translator's relationship with language is "fixed and unchanging". Alongside relationship with language, we can add translation competence and second language fluency, which are also not fixed, nor unchanging. As Trainor puts it:

> Although the question of whether a translator is born or made is still a matter of debate, few doubt that practice is the key to improvement in a variety of fields, and translation is no exception. Just as written expression

---

together in so immediate a relationship as that between a writer and his original reader?" (Schleiermacher in Venuti, 2012:47).

[16] As we can see in these early theories of translation, the translator is assumed to be a man.

> techniques can be acquired, we are convinced that we can also acquire skills to improve our ability to translate, even into a second language. (Trainor, 2004:60)[17]

This begs the question, once again, of who benefits from dogmas such as the L1 translation norm. In what way would Translation Studies be weakened or severely affected as a discipline by allowing translators to translate into a second language or be trained in it. Questions such as these have yet to be answered, and the answer may lie in 1. a greater dialogue between the many areas within the discipline of Translation Studies, which often do not benefit from an exchange between themselves (and thus remain monodisciplinary in an inherently interdisciplinary area) 2. a closer look at the foundations of such monological tenets, and 3. asking L2 translators themselves how they see their practice. The present thesis is my attempt at answering these questions.

1.3 L2 translation pre-Translation Studies

1.3.1 Translation into Latin – an Early Modern form of L2 translation

Contrary to what one might expect, and to what the near invisibility of L2 translation within Translation Studies suggests, translation into a non-mother tongue was not always an exception (Pokorn, 2005). In fact, it became so after higher esteem was accorded to vernaculars, and more strongly after the institution of the nation-state and its strong ties to a national language. The advent of printing created certain genres and codes for this new medium, the written text, which sped up the development of written language as well as of language prescriptivism. This was because more language users making use of such medium called for a code to be agreed upon. Literature and religious texts provided fertile ground for translation at the beginning of an exchange, at least Europe-wide, of texts from different languages. The historian Peter Burke

[17] "Aunque la pregunta de si el traductor nace o se hace sigue siendo objeto de debate, pocos ponen en duda que la práctica es clave para mejorar en diversidad de ámbitos y la traducción no es una excepción. Al igual que se pueden adquirir técnicas de expresión escrita, estamos convencidos de que también podemos adquirir destrezas para mejorar nuestra habilidad para traducir, incluso a una segunda lengua." All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

(2007) specifically analyses translations from vernacular languages into Latin in the Early Modern period in Europe and provides an overview of how dynamic the traffic of translation between different languages was. In this sense, Latin worked as a lingua franca.

The written form of European vernaculars themselves were nowhere near standardization, competing with many different varieties and local dialects. Therefore, a lingua franca was necessary for scholars and European intellectuals to communicate amongst themselves, as well as to have access to books. However, as is clear from the history of the Latin language, Latin, in medieval and Early Modern times, no longer had any native speakers in the modern sense of the term. [18] So, bearing this in mind, the many translations into Latin from the vernacular which were common practice in this period were, one could say, L2 translations. However, it is hard to put an exact figure to the number of translations into Latin in this period if the aim is to compare them to translations from Latin into vernaculars. According to Burke, this is because translations into Latin, at the point of writing his book in 2007 had been "relatively neglected" (2007:65). Burke mentions some general studies such as those by Grant (1954) and Binns (1990). The scene has changed since then, with recent studies of translations into and out of vernacular languages.[19] However, we must admit here Burke is trying to pin down the niche translation practice of translation into Latin, this specific direction of translation.[20] In the Middle Ages, a good number of the books produced were in Latin. In *The*

[18] For the purpose of the argument here, Latin is not considered to be a native language or mother tongue, for it is neither learnt at the mother's knee (Bloomfield 1933), a definition that equates a native speaker to a mother tongue speaker, nor is it the official language of the society in which the individual grew up. Contemporary linguists prefer to use the terms L1 for the first language of acquisition, or rather, one's native language, and L2 for a language that can be considered 'foreign' or learnt later in life. For more about the debate around native speakers, see Davies (2003) as well as the next chapter.

[19] For a few examples of this, see Fransen and Cook (2017), Coldiron (2016), Brown (2022), Campbell and Mills (2012), among others.

[20] The timelines are not always clear. The official definition of early modern encompasses the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, but in the UK context there are some that define this period by the language (Middle English) or by dynasty (encompassing thus Tudor and Stuart England). The invention of the printing press by Johannes Guttenberg in 1440 is placed somewhat around the start of the period, and the revolution in language such an event catalysed comes together with the advent of the Renaissance in Europe.

Coming of The Book, Febvre & Martin (1977) provide an overview of the number of books published in Latin and in other languages prior to 1500:

> A high proportion of books printed before 1500 (i.e. of the books referred to as incunabula) are in Latin - about 77 per cent. About 7 per cent are in Italian, 4-6 per cent in German, 4-5 per cent in French and just over 1 per cent in Flemish. Religious works are easily predominant among the books of this period, making up 45 per cent of the whole, with classical, medieval and contemporary literatures coming to just over 30 per cent, law just over 10 per cent and books on scientific subjects about 10 per cent. (Febvre and Martin, 1997:249)

These data show that Latin was the print language[21] of the medieval period. This can sound counterintuitive when considering that texts in the medieval period are published/disseminated before the advent of the printing press. Anachronistically, then, Anderson's definition of print language would not necessarily fit the case of Latin in medieval Europe. Latin was, given the circumstances, the lingua franca of medieval Europe, in terms of printing/written language. The vernaculars of the period, such as Old French, Occitan, Middle English, Middle High German, Old Norse, Italian, among others, were used in European medieval textual cultures prior and after print culture, but the standardisation of spelling and the further changes that took these languages to modern vernaculars would happen as a result of the printing revolution. The fact that the overwhelming majority of texts around 1500 were religious, also points to the function of book circulation in the early history of publishing, that these were initially used as a medium for dissemination of religious ideals, coming with the many protestant waves that swept through Europe in the 1500s.

---

[21] The use of the word print language, as per Anderson's (1983) definition, relates to the concept of print capitalism. The changes that came with religious and political movements and the invention of the printing press helped cause a different approach to the Bible, making people read it in the vernacular so that they would have their own interpretation of the word of God. This opened a whole new market, and the printing industry flourished with many new editions and translations of sacred works, as well as classics. This higher demand also meant that these vernaculars had to be standardized, and the growth of the printing market also meant a growth of literacy in the general population, since they now had a better chance of accessing these products. However, the unification of local dialects into a standardized national language meant also that the variety of spoken languages and dialects was erased or suppressed in favour of the practicality of standardisation that print capitalism needed and helped move forward.

The relative lack of scholarship on translations into Latin in the Early Modern period might, according to Burke, be due to the fact that it seems counter-intuitive to translate from a modern language into an ancient one, and translations into Latin of literary classics were seen as curiosities (Burke, 2007:65). This points again to an overall neglect of this type of translation. It does not reflect, however, the fact that these translations were being carried out and read extensively in the Early Modern period. Burke found 1,140 published translations into Latin between the invention of printing (1440) and the year 1799. According to him:

> The number of these translations testifies not only to the widespread knowledge of Latin at this time, but also to the fact that many educated people outside frontier regions found foreign vernaculars difficult if not impossible to read. Compared to what was available for the teaching of Latin, facilities for the teaching of Italian, Spanish and French in schools, colleges and universities were extremely limited, while they were virtually non-existent for the teaching of other languages. English, for example, was rarely taught before the eighteenth century. (Burke 2007:65-66)

Again, with this information, we can gather that even though Latin was not a mother tongue for translators in the medieval and Early Modern period, it was the print language which they were most used to, and which was widespread before the vernaculars gained their own strength and standardised form. Translation into, but also from Latin, and the linguistic exchange and borrowings that came from that, would also play an important role in the creation of the national languages and literatures.[22]

---

[22] This was, therefore, the beginning of an influence translation had on the vernaculars. The translator's ordeal of rendering new concepts and a new culture in a new language was responsible for the enrichment of the vernaculars. Many of the early translators who added words into the English language, for example, did so by "tarnishing" the language with borrowings from the source languages they were translating. Nama (1995) investigates the legacy of translators for the creation and institution of national languages and national literatures. In the case of England, Nama points to Alfred the Great as being the English monarch responsible for noticing the decay of literacy in England after the destruction of monasteries by the Vikings, and who "set out to gain political control over the English-speaking peoples in the South by appealing to "a shared sense of Englishness, conveyed by the language" (McCrum et al. 1986:69). Another king, Edward III, was the first to address the parliament in the English language, and Henry V was responsible for the change in official records from French and Latin into English.

Burke splits his analysis into 50-year time periods, from the fifty years before 1500 to the late eighteenth century. The data shows that, from a meagre start of only five texts translated into Latin before 1500, peaking with 387 in the first half of the seventeenth century, and then declining again towards the end of the century, Latin was more frequently a language of translation than previously imagined (Burke, 2007:68). The rise in numbers can be explained by the rise of humanist thought, and the spread of print, among others. The decline in numbers can be explained with the beginning of the valorisation of the vernacular, and the process of nation-building which was still in its infancy during the period. The crucial period for translations into Latin in Europe is from 1550 to 1700, according to data gathered. According to Burke (2007:68) a lack of translation into the national languages in the early sixteenth century might be explained by a prejudice towards the vernaculars, whereas the decline in translation into Latin at the end of the period studied (late seventeenth century) may be due to the decline of Latin itself.

But where did these translations into Latin come from? Who were these translators? Who were the possible reading audiences? According to Burke, most of the texts were translated from Italian (321) and French (276).[23] English, with 159 texts, and Spanish, with 133, were not yet as universally spoken and read as they are today. German, with an important centre of printing (Köln), university culture, and the legacy of Martin Luther's linguistic

---

The first major printer in London, Caxton, and his strengthening of the London dialect through mass printing, was already influenced by foreigners using the English language and 'tarnishing' it. Caxton employed a diverse crowd, and this variety of languages and dialects helped shape the English vernacular in its infancy. According to Baugh, "the books that issued from his press and from the presses of his successors gave a currency to London English that assured more than anything its rapid adoption" (Baugh, 1957:235)

[23] Burke points out that "Given the lack of any bibliography of translations into Latin, or indeed any complete catalogue of publications in any European country in this period (apart from Britain, Belgium and the Netherlands), all generalizations offered here must be taken as extremely provisional, and the figures quoted as no more than indications of relative importance" (2007:66). However, he adds no disclaimer to the fact that he is using words such as Italian, French, or German as if they were already standard, national languages in Early Modern Europe, when the history of these language proves otherwise. The author seems to have put together both langue d'oïl (Old French) and langue d'oc (Occitan), and the many dialects coming from both these major groups that make up what today is considered to be French. It seems that some of Burke's categorisations must be taken with a pinch of salt, as language loyalty was not necessarily a feature for the multilingual reality of many of these translators.

and religious revolution, came far behind, with 77 texts, followed by other "minor" European languages of the period.

It is clear from the data collected by Burke that Italian and French were the leading source languages for translations into Latin in this period. However, who was carrying out the majority of these translations? Of the 557 translators who have been identified,

> German speakers contribute at least 164 known translators. The French speakers (including inhabitants of the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and French Switzerland) contribute 100, while English speakers (including Irish, Scots and Welsh) contribute 60. The Dutch and Flemish speakers, not always easy to identify, contribute at least 48, a high figure given the relatively small size of that population. On the other hand, the Italians contribute only 46 translators (…) It should be added that the British, French and Italians almost always translated works from their own languages, leaving the Germans and the Netherlanders to translate the Spanish texts and many of the Italian ones as well. (Burke 2007:70)

This shows an even more interesting trend that goes beyond the issue of L1-L2 directionality. If the majority of source texts were from Italian and French, but Italian and French translators were not the majority, then this means that at least some of these texts were translated into Latin by German speakers, the majority group. This leads us to conclude that at least a substantial number of these translations were not only carried out into a non-mother tongue (Latin) from a native language, but interestingly, from a non-mother tongue into another.[24] These statistics presented by Burke are, however, clouded by generalisation in terms of these vernaculars and their 'native speakers'. For example, what is the definition of German speaker in this case? Germany at the Early Modern period, had 6 print languages (West Central German, East Central German, Swabian, Alemannic, East Franconian, Austro-Bavarian) But who were these translators?

[24] It is important to note, however, that the Renaissance scholars and clerics who carried out most of these translations did speak French and other Romance languages, using them as an instrumental language. This fact helps to counteract our contemporary idea that a Renaissance individual living in the area now known as Germany had to speak German as their first language or have it as their most-used language.

> From the sociological point of view we find a group dominated, unsurprisingly, by the clergy, especially the Catholic clergy and above all the Jesuits, who contributed over eighty translators. Then came Protestant pastors, teachers (in schools and universities), writers and physicians. (Burke 2007:69)

Germany was an important centre for publishing at the time, especially for texts coming from the Spanish-speaking world, with Mainz, Munich and Cologne being the main centres for this. Cologne was especially central, "where certain publishers, such as Kinck, Mylius and Crithius seem to have specialized in works of devotion" (Burke 2007:72). The effort of the German market, especially after Luther, to spread the Protestant word across Europe, is one of the reasons for this prominence. Since religious texts were abundant and accounted for the majority of texts translated at the time, and the reformation included the idea that works of piety in other languages should be translated and distributed, Germans were at the centre of these changes. Germany, with its unification in the nineteenth century, was also a driving force in the new ideas about nationalism and language, a subject to which we will return later.

As we can see from the data presented by Burke, translation in medieval and Early Modern times was more visible, and the proficiency of the translator working in the languages used was not necessarily defined by an opposition between mother tongue and foreign language. But why did this situation shift?[25] With the coming of Neo-Latin, humanists distanced Latin even more from a language of everyday use. Already a high-status language, Latin's development into Neo-Latin distanced the language, turning it into a more Ciceronian, highly meta version of itself. This distancing is considered by

[25] As stated before, religious, and political changes in the Early Modern period were responsible for a shift in the position of the vernaculars for official affairs. According to Nama (2012): "The sixteenth century was a period of effervescence distinguished by two great movements: humanism, whose reaction against the scholastic tradition led to renewed interest in ancient languages and literature, and the Reformation, which also advocated a return to sources, in this case to the Bible in its original Greek and Hebrew languages. During this period of emerging ideas and religious conflicts, of discoveries and inventions, translation was to enter a new golden age. But the pivotal role of translation derived primarily from the rise of a national language and literature (Nama, [1995] 2012: 34).

Benedict Anderson as one of the factors which gave impetus to the same vernacularizing thrust mentioned above:

> Thanks to the labours of the Humanists in reviving the broad literature of pre-Christian antiquity and spreading it through the print-market, a new appreciation of the sophisticated stylistic achievements of the ancients was apparent among the trans-European intelligentsia. The Latin they now aspired to write became more and more Ciceronian, and, by the same token, increasingly removed from ecclesiastical and everyday life. (Anderson, 1983:39)

This was the change from a Latin that was used by many speakers of different languages as a lingua franca and translated into quite heavily in the early days of the printing press into a Ciceronian style that preferred high eloquence and rhythm in the writing of works in Latin. Such a change in the character of Latin can be identified as one of the reasons why Latin was ultimately dropped in favour of vernacular print-languages. [26]

In contemporary public discourse about English as a lingua franca, there is an inherent fear that English too might become a non-vernacular, a lingua franca only, thus losing its character.[27] That is, that English is becoming a language of communication (Kommunikationssprache) rather than a language of identification (Identifikationssprache) (cf. Hüllen 1992) thus losing its soft power and becoming merely a tool as it is used in countries as a second, foreign language (see Kitsou 2016). This is a fear that supports and feeds linguistic gatekeeping practices when it comes to the use of English and translation into English. For the moment, it is important to point out that L2 translations into English are the focus of this work. There are countless other language combinations that do not even touch the realm of English, therefore one could find even more evidence against the L1 translation norm in the several different language combinations that do not go through English, or are

---

[26] Cicero's concept of *humanitas* was taken by the humanists as applied to *caritas*, the Christian concept of charity, and thus a specific kind of Latin aimed at spreading these ideals was born. According to Bloemendal "The humanists expressed their views in a kind of Latin which also recalled the classical use of the language, as distinct from medieval Latin practices. Therefore, we tend to label their language 'neo-Latin'". (Bloemendal, 2017: 244)

[27] For more on this, see Widdowson (1994).

unknown to anglophone Translation Studies. However, English has been used as a relay language for translations when there was no one who could do the specific language pair required, thus making English act as interference, for indirect translations, for example. This situation is becoming increasingly rarer, but there is no denying English is a global, powerful language, and translating into English confers power. In Translation Studies English is also the lingua franca, used and spoken and written by many non-anglophone scholars. Yet, the L1 norm features more notably in the works of anglophone scholars and, to some extent, in the writing of western Europeans as well, who, I would argue, have been more heavily influenced by the nation-state monolingual ideology.

For a world that has become strongly ideologically monolingual, fed by the historical amnesia that sees languages and nations as bounded entities, to translate in the 'wrong' direction is a transgression, an unnatural, possibly non-existent phenomenon. However, as we can see from the studies above, as well as in the explicit and implicit bias against L2 translation within the discipline of Translation Studies and in the literary translation market, these views have not been appropriately tested, and when put to the test did not reach conclusive enough results to support a rebuttal of L2 translation. Nonetheless, the L1 translation norm is still thriving. Some anecdotal information would point to a slow change in the way the practice is viewed by translators, editors and scholars, but within the scope of this work, before we dive into the interviews conducted with L2 translators, we need to revisit the historical timeline and epistemic evolution of concepts such as monolingualism, multilingualism, mother tongue, native speaker, translingualism and exophony, among other terminologies that will help us understand how such a rule came to be. This historical and terminological review will not, however, have the aim to add yet another strict term for defining the practice of translating into a second language. In our attempt at naming things and understanding how these names appeared and have been used, we may be able to displace some of the powerful foundation stones of the L1 translation meme.

Chapter 2 – Monophones, Mother Tongues: Creating the native

> *Proficiency in the adopted language alone decided whether integration was accomplished or not, a measuring stick that perpetuated and reinvented the migrants' outsider status; their foreignness, the accent, oral or written, betrayed all confidence of belonging and served as an instrument of exclusion. […] seen in this light, the foreign language can be perceived as monolithic, immutable and sacrosanct, the standard language as a system of exclusion and the scrupulous mastery of it as an impossible ideal, a Sisyphean undertaking. (Stoklosinski, 2014:20)*

This chapter will concern itself with the coming-of-age of the monolingual ideal. This contrasts with chapter three, which will deal with all that is multiple and all that defies monolingual and monocultural ideals. In chapter two we will explore the history of monolingualism, that of the national language, and the many myths that uphold such a strong monolith: language loyalty, the ties between nation and language, monolingual biases and norms, native-speakerism, the mother tongue and the family romance. The chapter concludes using Yildiz's (2012) proposition of a post-monolingual paradigm, before the thesis moves on to less monotopic views of language. The aim of this chapter is to show both the charged history of these concepts surrounding languages as well as their recency. These concepts may also serve certain viewpoints that do not take the plurality of language practices into consideration. My argument here is that translation should no longer uphold such outdated values. As we will see in the interviews with L2 translators, these values still largely inform discourse around language, even by language practitioners (in this case, translators). At the same time, the fourteen translators interviewed defy such strict, normative monolingual categorisations.

2.1 The Middle Ages and Meta-Linguistic Awareness: Attitudes to Language

Language was already a topic of discussion for writers, philologists, and philosophers in medieval and Early Modern Europe. The literate people of these periods were not unconcerned about language. These claims were made by historian Peter Burke in his book *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (2004). As we have seen in the previous chapter, Burke also provided an

overview of translations into Latin in medieval and Early Modern Europe. The two contributions are heavily intertwined, which is why they are in dialogue in the present thesis. Even though one of the claims in the present chapter is that national languages and monolingualism are fairly recent phenomena, we can see in a timeline a growing anxiety about language, especially in regard to competing European languages. In fact, growing concerns about language loyalty, language death, deficits and gains, crises and imperialism were present before the concept of a national language and the timeline points to the influence of these on national monolingualism. Using Burke's study, we can summarise this process in the following manner.

In an attempt at controlling the use of a nascent national language, countries like thirteenth-century Spain were already moving toward language standardisation. From the fourteenth to the fifteenth century, there was increasing linguistic awareness in places such as Italy, England, France, and Central Europe, with precursors for vernacular awareness championing the use of vernaculars in literary writing, like Dante, for Italian, and Chaucer, for England, two generations later (Galbraith, 1941:126).[28] Furthermore, early modern Europeans were also increasingly concerned with language contact and the impact that competing languages could have on their own languages.[29] From the mid-fifteenth century onwards, a "crisis of language" started to show itself through an increasing consciousness of varieties of language. This was a gradual, not a sudden, process. In the area of philosophy, a revival of the classics also shone a light on the relation between words and things, through re-readings and translations of the works of Plato and Aristotle, among others. With more language consciousness comes more consciousness of the appeal of learning different languages. In the same period, there is a surge among the intellectual

[28] Historian Vivian Galbraith, for example, claims that it was "only in the thirteenth century that Europe began to be vernacular-conscious" (1941:124).

[29] In fifteenth-century Bohemia, for example, reformist Jan Hus was worried about German influence on Czech. In 1295, for example, Edward I of England worried that the King of France planned to invade England and wipe out the English language. At the end of the fourteenth century, the King of England set out a decree for the destruction of the Welsh language. In eastern Europe, Polish chroniclers were already worried about extermination of the Polish language by Teutonic neighbours. Ironically enough, there are records of speeches in the English parliament against the invasion of the French and their language, which were delivered in French (cf. Burke, 2004).

elites and other groups of people learning Greek and Hebrew, and different European vernaculars. It is at this time as well that linguistic diversity becomes more visible. There is a proto-Sociolinguistics of sorts, and the function of language becomes an object of critical attention. In sixteenth-century Italy, we have examples of criticism of the use of Latin in certain official contexts and how it excluded the majority of the population from a community of interpretation. Giambattista Gelli claimed that "the point of Latin liturgy was to keep the faith secret from the laity, to exclude them from the community of the church"[30] and Carlo Ginzburg claimed that speaking Latin in court was, in his view, a betrayal of the poor.[31] Similarly, Martin Luther's famous translation of the Bible into vernacular German which would provide direct access to the word of God in the German language was revolutionary not only in the religious reformation that ensued but also in the field of translation.[32] In seventeenth-century England, during the Civil War, the same concern about the use of Latin was voiced by the likes of William Dell, Samuel How, and Gerrard Winstanley. According to Burke "The main point of these critiques was that the use of foreign languages allowed professionals to mystify and so to dominate ordinary people."[33] Such critiques provided the basis for the idea of multilingualism as an elitist language reality.

Together with these new points of view, there was at the time a more widespread concern with the riches and the poverties, or deficits, of languages.[34] In the later Middle Ages, as scholars like Gianfranco Folena (1991) claim, there was already a "crisis" of language, while Burke sees the situation as more of a "discovery" of language (Burke, 2004:16). The scholars point to this discovery gradually happening through the late Middle Ages, strongest during the Renaissance period, and culminating on many of the first official grammars and histories of European Languages in the 16th and 17th centuries. During this

---

[30] Burke (2004:17), citing Gelli (1546).
[31] Ginzburg (1976:9), apud Burke (2004:17).
[32] It was not only Luther's translation that was influential in the development of German and in breaking down the walls of translation in Western Europe, so too was his essay *Ein Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (An Open Letter on Translating) (1530) where he defended his translation choices and approach.
[33] Burke (2004: 17). Citing Hill (1958), Hill (1972), Burke (1988).
[34] In fact, Burke uses the term *Anxiety of deficit* referring to this particular concern, and claims this term is in reference to Renaissance scholar Richard Helgerson.

period there was growing preoccupation among educated people about the poverty of vernaculars in comparison with Latin.[35] These worries are called by Burke, based on Borowski (1999), a humility topos.[36] This can be verified by the frequent use, in texts of the period, of Latin words for abstractions, for concepts lacking in the vernaculars. Some, however, defended their own languages with arguments that referred to their abundance and copiousness.[37] This, in turn, can be called the topos of pride. In this phenomenon, new words entering the European vernaculars were compared to immigrants seeking citizenship, by the likes of Du Bellay, for French, and George Peele and Samuel Daniel, for English, for example. At the same time, a growing debate was present throughout Europe about the facts and figures of language mixture, its dangers, and advantages. This called for several histories of languages to be written, prioritizing classical languages like Latin and Greek, but including vernaculars as well, and a growing interest in roots of language and in etymology. By the seventeenth century, the fixation with origins was strong and directly connected to a competition between the European *literati* on the primordiality of their own languages. Primordiality was directly linked to maritime expansion and imperialistic attitudes. Antonio Nebrija, in 1492, had already claimed that Castilian had always been a companion to the empire, and later on, Bernardo de Aldrete and Nunes de Leão both defended the view of language as empire, for Spanish and Portuguese, respectively. [38] If languages are empires, then conquered people had to accommodate to them.[39] This idea, or topos, was strong in times of colonization and expansion. Gradually, languages were seen as tied to the pride of a nation, and as a medium of colonization, following the flags and accompanying the banners.

According to Burke (2004) "this imperial topos was linked to the ancient idea that everything on earth goes through a sequence of stages, from beginning

---

[35] Examples presented by Burke include languages such as Polish and French.
[36] Borowski, in Giovanna Brogi Bercoff et al. (1999:27).
[37] Such as Sebastian Franck and Christian Gueintz, for German, Claudio Tolomei, for Italian, Richard Eden, for English, and Hendrik Spieghel, for Dutch, among others. (Burke, 2004: 18)
[38] On Nebrija: Francisco Rico (1978); Miguel Angel Esparza Torres (1995). Bernardo de Aldrete (1604: facsimile ed., Madrid, 1972); cf. Woolard, (2002; Duarte Nunes de Leão (1606: in Buescu (ed.), 1983). Apud Burke (2004:18).
[39] "las lenguas son como los imperios, que suben a la cumber, de la cual como van caiendo, no se vuelven a recobrar" Aldrete (1972:185). Nunes de Leão (1983:195).

to end, or from childhood to old age" (2004:22). If languages grow and mature, like people (as claimed by Swedish poet-scholar Georg Stiernhielm), then they could also be in decline.[40] A similar idea was that dialects had developed into languages. In the English-speaking world, John Dryden offered the view that English, in his day, was improving, while Jonathan Swift presented a more cynical view that English, in fact, was in steep decline. Language purity began to be a constant in discussions around language. Earthly languages were seen as corruptions of divine, pure language. In the same line, foreign words also corrupt pure language. This can be seen in commentaries by, Castellesi, for example, who claimed that Latin after Cicero was imperfect and corrupt, or by Edward Brerewood in England. Nunes de Leão made a similar claim, and Jan Malecki proposed that Polish was, in fact, a corruption of Czech. This led to claims that rustic speech was more pure than urban speech, since peasants spoke less with foreigners, they preserved archaic, pure forms of language. Similarly, Arngrímurjónsson (Iceland) claimed that the isolation of Iceland explains its language purity, and Leibniz connected the remoteness of a region to the preservation of its ancient language.

In Early Modern scholarship, the comparative approach was at the centre of discussions surrounding vernaculars and their histories, as well as their strengths and weaknesses, also influencing the analysis and separation of language into families. Changes in languages meant, for scholars such as Louis Le Roy, Claude Duret, John Wilkins, a corruption of customs. Some scholars, however, saw these changes in a positive light. French essayist and grammarian Dominique Bouhours, for example, equated the polishing of language with the polishing of manners. It was around the same period that scholars started to divide languages into families based on affinities and descent. At the time, Romance languages were seen as sisters and mothers. Studies started to come about in northern Germanic languages, Celtic languages, Sanskrit, among others. Such a relationship between the many languages of the time points to the notion of a 'family romance'. Similarly, this familial imagery used to describe and study

[40] Georg Stiernhielm (1671).

languages was largely based on a biologizing of language that pervades to this day. According to Thomas Bonfiglio:

> In the early modern period, the notion of language as a botanical entity entered into the cultural *habitus*; the accustomed understanding of language as such aided in its enracination and configuration within the matrix of race and ethnicity. […] The genealogical model of language "families" was used to sketch broad ecolinguistic distinctions between "Semitic" and "Aryan" and to separate Christians from Jews. […] One finds a continuance of models of language in current scientific discourse that encourage ideologies of innateness, however surreptitiously. The culprit in the discourse of ethnolinguistic prejudice is the racializing of language and the unreflective grafting of genetic and genealogical models onto it. (Bonfiglio, 2013:43)

As Bonfiglio puts it, the birth of Ecolinguistics can be blamed for the many ideologies inherent in thinking about language and, I propose here, in Translation Studies, about the innateness of language and the connectedness between language and self.

To finish on Burke's overview of meta-linguistic awareness in medieval and early modern Europe, the focus shifts to linguistic diversity, whose increasing awareness was made even higher by marine expansion and contact with new people, cultures, and languages via colonization. Scholars started to gather words from new, 'exotic' languages, such as Antonio Pigafetta with the Moluccas, Jacques Cartier in the 1530s with a vocabulary of Mohawk and Iroquois, and Jean de Léry for the indigenous language Tupi in Brazil. Missionaries were largely responsible for studying and recording local languages. If linguistic diversity is closely connected to exoticism, it is difficult to appreciate how multilingualism in translation can be commonplace for many linguistic communities anywhere, even in traditionally monolingually-biased countries.

These ideas about the worth and place of multi- and monolingualism have, as can be seen in today's linguistic and literary landscape, seeped into linguistic and literary theory alike. They have been highly influential and perhaps can explain the issues of power and monolingual bias in the L1 translation meme.

This overview borrows substantially from Burke's careful exploration of these themes in the historical periods presented. Burke's detailed

investigation is unique, in that it comes from a historian who is concerned with language and translation. In another chapter, Burke proposes that "If the past is a foreign country, it follows that even the most monoglot of historians is a translator" (2007:7). By uncovering examples of the start of language awareness in medieval and early modern Europe we can see how such an awareness came to be largely through anxieties related to language contact and competition between languages. If it were not for fear of subjugation by competing languages (something that did not keep European countries from linguistically subjugating colonised populations), these topoi would not be necessary, or rather would not have come together in the same way. Such an assumption is supported by Thomas Bonfiglio, who, investigating the advent of the idea of language trees and referring to seventeenth-century German grammarian Schottelius's concept of the *Sprachbaum* [tree of language] concludes thus:

> One sees here the extremes to which the anxiety of vernacular authority can motivate the philology of nationalism. One arrives at a codeterminative intertwining of the trees of nature and the trees of language. This is the birth of the arboreal models of language that we are familiar with. The dominant model for the configuration of language was generated not by science, but by ethnolinguistic nationalism. (Bonfiglio, 2013:39)

With these contributions by Burke, Bonfiglio, and others, we can see how monolingualism started to slowly pervade thinking about language and cultures in the European sphere, which then spread throughout the world as these countries started to colonise other continents and brought their linguistic worldviews with them. We can see with this brief overview and timeline that linguistic anxieties related to competition between European seats of power arrive at a solution: to standardise and control language and language use. Comparative Literature was born out of these competing European systems. Translation Studies, as a branch of this scholarly tree, has inherited similar anxieties and worldviews. The gatekeeping present in language and translation, I would argue, also derives from such anxieties, and needs for control. As we will see below, it was the advent of print culture that catalysed these changes

and made for a view of the world as inherently monolingual, with multilingualism as the odd exception. Literature as we know it today, the canonical, written form, at least, was born out of these anxieties and standardisations, and literary translation follows suit. This section has shown that linguistic anxieties concerning vernaculars and language standardisation are not phenomena inherent to language, but are historically embedded, bound to socio-cultural contexts. In other words, concerns about linguistic purity and linguistic anxieties that may feed much of the normatisation of language use as well as linguistic gatekeeping are far from being immutable and, instead, are to be traced back to these particular historical reasons.

2.2 Inventing monolingualism: language and nation

Following a chronological line that covers the medieval and early modern periods, we arrive at the late eighteenth century and, most importantly, the nineteenth century, as turning points for the nation-state and its ties to a national language.[41] The view that the advent of printing was responsible to a significant degree for the emergence of the nation-state is proposed in depth by Benedict Anderson in his book *Imagined Communities* (1983). Anderson proposed the concept of the imagined community as a way of explaining nationalism, and the nation as a socially constructed community imagined by people who feel they belong to the same group. The main pillar of his theory is the connectedness between the ascension and establishment of nation and nationalism and the advent of print capitalism.[42] Anderson's theory is considered within Nationalism Studies as a modernist view, that is, shared by those who consider the nation-state to be a modern phenomenon, arising in the late eighteenth century. The modernist view arose in the 1970s and 80s, and includes names such as Gellner, Hobsbawm and Breuilly, among others. Proponents of this view are, in the majority, historical materialists, and oppose ethno-symbolists, like Anthony Smith, who trace the beginnings of nationalism

[41] For an overview of linguistic diversity, national language and the absence of ethnolinguistic nationalism in antiquity, see Bonfiglio (2010)

[42] As early as 1960, Emerson defined nationalism in the sense that it creates unity across social strata and is related to the transformation from feudal into bourgeois society and the expansion of secular education in vernacular languages (Emerson, 1960:147)

to pre-modern conditions. Modernist scholars of nationalism differ in perspective, Gellner's being more towards sociology, while Hobsbawm and Breuilly focus on history and geopolitics. Anderson differentiates himself from others mostly because of his link between nations, nationalism, and print languages, using examples from the Americas and Asia, therefore opening the field beyond Europe. For the purpose of this analysis, and because of the many studies that support the modernist view in nationalist studies, my argument is in line with the modernists. Mainly because this current of thought considers not only the European reality, but also accounts for pan-Asian, pan-African, Latin America, and the Global South with strong examples of modernist nationalistic trends.

Ernest Gellner shares the idea of the nation being tied to modernity and the spread and standardisation of the vernacular. In his view, nationalism is:

> the general imposition of a high culture on society, where previously low cultures had taken up the lives of the majority, and in some cases the totality, of the population. It means the general diffusion of a school-mediated, academy supervised idiom, codified for the requirements of a reasonably precise bureaucratic and technological communication. It is the establishment of an anonymous impersonal society, with mutually sustainable atomised individuals, held together above all by a shared culture of this kind, in place of the previous complex structure of local groups, sustained by folk cultures reproduced locally and idiosyncratically by the micro-groups themselves. (Gellner, 1983:57)

Similarly, Anderson sees the nation as this imagined community because:

> regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings. (Anderson, [1983] 2016:7)

Gellner's functionalist view of nationalism sees it as the result of a shared, formal education system and mainly due to industrialisation. Gellner

uses the word "fabrication" to explain the constitution of the imagined communities, while Hobsbawm calls them "invented traditions".[43] In that sense Anderson's view is less pessimistic, and much more utopic, seeing the common identification of supra-national groups as a symbol of cultural diversity. Their theories differ on a number of issues but find common ground in crediting nationalism for the standardization of language and mass spread of texts by early capitalism (Anderson 1983; Gellner 1983). Anderson explains his use of the word "imagined" in his discussion of the nation by arguing that "it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson, [1983] 2016:6) Here, he makes a connection with Seton-Watson, who defines a nation as formed of people 'considering themselves' part of a whole (Seton-Watson, 1977:5).

The case of the Americas is important for thinking about the issue of language and nation. Anderson credits the insurgence of nationalist movements in Latin America, especially when tied to a national, shared language, to the creole populations of Spanish-speaking Latin America. United under a common language and hybrid situation,[44] these *criollos* were instrumental to the many independence movements in Spanish-speaking Latin America which slowly rid its countries/peoples of official colonial rule from Spain. This creole elite and middle-class defined *what* was to be perceived as a nation and *who* could be called *latinoamericanos*. Anderson argues that Tom Nairn's (1977:41) thesis of nationalist movements as populist in outlook fails to hold truth, especially in the case of Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking Americas. For the creoles, language was not an issue in the fight for

---

[43] As Anderson himself argues in the third chapter of Imagined Communities (1983) and Anthony Smith does in the Warwick Debates on Nationalism (Gellner & Smith, 1996). For the invented tradition proposition, see Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983).

[44] In the context of Brazil and South America, Silviano Santiago's term *Entre-lugar* (1978), between-place, for the double, hybrid situation of the Americas is worthy of mention here. Being one of the oldest colonial settlings and containing not only a mixture of the European with the Indigenous populations, but also the many enslaved Africans that contributed to these countries' economies for centuries, the Americas are the place in-between par excellence, and such a situation brings about a complex question of national/continental identity that permeates its cultures, literatures, and politics.

independence. Language, according to Anderson, "was not an element that differentiated them from their respective imperial metropoles" (Anderson, [1983] 2016:47). This is true in the case of the United States and Brazil, where the fight for independence was driven by the elites, who shared their languages with their metropoles.

The first idea of creating a Pan-American nation between the Spanish-speaking colonies failed early on, but Bolívar and San Martín, the *libertadores* of Latin America, had as an ideal to include indigenous populations under what they would call Peruvians, Colombians, etc. However, the issue of language was not an issue per se for these groups precisely because *criollos* were, by definition, Europeans who were born in the colonies. Since their language was the same as the one spoken in Spain, and since they were the ones leading the revolution and making up the ideal of these new nations, their own languages were central. There were, of course, indigenous groups and enslaved populations which tried repeatedly to fight for their own independence, and who spoke different languages than those of the colonizers. However, the "social thinness of these Latin American independence movements" (Anderson, 2016 (1983:49) is one of the culprits for the top-bottom movement of nation-building in Latin America. This would help in building an idea of a monolingual America, united around the language of the colonizer, and ignoring or even completely vanishing with the indigenous languages and the linguistic variety that defines the continent, in what Haugen (1973) defines as Linguistic Genocide.[45] Mignolo summarises the process of nation-building tied to imagined communities in the Americas as follows:

[45] Coulmas (1988) uses Haugen's term as applied to the postcolonial context, but in fact, Haugen used linguistic genocide in a more general definition, to deal with the suppression of minor languages or dialects in favour of the practicality of having a standardized unified language. According to him "And yet, who are we to call for linguistic genocide in the name of efficiency? Let us recall that although a language is a tool and an instrument of communication, that is not all it is. A language is also a part of one's personality, a form of behavior that has its roots in our earliest experience. Whether it is a so-called rural or ghetto dialect, or a peasant language, or a "primitive" idiom, it fulfills exactly the same needs and performs the same services in the daily lives of its speakers as does the most advanced language of culture. Every language, dialect, patois, or lingo is a structurally complete framework into which can be poured any subtlety of emotion or thought that its users are capable of experiencing. Whatever it lacks at any given time or place in the way of vocabulary and syntax can be supplied in very short order by borrowing and imitation from other languages. Any scorn for the language of others is scorn for those who use it, and as such is a form of social discrimination." (Haugen, 1973: 55)

> Basically, independence from Spain and from England, which was a particular case of decolonization, was followed by a process of nation building in a new imperial order. One of the strong weapons in building homogeneous imagined communities was the belief in a national language, which was tied up with national literature and contributed, in the domain of language, to the national culture. Furthermore, the complicity between language, literature, culture, and nation was also related to geopolitical order and geographical frontiers. (Mignolo, 2000:218)

The many insurgences in Latin America were not movements in a social or political vacuum. The influence of movements such as, firstly, the Reformation, Renaissance Humanism, and the Enlightenment, coming in the wake of the French Revolution, have made their mark and influenced many independence movements in the Americas. Therefore, there is retro feeding between Europe and the Americas, Metropolis and Colony, the tension between which caused the need to reaffirm the nation-state. Bjornson mentions the early definitions of the nation and its rise as a theoretical construct towards the end of the eighteenth century thus:

> The word nation derives from the Latin *nasci* (to be born) and originally designated people who were born in the same place. […] With the breakup of the feudal order and a rapid expansion of trade, the national states that emerged in Renaissance Europe provided a mechanism for protecting the capital investments of the rising middle classes while preserving the social and legal prerogatives of the aristocracy. (…) It was not until the late eighteenth century that the word nation acquired the meaning generally associated with it today. Although Voltaire persisted in defining the nation only in terms of a self-conscious elite capable of influencing the intellectual and political movements that determine a people's destiny, other eighteenth-century thinkers and Rousseau in particular popularized the idea that a nation should express the collective will of all people living within its borders. (Bjornson, 1991:1-2)

As we can see from the quote above, Bjornson shares the view of many critics of modernist nationalism studies, viewing Renaissance Europe and the Enlightenment as major catalysts in the coming of the nation-state. Usually, the

Romantic movement of the nineteenth century is blamed for popularizing the idea of a language as tied to a nation's soul. This view of language as tied to the soul of a nation did not materialise out of thin air but was in turn a slow and pervasive line of thought that arose for a variety of reasons across the centuries.

2.2.1 Romantic ethnolinguistic nationalism: the case of the German tradition

As pointed out before, the slow rise of the nationalist ideal culminated in the long nineteenth century's consolidation of our modern view of the nation as tied to a national language and to a specific cultural identity. The unification of Italy and Germany, in the late nineteenth century, is an example of the results of this nationalist ideal. The Romantic movement inspired by the Enlightenment is generally regarded as responsible for cementing these views. We can see, however, that the reasoning behind this defence of the national language is, in its context, necessary to achieve specific goals. The fact that these ideals were unquestioned for such a long time and are so ingrained in our way of thinking about nations, is what many authors try to question. I will try to discuss some of these ideas below, while also placing them in context.

In the German tradition, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, heavily influenced by incipient Enlightenment ideals, started the strong tradition of linguistic nationalism through his attempt to motivate the French-speaking nobility of Germany to speak German. Germany was, in the aftermath of the Thirty Years War, devastated and brought down to the status of a developing country, thus strengthening the unity and superiority of the nation was of utmost importance to rescue national self-esteem. It is important to remember that Germany at the time was made up of distinct, autonomous territories/principalities, and socially stratifying bilingualism was widespread across the different kingdoms that made up the area now called Germany. The nobility spoke French and wrote in Latin while German (as well as a vast array of dialects that were not mutually intelligible) was spoken (and often only spoken, not written) by the common people. For Leibniz, a counsellor at the court of Hannover, language possessed a powerful political dimension and was instrumental in uniting

people and strengthening the political autonomy and identity of German-speaking peoples. In order to spread literacy and education in society and strengthen the vernacular, it was important to refine and upgrade the language. The elites, however, did not want to give up their privileges, since language was a marker of social distinction. In order to convince this elite to use German as a literary language, Leibniz resorted to strengthening the idea of the nation as socially bonded, and sought to spread literacy with the aim of bringing out the glory of a nation (cf. Coulmas, 1988:5). His idea of a German-minded society [*Deutschgesinnte Gesellschaft*] formed the basis of this effort. He proposed measures for bettering the German language, among them, a preference for words and terms of German roots in lieu of foreign loan words). This, in turn, influenced many grammarians and lexicographers in centuries to come (and remains pervasive in the German tradition until this day) who took these measures to the extreme.

Leibniz's ideas were influenced and strengthened by the deterministic approach to language and nation which posits that the lexicon of a language incorporates a worldview. This view is seen in the poet Klopstock's idea of the *Deutsche Gelehrtenrepublik* [German Republic of Letters/Scholars], in which 'every language is, as it were, a repository of the most characteristic notions of a nation' (Klopstock, [1774] 1975:120). For Leibniz, the national language was instrumental in raising literacy and meant an increase in education. For the Romanticists who followed him, cultivating German meant cultivating the spirit of a nation, since, in their view, one enshrined the other (Coulmas, 1988:7). In his book of political philosophy *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1806) [Addresses to the German Nation], Johann Gottlieb Fichte offered the determinist view that a living language expresses the soul of a nation. The context following Napoleon's invasions and French occupation across Europe called for this separation of nations using language as a major player in strengthening the bond between members of a nation. In order to defend and value the German language, Fichte came up with the difference between Living and Dead languages. Dead languages were, however, not only Latin and Ancient Greek, but also English and French, for example, for being derived from mixed and broken-off traditions, while German was considered a true

living language for having a character that could not be bent at will. Thus, he saw Germans as an *Urvolk*, and German as the language shaped to express the truth. This idea of a special language proved to be attractive and versatile for many speech communities to adjust it to their purposes. Since language in this view is a natural bond to the nation and to tradition, to an emotional community and kinship, breaking this tradition by speaking or choosing a foreign language is, according to Klopstock again, treason (cf. Coulmas 1988:9).

Johann Gottfried Herder, in *Über die Neuere Deutsche Literatur* (1767) [About the Modern German Literature], his foray into German literature and attempt at historicizing the German literary tradition, points to the *Genius* of a language, a term he borrowed from Cicero. He connects the childhood of a language and a nation to the childhood of national literature. Herder, in proto-Chomskyan fashion, views language as emanating from an internal organ, from the core, the soul of the individual. He also connects language to a specific *Denkungsart*, mode of thinking, of a nation. Therefore, his view defends each language as a specific cognitive form, and languages as different systems and, to quote Humboldt, "worldviews". In his own words, each nation has "their own storehouse of these thoughts which become words, this is its national language".[46] Herder is usually identified as responsible for popularizing the national language issue (by e.g. Barnard 1965, Minogue 1967, Fishman 1972, Smith 1981, among others), but as can be seen, he is not alone in furthering this view and was in turn part of a tradition.

Following nineteenth-century thought, Wilhelm von Humboldt proposed the individuality of each different language as a peculiar property of a nation. He follows Fichte's ideas and belongs to the same *Zeitgeist*, but as a linguist, he sees the differences between languages and nations through the lens of scientific investigation. Agreeing with Herder, Humboldt understood the inseparability of language and thought, and language as a social phenomenon that bound individuals together in a group, in this case, a nation. In his view, a difference between languages meant a difference in worldview,

[46] ein eignes Vorrathaus solcher zu Zeichen gewordenen Gedanken, dies ist ihre Nationalsprache

and "the diversity of languages rests on their form, and the latter is most intimately connected with the mental aptitudes of nations" (Humboldt, [1836] 1999:54). Such a view reached its peak with the well-established, and now largely debunked, Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which, put simply, posits that the particular language one speaks influences the way one thinks about reality. It is also known as the linguistic relativity hypothesis. According to Lucy (2001):

> Formulations related to contemporary ones appear during the Enlightenment period in the UK (Locke), France (Condillac, Diderot), and Germany (Hamman, Herder). They are stimulated variously by opposition to the universal grammarians, by concerns about the reliability of language-based knowledge, and by practical efforts to consolidate national identities and cope with colonial expansion. Most of this work construes the differences among languages in terms of a hierarchical scheme of adequacy with respect to reality, to reason, or to both. Later, nineteenth-century work in Germany by Humboldt and in France/Switzerland by Saussure drew heavily on this earlier tradition and set the stage for the approaches of Sapir and Whorf. Humboldt's arguments, in particular, are often regarded as anticipating the Sapir–Whorf approach. He argued for a linguistic relativity according to the formal processes used by a language (e.g., inflection, agglutination, etc.). (Lucy, 2001: 13487)

Thus, as we can see, this hypothesis was heavily influenced by Humboldt and his predecessors in different European contexts. The opinion that language and culture belong and are intrinsic to the soul of the nation is pervasive in the modern view of language, nation, and identity. However, such a view can also pose a risk: a risk of xenophobia, racism, and othering those who do not fit the category of the native. A well-known commentary by an antisemitic figure, Wagner's essay entitled *Judaism in Music* can be seen as an example of such a thought context. In his view, a nation is a historical community, and only those who belong to this ancient, traditional community can say who can belong to it, and what is authentic to said culture.[47] A Jew, in his view, speaks the language of the nation as an alien. Positioning the Jew as a foreigner is indeed a common feature of his arguments throughout the text:

[47] Members of this historical community act as gatekeepers, deciding who can be a member, and who can partake in their culture. More about gatekeeping in chapters 3 and 4.

> Now, to make poetry in a foreign tongue has hitherto been impossible, even to geniuses of highest rank. Our whole European art and civilisation, however, have remained to the Jew a foreign tongue; for, just as he has taken no part in the evolution of the one, so has he taken none in that of the other; but at most the homeless wight has been a cold, nay more, a hostile looker-on. (Wagner, [1850] 1894:14)

In this we can see not only Wagner's exclusion of the Jew from the German nation as a 'hostile looker-on' or a 'homeless wight', but we can also see that he does not believe that writing in a foreign tongue is possible. Such an idea can be easily contradicted by the many examples of "geniuses" in medieval and early modern times who did indeed write in foreign, mixed, and multiple languages, as we will see with Forster's study (1970) further along. I chose to end this section on a well-known anti-Semitic's commentary to remind us of the risks involved in supporting racism and xenophobia in language under the veil of language nativity or national languages, and even the risk of placing the essentialist view of language above the diversity and multitudinous character of language and culture.

2.3 Mono-Linguistic ethnocentrism and monolingual myths

When talking about nation and language, it is of great importance to discuss the idea of the mother tongue and monolingualism in general. I have shown before that some scholars have proved that in medieval and early modern times translation was much more visible and carried out from one language to the other without necessarily demanding from the translator a mother-tongue ability of the target language. It can also be said that in these times, in fact, multilingualism was much more present in the writing of literature, and to test the limits of poetic language in different mediums. The assumption that the world is largely made up of separate and different monolingual communities is what scholars who deal with multilingualism call

the monolingual bias (or monolingual *habitus*).[48] As I have tried to demonstrate in this chapter, monolingualism is a much more recent phenomenon, and if we start from a Western-European, Anglophone school of thought, we might err in thinking that the world is so much more simple and monolingual than it actually is.

Contemporary Sociolinguistics, especially the study of multilingualism, strive to move away from monoglot Eurocentric definitions of language and deconstruct these perspectives which are based on the monolingual. According to Love (2009), the monolingual culture that pervades linguistic discourse is "an exercise in culture maintenance" (2009:31). This culture maintenance also comes in the form of inventing languages, grammar and seeing language through a lingualist perspective: that of language as a monolith.[49] As Benedict Anderson proposed that nations are imagined communities, linguists such as Alastair Pennycook and David Gramling propose that languages are also not only imagined, but invented, the result of a conscious project to standardise and separate languages from dialects. More recently, from the 1970s onwards, some scholars, such as Einar Haugen, who created the concept of Language Ecology, claimed such fixed concepts to be altogether false. According to him:

> [t]the concept of language as a rigid, monolithic structure is false, even if it has proved to be a useful fiction in the development of languages. It is the kind of simplification that is necessary at a certain stage of a science, but which can now be replaced by more sophisticated models. (Haugen, 1972:25)

Then, if we have moved past the need for a rigid view of a language as a single entity, what do we have? First, it is necessary to understand not only how the old views came to be, but also how pervasive such an idea was on different levels of language thought. According to Makoni and Pennycook (2006) not only were languages invented, so too were conceptions of

---

[48] I will explore the concept of *habitus* in depth in chapter 4.

[49] According to David Gramling, Lingualism is "a term invoked occasionally in Usage-Based Linguistics to critique the premise or belief, that languages are essentially coherent, stable, nameable entities that people can master and possess." (Gramling 2021:27). From this point onwards I will choose to call attitudes and views that follow a lingualism perspective as "lingualist", the adjective for lingualism.

languageness and metalanguage.[50] The notion of language as a separate entity has been proven by linguists across different continents to be invented (see Harries, 1987; Heryanto 1995; Mannheim, 1991; Kuzar, 2001 among others). The drive to test this notion and disprove it arises when scholars noticed how the monological approach to languages failed to understand their use in context. Not all people belonging to different language communities have one or two or more languages, thought of as such, as independent bounded entities that form a set of linguistic assets, as is often assumed in Anglo or Eurocentric thought (Heryanto, 1990). In fact, such meta-discursive regimes (Bauman and Briggs, 2003) have hindered the study of multilingualism in the linguistic realities of former colonies and of complex linguistic contexts beyond the European. Language contact and its subsequent many dialects, creoles and variants proved that such well-defined linguistic monoliths such as national languages did not capture accurately the linguistic realities of these communities. These linguistic structures were "responses to discourse needs" (Bybee and Hopper 2001:2) in that in seeing languages as objects one could also more easily categorise, master, and control such fictitious entities. With these, linguistic gatekeeping could be created, a highly racialised feature of language policing and language control. But the innate instinct to protect languages as entities came to be as a result of the attempt to categorise and control languages in order to study them. Grammar has always been seen as a fixed entity, a set of unchanging and unchangeable rules of a language, but scholars such as Hopper (1998) proposed the idea of grammar as emergent, as temporary, dependent on repeated social activity.

As we have seen previously, language loyalty and language awareness are rather recent creations in the history of human thought. These are the

---

[50] Languageness is Dorotskar's (2014) translation equivalent of *Sprachigkeit*, meaning all forms of proficiency, spread and use of language (2014:389). However, in Sociolinguistics, this is defined as that which defines a language, self-identification and social group's beliefs being central to defining what constitutes a language (cf. Tosco, 2021). Studies such as those conducted by Rieder (2018) focus the concept of languageness on folk criteria, applying the concept to groups like the Irish Travellers, for example. For more on languageness, see Hymes (1967), Irvine (1989), Hill (1998), Blommaert (2003), among others. Metalanguage is what Makoni and Pennycook call "Metadiscursive Regimes", citing Bauman & Briggs (2003), in that the invention of standard languages in turn created metalanguages to talk about and define such languages. They use the example of English and its establishment as a so-called 'neutral' international language, and the help that metalinguistic/metadiscursive regimes have had in holding up these inventions.

result of a rise in language ideology closely tied to the creation of the nation state. Seeing languages as separate, bounded entities and not within their context of use would mean also ignoring the fundamental social notions of community and humanity, central to language anthropology (Woolard, 2004; Kroskrity 2000). Such a notion did not exist in pre-colonial times. In fact, prior to colonial encounters, the differences between varieties of language use had different meanings in colonial settings (Makoni and Pennycook,2012). As David Gramling states in his book *The Invention of Monolingualism* (2018), "indigenous people in the colonies were gradually de-competenced through a multilingual process of monolingualisation" (2018:15). Monolingualism was forced upon these colonised populations, and the European languages established in these colonies were artificial implantations, and their colonised users merely suboptimal users of the language. Their natural multilingualism was erased in favour of a colonial language. This resulted in

> an undeniable reality — namely, that colonialism has profound consequences on colonised subjects as linguistic or language subjects; that at the core of the colonial enterprise, whether by systemic design or not, is an active production of subjection through the discipline of language (Chow, 2014:37)

This monolingual bias so prevalent in our episteme, used as the norm for language research and literary studies, greatly affects communities and language users who do not fit these strict categories. In fact, the very concept of the native speaker as well as that of a mother tongue are creations of the same discursive practice of the monolingual imaginary. In the following section, I will explore some monolingually-inclined concepts and how they relate to each other.

2.3.1 The Native Speaker and the Gatekeeper

The monolingual bias, as seen previously, is an assumption that the world is made up of discrete and mutually exclusive languages, and that language users are, by default, monolingual. This is connected to those ideals of language as an essentialist entity, closely tied to cultural identity, and to the

self. Even when thinking of multilingualism, one tends to think of it as multiple monolingualisms.

The first term that we must unpack is that of the native speaker. This idealized subject, a monoglot representation that is still prevalent in linguistics and literature, and even more so in literary translation, fails to stand up to scrutiny. According to Claire Kramsch:

> The only speech community traditionally recognized by foreign language departments has been the middle-class, ethnically dominant male citizenry of nation-states, as Mary-Louise Pratt argues. The native speaker is in fact an imaginary construct - a canonically literate monolingual middle-class member of a largely fictional national community whose citizens share a belief in a common history and a common destiny (…). And this ideal corresponds less and less to reality (Kramsch, 2003:255)

The imaginary construct of the native speaker is thus a powerful myth, used to further concepts of representation and imagined community and nation-building, a yardstick used in linguistics and literary theory that is largely unquestioned and untested. Halliday (2005) proposed the term native-speakerism to deal with the pervasiveness of this myth in language studies, language policy, literature, and translation. Damian Rivers in *The Idea of the Native Speaker* (2018) traces the origin of the term, at least in an English-speaking context, to an inaugural address given by English Literature Professor George P. Marsh in 1858 at Columbia University. In this lecture, Marsh showed preoccupation with the corruption of English by the American masses and campaigned for the insertion of English language philology in the American curriculum. According to Rivers, Marsh

> essentially offers a continuation in regard to previous perspectives on languages, nations and peoples, a viewpoint structured by the idea that distinct categorization and separation was possible given that homogeneity in terms of pronunciation, grammar and general language use stood to be the normative and desired condition. (Rivers, 2018:17)

Thus, the concept of the native speaker was born as a result of a specific type of language anxiety closely tied to linguistic prejudices of the time.

The normative aspect, derived from a need for homogeneity, is central to the idea behind the native speaker. According to Rivers, commenting again on Marsh's proposition:

> One can make connections between beliefs concerning language ownership, the maintenance of language standards and the relationship between language nativity and race, in addition to the role of language in national identity, all derived from the position that "languages adhere so tenaciously to their native soil, that, in general, they can be eradicated only by the extirpation of the races that speak them" (Marsh, 1859, p. 88). (Rivers, 2018:18)

We can see from the quote above why some scholars started to draw lines between the native speaker and questions of race and nativity. In the still emergent field of raciolinguistics, the "native" has been studied, and theorised at length, and the connection between language and race is largely criticised (Rosa & Flores, 2017; Alim, 2016; Aneja, 2016, Cameron, 2007). There is, in Sociolinguistics and Applied Linguistics, ample evidence to suggest that native speakers do not necessarily perform better in linguistic tasks than non-native speakers. In fact, very little research has been done on what native speakers indeed share in terms of linguistic abilities, as pointed out by Hulstjin (2015). After all, native speakers "do not always speak according to the rules of their standard national languages; they display regional, occupational, generational, class-related ways of talking that render the notion of a unitary native speaker artificial" (Kramsch, 2003:251). The most compelling evidence of the varying abilities shared by native speakers is presented in an overview by Treffers-Daller (2018):

> Comparing L2 learners with presumably monolingual native speakers is also problematic because such native speakers' abilities differ widely from each other. Alderson (1980) not only found that what he termed native speakers did not always restore grammatical gaps in a cloze test but also that the differences between native and what he called non-native (L2) speakers were very small, and that some non-native speakers outperformed the native ones. These findings led Alderson to conclude that "native speaker proficiency, even on lower-order tasks, varies" (p. 74), and he considered the use of native speakers as criteria-setting for non-native speakers on tests "misguided" (p. 75). In a similar vein, Hamilton,

> Lopes, McNamara, and Sheridan (1993) reported on the performance of presumably monolingual native speakers on a reading and writing test that is widely used with adults seeking to work or study in an English-speaking country (the International English Language Testing System, IELTS; see www.ielts.org/). Hamilton et al. found this performance "far from homogeneous" (p. 348). (Treffers-Daller, 2018:290)

Therefore, how can we use the native speaker as a guide when the very concept of a native speaker hides a multitude of language practices, uses, and performances? In the field of language teaching, specifically in L2, there already has been a call for a "post-native-speakerist pedagogy" (Holliday, 2006; Houghton & Hashimoto, 2018). However, as Davies puts it, there are arguments in favour of having a model type:

> Consider the institutionalised activities of publishing and examining in the written language and of selecting radio and television newsreaders/casters in the spoken language. In such cases there is compelling social consensus in favour of the use of a model type. It is also the case that a particular type of native speaker (or native-speaker-like non-native speaker) is chosen, the prestige model. (Davies, 2003:7)

Hence, even though many question the use of the native speaker as a model, some argue that this model is necessary, especially in practical matters. However, this does not eliminate the need to critique and challenge the unquestioned, homogenic native-speaker norm. As previously stated, raciolinguists and postcolonialists alike criticise the racist implications of an assumed nativity which is tied to race and sovereignty. As Chow puts it:

> Can anyone ever be expected to inhabit discourse archives as a native speaker, whose enunciations are permanently free of the interference of other forms of speaking and writing? Should not the idea of the native speaker as such—a putative sovereign subject and author, imagined to be in full possession of her language and at one with her own speaking voice—be recognized as a last bastion of those epistemic unities that, as Foucault shows, are emblematic of the long-standing practices of knowledge production based on the exclusion of discontinuity? (Chow, 2014:56-57)

Therefore, as we can see, the very neutrality of the native speaker as an ideal language user is challenged. Chow's mention of 'exclusion of discontinuity' connects with Davies's comment earlier, in that for practical means what is outside the norm, what represents discontinuity against the model, is excluded, and disregarded. The outliers, as they are seen, are the exception. But what if the norm is the exception? In the case of native speakers and monolingual norms, would not it be possible for us to regard those who fit this outdated norm as the outliers? When so much of the world's linguistic realities do not fit a definition, there might be something wrong with the definition, the norm itself, not with its outliers. On nonnativeness as a symptom of discontinuity, Chow concludes:

> Because the native speaker is thought to occupy an uncorrupted origination point, learning a language as a non-native speaker can only be an exercise in woeful approximation. The failure to sound completely like the native speaker is thus given a pejorative name: "(foreign) accent." Having an accent is, in other words, the symptom precisely of discontinuity—an incomplete assimilation, a botched attempt at eliminating another tongue's competing copresence. In geopolitical terms, having an accent is tantamount to leaving on display—rather than successfully covering up—the embarrassing evidence of one's alien origins and migratory status. (Think, for instance, of Derrida's unease at not being entirely rid of his Algerian accent on some occasions.) The speech of the native speaker, in contrast, is deemed so natural that it is said to be without—or shall we say outside? —an accent. (Chow, 2014:58)

The assumed neutrality of the native speaker's use of language is, as we see from Chow, fraught. There is also a need to question the posited neutrality of the gatekeeper. If the authority that lies behind gatekeeping is also based on the assumed neutrality of the gatekeeper, then this conceals the potential ideological and epistemic building blocks behind the gatekeeper's stance. That is, the gatekeeper is assumed to be an authority in deciding what counts and what does not, assuming they are neutral in their outlook. However, gatekeepers have their own personal histories, prejudices, inclinations,

ideologies, accents.[51] In the case of the L1 translation norm, we are trying to understand who is doing the gatekeeping. From what we see in the interviews conducted in this thesis, this gatekeeping is manifold: it comes from publishers, editors, language instructors, professors, scholars, institutions, established/consecrated translators, readers, and sometimes from L2 translators themselves, consciously or unconsciously. There is, however, one culprit behind all these gatekeepers: the L1/monolingual norm itself. All the aforementioned agents/actors are fed this norm from early on, but not all of these gatekeeping acts are unconscious. There are gatekeeping practices that are quite self-aware, of their power and their goals, sometimes with the aim of culture maintenance and continuation of structures already in place. As Claire Kramsch puts it:

> Foreign language study acquires credibility and legitimation from being backed by national communities of native speakers, who set the standards for the use of their national language and often for the reading of their national literature (Kramsch, 2003:251)

Similarly, rules such as the L1 translation norm and the monolingual bias feed the gatekeepers' view of language and translation and serve as backing for the intentions and goals of national languages and national literatures. In the case of literary translation into English, English native speakers or, at least, those considered to be so by others in their native-speaker community, control the gates consciously and unconsciously to protect their own: their own written/literary culture, their own views of translation, their language, their own right to translate into English. This need for protection and control seems to be behind much of the gatekeeping present in the case of

[51] Gatekeeping studies in language research are few and far apart, scattered across different disciplines without much communication between them. It is generally agreed that the study of gatekeeping dates back to German American psychologist Kurt Lewin's conceptualisation of channels and gates in group dynamics, published posthumously in 1947. Later, Journalism and Communication scholars such as White (1950), Donohue, Tichenor, and Olien (1972) started to apply Lewin's concepts to explore shape, display, timing, withholding, or repetition of messages within the idea of gatekeeping. In book publishing, gatekeeping studies include Coser (1975); Coser et al, (1982); Lefèvre (1986, 2016); Greco (2013), among others. In Translation Studies, most gatekeeping studies are found within the area of Sociology of Translation, which will be explored in chapter 4. For more on gatekeeping in general, see Barzilai-Nahon, 2009; Shoemaker and Vos, 2009.

literary translation into English. However, not all translators working into English might have sounding or writing like a native English speaker as their ultimate goal.

Whenever a new language is learned, often the goal is to approximate as much as possible the language use of a native speaker. In translation, this may be seen in the goal some translators and translation cultures have of reaching a target text that reads as if it had been written originally in the target language/culture. This shows how prevalent native-speakerism still is. However, there are attempts at critiquing and challenging this fraught benchmark of the native speaker. Chow, for example, draws upon Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o to propose a different languaging domain to deal with a second, or foreign language.[52] According to her:

> Once linguistic—or shall we say accentual—plurality is restored to the enunciative field, any claim to the primacy or originariness of the native speaker is just that: a claim. Such a claim is viable only by erasure of the liminality of a language—the fact that its identity as one entity is always already the result of its proximity to other languages—and by erasure of the discontinuity, the expansive field of the *énoncé*, that is embedded in any historical situation of social interaction. It is, I believe, to such liminality and discontinuity that Achebe alludes when he writes the answer "I hope not" to his own question. In that affirmative, forward-looking gesture of negation—that an African will, he hopes, not learn to use English like a native speaker—we hear a creative domain of languaging emerging, a domain that draws its sustenance from mimicry and adaptation and bears in its accents the murmur, the passage, of diverse found speeches. I would like to name this emergent languaging domain the "xenophone." (Chow, 2014:59)

Therefore, as Chow proposes, a xenophone language domain would mean not striving to sound, to fit into the native speaker model, to not have as a goal an approximation, 'an exercise in woeful approximation' as the author puts it. Chow's proposition has not yet been adopted as a mode of writing and

---

[52] I will explore the concept of languaging at length in chapter 3. At this juncture, as Chow mentions languaging here, it is necessary to briefly introduce the term. Languaging is defined by Swain as "the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (Swain, 2006: 89).

translation, but it begs the question of whether an outwardly, performative languaging domain that resists fitting into the monolingual, native model does not indeed make sense to the idea of L2 translation as an exophonic practice. We will explore this in depth in the next chapter. At this juncture, it is necessary to explore some of the myths behind this strong view of language nativity: those of the mother tongue and the family romance.

2.3.2 Mother Tongues and the Language Family Romance

The history of the term "mother tongue" is fraught. It is a problematic term if we consider the complex relations between languages, especially in a globalised world, and so much more so in a context in which the roles of women and mothers are being questioned in the last decades within Western critical scholarship. Diachronically, the origin of this term can be traced to a Catholic medieval context. For this, I will turn to Bonfiglio (2010), who offers an overview of the term and its many developments.

The traditional view held by many linguists and historians is that mother tongue is a calque of medieval Latin's *lingua materna*. There is no occurrence of the word in Roman times, thus showing that the imagery stems from the context of the specific use of Latin by the Catholic church in the Middle Ages, and not from Ancient Rome. Some scholars in the German context challenged the traditional view, proposing instead that mother tongue comes from the German *Muttersprache*. Leo Weisberger (1929) argued that some of the early instances of the word in Latin were texts written by a friar who was of German origin. Leo Spitzer (1942) opposes this view, proving that there were earlier occurrences of the word in Romance languages, concluding that it was a Romance neologism. In fact, in his text *Muttersprache und Muttererziehung* (1942), Spitzer was the first scholar to cement this argument, interpreting the use of *lingua materna* as a medieval Catholic neologism. Hutton (1999) offers an analysis of the Nazification of German linguistics and comparative philology in the 1930s, and a growing strong link between mother tongue and nationalism. Weisberger (1929) and Schmidt-Rohr (1932) belong to

this group of scholars in this context who would exalt the mother tongue and tie it to the soul of a nation.

Bonfiglio cites many instances of paintings and other iconographic proof that portray the Virgin Mary breastfeeding baby Jesus. Caroline Bynum (1986) investigated the figure of Mary in the Middle Ages and concludes that women's bodies were analogous to both food and Christ's body. Mary, the mother of Christ, gives the milk, the celestial gift. Thus, through lactation, woman is the essential food provider and preparer (Bynum, 1986:190). The image of the mother nurturing a baby with milk can be tied to a mother nurturing a mother tongue, according to Bonfiglio's interpretation of Bynum's argument. Unfortunately, this is as far as we can go, since the subject invites a number of different interpretations. When it comes to written texts, Thomas Bonfiglio (2010) claims that it was Dante Alighieri in his *De vulgari eloquentia* (1304), who helped cement the idea of a mother tongue and nurturing when he attempted to draw a line between the vernacular and Latin, in his defence of vernaculars. In it, he positions the vernacular as the natural language, the mother tongue, while Latin is artificial, an outsider. He uses terms related to nurturing and lactation, and even says that the mother tongue is what we learn from those who nurture us (*nutrix*, *nutrice*) be it a mother, a nanny, a wet nurse, or all of them. Further, in the same text, he poses the issue of Adam: if he has no mother, being the first man, he is a man without mother or milk. Which language is Adam's mother tongue then? It is in the same text that he uses for the first time the term mother tongue (*maternam locutionem)* in Latin. Bonfiglio argues that Renaissance scholars such as Dante were instrumental in helping cement this image, thus connecting the mother metaphor to languages and cultures:

> When the philologists of the Italian Renaissance invoke mammary images in the discourse of the acquisition of the vernacular, they concurrently access the tremendous religious and cultural power of those images and introduce this power into the theater of language. (Bonfiglio, 2013:35)

Current studies on "motherese" further these assumptions of the close relationship between the mother and an infant's first language.[53] Falk (2004) argues that the attribution of the term as such anchors language acquisition in mother-infant physical proximity and intimacy, attributing bodily aspects to language.[54] This bodily aspect is present in the metaphors that consequently result in a trope when people, including writers and translators, talk about their linguistic identity. For now, it is important to reinforce that in Linguistics, this term is now in disuse. The term mother tongue is too tied to the idea of the mother as the main carer, and it does not apply to reality in all contexts. One's mother tongue is not always one's mother's mother tongue. Nevertheless, the mother tongue is still a powerful image and a metaphorical opportunity in literary writing. It easily ties to the monolingual ideals and with them the family romance model.

The family romance in the European early modern comparatist approach was extended to the idea of gendered discourses to describe separate languages. Family romance is a term used by Yasemin Yildiz (2012), borrowing from Freudian discourse, with which she claims that "linguistic family romances" assist in the creation of a fantasy of familial connections to language which do not exist, and that "the model offers a blueprint for tracing the emergence of possible alternative family romances that produce different conceptions of the relationship between languages and subjects and origins of their affective ties" (Yildiz, 2012:12). If the linguistic family romance is a mode used to express an individual's affective ties to the languages they use, the medieval and early modern practice of creating family ties between Indo-European languages further these already complex linguistic and cultural relationships.

According to Davidson (2009), in her introduction to *Medievalism, Multilingualism and Chaucer*, it was after the medieval and Early Modern periods that English was constructed in the general discourse as superior in comparison to French because it was seen as a manly language. She goes further by claiming that "masculinist discourses that, by first effeminizing multilingualism, have

---

[53] Form of speech used especially by mothers in talking to very young children: also called parentese, baby talk, caregiver speech, caretaker speech.

subsequently contributed to supporting Anglophone monolingual superiority so successfully." (Davidson, 2009:4). Ardis Butterfield, in a book dedicated to the topic, explores the language politics in the period of the 100 Years War and the vernacularising thrust in England that sought to separate English and French in English literary scholarship, as a reflection of the conflict between France and England. The two vernaculars of England at the time, French and English, meant that English had to fight for its supremacy, which was reflected in the gender attributions made to either language. Butterfield claims that:

> English is not yet confident enough in its local identity to feel authorized as a written vernacular. It appeals to the notion of a mother tongue to justify its natural status, but this notion conforms its vulnerability. French, on its part, revels in a more learned fantasy about female eloquence, but this association also contains the capacity to sully it. It must shake off its links with mere female orality and conform its status of written, authoritative expression. (Butterfield,2009:349)

If French multilingualism was seen as the weak feminine counterpart to Anglophone masculine monolingualism, as then it is not too difficult to see the connections between those notions already mentioned here of the mother tongue, the wet nurse language, kitchen languages, and so on.[55] According to Ardis Butterfield, the multilingual reality of England before Chaucer has been largely erased from the history of English literature. To that, the author claims:

[55] My use of kitchen languages here refers to many different uses of the kitchen/cooking metaphor used in relation to language. In the Middle Ages and Early Modern times there are several references, in German, Italian, and English, among others, to a poor grasp/use of Latin as *Küchenlatein, latino di cucina*, Kitchen Latin. In a different sense, in the contemporary US context, the substantial Latinx Community means that many restaurant workers are Spanish speakers and thus a sort of lingua franca of the professional kitchen is established: kitchen Spanish. Kitchen Spanish may refer sometimes to a US American monolingual anglophone speaker who has worked in restaurants and learned a few words and commands in Spanish, refering to this repertoire as Kitchen Spanish. The idea of kitchen languages relates as well to the concept of mother tongue and that of a domestic, private language acquisition vs. Public/education acquisition. Perhaps the most well-known case is that of feminist publishing collective Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press, set up in the 1980s in the US by audre lorde and Barbara Smith. Their explanation for the name was that the kitchen table was historically a safe space while also being a place of labour for women of colour. Following this, a multilingual translation anthology edited by Madhu H. Kaza, featuring work by immigrant and diasporic translators, was published under the auspicious name *Kitchen Table Translation* (2017).

> That England was a trilingual country right through the period is an often asserted but remarkably unacknowledged point in English literary history. Despite the existence of a substantial body of writing in French and Latin produced in England, and an important and growing body of work on the trilingual manuscript culture of late - thirteenth and early - fourteenth century England, the conventional literary history elides this in favour of writing in English. Research on such manuscripts as London British Library MSS, Harley 913 and 2253, BL MS Addit. 46919, and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 86 continues apace, but writings in English in these manuscripts, and monolingual compilations such as the Auchinleck MS, still tend to gain the lion's share of attention in discussions of Englishness. (Butterfield,2009:11-12)

Thus, it seems that it was after the period that a growing chasm between the two languages, partly brought upon by the 100 Years War, has resulted in an effort to erase multilingualism (represented by the vast use of French in medieval and Early Modern England) from the history of English literature and culture, and thus frame it as a foreign, other force. Increasingly, then, English had to become the national language, pushing other language uses into the realm of the home. If the state is monolingual, but the home is multilingual, the multilingual being hidden-behind-curtains linguistic practices while the public, the state, is monolingual, and masculine, then much can be explained about current approaches to multilingualism in language policy and planning, not least in the post-Brexit United Kingdom.

Both the native speaker and the mother tongue are powerful myths, powerful because they remain uncontested. According to Gilmour (2020):

> Yet their power lies in their ubiquity, and in the pronouncements which they make – without ever seeming to – about what a language is, about who authentically belongs in language and who has authority as a speaker, as well as about language's intrinsic, self-evident, and given interiority. (Gilmour, 2020:101)

If we want to contest such terms, we must look to those, like Chow, who aim to do exactly that, and propose new ways and new paradigms to counter the powerful myths of the mother tongue and the native speaker. In

these chapters and in the interviews that follow, it will be demonstrated how fraught this view of language-as-monolith can be when applied to translation, and to L2 translation in particular.

2.3.3 The Postmonolingual Condition

Yasemin Yildiz, in her book *Beyond the Mother Tongue* (2012) also offers an analysis of multi- and monolingualism from a historical approach. According to the author, monolingualism is a relatively recent phenomenon, but a highly successful one, aided and based on a monolingual paradigm that obscured from view the multilingual nature of Europe both in the present but also in the past. It is believed that this paradigm had its onset at the end of the eighteenth century.[56] The monolingual bias and monolingual *habitus* of our modern way of thinking affect the construction of individuals and their proper subjectivity, the formation of disciplines and institutions, and imagined collectives, culminating in a most base/essential sense in cultures and nations.

But what is the postmonolingual paradigm? This term, introduced by the author, uses the prefix "post" in a historicizing approach as temporally dominated, that is, it signifies the period since the emergence of monolingualism as the dominant paradigm, which first occurred in late eighteenth-century Europe. (Yildiz, 2012:4). This paradigm, however, spread in different ways across varied contexts, so the term would also need a more flexible character, in order to define the period or the paradigm both temporally after monolingualism as a dominant ideal, but also the tension between mono- and multilingual contexts. In this sense, according to Yildiz, the postmonolingual paradigm "refers to the unfolding of the effects of the monolingual and not to its successful overcoming or transcendence." (Yildiz, 2012:4). It offers, at the same time, with "post", a critical function to the dominance of the monolingual *habitus*, a struggle against, a rupture. In the author's own words, then:

---

[56] The linguist Einar Haugen (1966) first defined the monolingual bias as likely stemming from historical processes of nation-building and cultural assimilation, and the idea of monolingual bias/paradigm has no direct ties to a specific historical period but points to the start of nation building as the main catalyst for this change.

> postmonolingual in this study refers to a field of tension in which the monolingual paradigm continues to assert itself and multilingual practices persist or reemerge. This term therefore can bring into sharper focus the back-and-forth movement between these two tendencies that characterizes contemporary linguistic constellations (Yildiz, 2012:5)

The German context, which is considered to be one of the founding grounds of the monolingual paradigm also offers nowadays many counteractions to the monolingual bias. In the political turmoil that was the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, German thinkers such as Herder, Humboldt, Schleiermacher, and Wagner, to name a few, started spreading the romantic notion of a natural language tied to a nation, a people, a *Volk*. According to anthropologist Susan Gal (1993), language started to be seen as an object, with particular attributes, after the romantic reaction to the Enlightenment. Herder saw language as emanating from a particular people. According to Yildiz "the multiplication of languages is not an issue for this Herderian view as long as each language is conceived as distinct and separate and as belonging to just one equally distinct and separate people." (Yildiz, 2012:7)

In the chapters that constitute Yildiz's monograph, the author explores several examples of writers in the German-speaking context who are in some way or another negating the monolingual paradigm of German: Franz Kafka, Theodor Adorno, Yoko Tawada, Emine Özdamar, and Feridun Zaimoğlu. She argues that all of these authors see mother tongue in the German context in a different way, be it as a site of alienation, identity, exclusion, inclusion, violence. These authors do not negate or move against German but rather show how German in their context is different from the public discourse around the homogeneity of the German language. According to Yildiz:

> This stress on homogeneity, I would argue, constitutes an inadvertent admission of the reality of heterogeneity. In post-monolingual terms, it constitutes an attempted reassertion of the monolingual paradigm vis-à-vis the realization of multilingual realities. Coloring the tongue is a response to recognizing that not all tongues are German, that the country is multilingually inhabited. This particular vision does not want to admit the nature

> of multilingual practices, the ability to live multiple belongings, but neither does it want to admit the reality that many minorities are already German speakers, even if the dominant society does not yet believe that. (Yildiz, 2012:208)

These authors, and in fact, others that could be added to this roster, are destabilising the connection once thought inherent and indivisible between language and ethnicity. This connection forgets that it portrays language as a standardised system, rather than as a social and cultural practice. If language is seen as the latter, language as a practice is one of the multiple ways the post-monolingual paradigm proposes its major transgressions. Again, as stated by Yildiz:

> The German that emerges here in postmonolingual perspective has been and continues to be a home for many—a home that is itself undergoing transformation, a home that is not exclusionary, that it is impure, marked, tainted, "enriched," and charged. The use of German by those not deemed legitimate speakers, whether Kafka or Zaimoğlu, indicates that German is already a lingua franca—with all the de/formations that happen to such a language, as the different forms of "Englishes" in the world demonstrate. This view of German as a lingua franca rather than as a purely national language could be a curative to the proprietary, exclusionary claims made on the language today (2012:211)

As we see in this quote, Yildiz raises the issue of German as a lingua franca. The study of the world's lingua francas and its many historical, political, cultural implications is a rich area which looks closely at how national languages become deterritorialised and turn into a global, international language, yet not necessarily culture-free (Hülmbauer et al, 2008; Baker, 2009; Cogo, 2012). English, as the perceived major lingua franca in many contexts, has its own area of studies, ELF, English as a Lingua Franca. There are different perspectives within the area, some arguing that those who speak ELF should not be considered learners, but users, while some criticise the native-speakerism still present in the teaching of EFL. The study of lingua francas is a fast-evolving discipline, due to the very dynamic nature of the objects of study. For this reason, and so as not to expand tangentially in another terminological

direction, a mention of lingua franca as a move towards deterritorialising languages will suffice. There is a need for more studies on translation and lingua francas and the many gatekeeping practices in place. For the time being it is important to notice that in a post-monolingual paradigm the connection between language and nation is no longer straightforward. This connection moves away from essential ideas about a language and its natives and into the many ways in which languages in use are changed by different languaging practices.

2.4 Denouement

At this textual crossroads I would like to bring back a provocation from Pokorn's (2005) study to foreground how the themes and topics raised in this chapter connect to the issue of L2 translation. As she puts it:

> Some contemporary translation practitioners and theoreticians then uncritically accept the concept of an ideal native speaker as an arbiter and model of grammaticality, who masters his/her mother tongue completely and in all its details, who has access to all the hidden channels of unutterable associative connectedness between words and concepts, and can therefore also create linguistically and culturally impeccable translations. This theoretical position, however, also has an additional corollary: it ethnocentrically defends the notion of the superiority of the "natural native speaker", the innate state that can never be acquired, and thus rejects the marginal and peripheral (i.e. translators from immigrant communities and the practice of team translation) as necessarily inferior. (Pokorn, 2005:27)

As Pokorn eloquently posits, these 'uncritically accepted concepts' must be unpacked, repeatedly, and translation practitioners and theoreticians must come to terms with evolutions in other disciplines regarding these myths which sustain the beliefs still rampant in Translation Studies, especially when talking about literary translation. We must be weary of norms which exclude such a great number of people from the communities of interpretation and action within literary translation. Literary Translation Studies, into English especially, must face various privileges, prejudices, and dangerously excluding

practices which are still acting to keep some translation practices, such as L2 translation, as a suboptimal outlier in the translation world.

Chapter 3 – Bi, Multi, Trans and Exo: The multiplicity of language practices

In this chapter, I will explore key concepts beyond monolingualism, those that try to name and understand when people use more than one language. In this overview, the reader will encounter several terms: bilingual, languaging, bilanguaging, multilingualism, plurilingualism, translingualism, translanguaging, exophony. There is discussion around the differences between the various terms: both in definition and in application, and I intend to give an overview of the main issues. However, the aim is not to create further confusion, adding another species to this fauna of terminology. The objective here is to foreground the multiplicity of language practices, the inherent monolingual bias even in multilingualism studies and approaches. The studies and issues foregrounded here will also show the epistemic weakness in trying to forcefully tie these concepts down in favour of language order and of a linguistic utopia (Pratt, 1987) still prevalent in Translation Studies.

3.1 Bilingualism, Bilanguaging

When we talk about translation, and more specifically translation directionality or language pairs, it is assumed that at least two languages are at play: the source language and the target language. In the US American context, the field of comparative literature, under which studies of translation are usually found, also assumes two languages are involved in a translational act. In the UK context, on the other hand, translation is found within Modern Languages departments, which are also somewhat tied to distinct national languages. Even the way comparative literature sees multilingualism is under the guise of multiple monolingualisms. Two languages imply a level of bilingualism, as is clear from the term's prefix. But how is bilingualism defined and understood?

From the very limited definition of bilingualism as "the native-like control of two or more languages" by Bloomfield (1933) to an all-encompassing definition of incipient bilingualism by Diebold (1964), which resulted in people with minimal competence in the L2 being categorized as bilinguals generally in society, the word 'bilingual' has been the subject of

major disputes and research over the last century. Not only is bilingualism divided into two kinds: individual and societal (i.e., a characteristic of a specific individual, or a phenomenon in a social group, community, or country), but there are also different dimensions of bilingualism (Baker 2001). These dimensions range from language ability to language use, a difference between degree and function. According to Stern (1992) there is no standardized use of terms like language ability, language achievement, language competence, language performance and language proficiency. This in turn is an issue for the study of bilingualism and has implications for the use of the word bilingual in different settings.

The many dimensions of bilingualism also hinder a generalized view of the phenomenon. Valdés and Figueroa (1994) separate these dimensions into six categories: age (simultaneous, sequential, late), ability (incipient, receptive, productive), balance of two or more languages, development (ascendant, recessive), context of acquisition and the difference between elective and circumstantial bilingualism. This goes to show that there are many aspects to bilingualism that go beyond a simple definition such as Bloomfield's. Not only that, but when thinking about bilingualism the four classic linguistic skills come to mind: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These abilities, however, are not always balanced, they are not, as Baker (2001:5) puts it, black and white. There are sub-scales and different dimensions to these abilities, a set of skills within skills that are not easily quantifiable or definable. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), inner thinking, which can be a part of inner speech, is a possible fifth language ability to be placed alongside the ones mentioned above. Baker (2001:6) also mentions the issue of minimal and maximal bilingualism, opposing the maximal definition of bilingualism by Bloomfield to the minimal requirement definition by Diebold.

In between these two poles, the reality of bilingualism is of diverse proficiency levels in many shades and, more importantly, language use. Language use as a valuable tool for measuring bilingualism in different contexts appears to be one of the least problematic ways of dealing with the multiplicity of the topic. A native speaker of two or more languages might be considered a bilingual, but Cummins (1984) proposes the idea of academic

competence in a language, the ability to express oneself in a professional context in which writing plays a major role, which is not necessarily an ability that all native speakers or bilingual speakers have in the languages of which they are traditionally considered to have mastery. Similarly, works such as those of Bassetti (2012), show that it is important to differentiate between a bilingual and a biliterate, as not all bilinguals make use of different writing systems (the difference between monoliterate bilinguals and biliterate bilinguals). Such a distinction is especially important when thinking about the translation of written texts. According to Bassetti:

> The secondary role attributed to reading and writing is largely a consequence of the widespread idea of the primacy of spoken language, whose basic tenet is that spoken language is innate in all human beings, whereas written language is only learnt through instruction and is not universal. However, this tenet does not apply to instructed sequential bilinguals, who rarely acquire a native-like pronunciation in their second language but can acquire native - level spelling skills, who are often instructed in L2 pronunciation but not in L2 orthography, and whose L2 input and output are often written from the very beginning and in large amounts. (Bassetti, 2012:652)

This differentiation proposed by Bassetti is central to the work of L2 writing and translation. After all, here we are not talking about speakers, but language users, and users of a very specific written language, in the case of literary translation. As we know from Noam Chomsky's theorization (1965), language competence and language performance are two different things, and as we will see further on when we talk about language as performance, having competence in a language and performing well in that language - be it spoken, written, signed, and within these in the several different contexts that exist – are two very different things.[57] Adding another language to that mix makes the performance an even more complicated affair.

[57] Chomsky's emphasis on grammar in defining competence has been the object of some criticism, but his distinction is essential for linguistics. However, Chomskyans would often focus more on competence than language performance, which is the opposite of the focus we will arrive at the end of this chapter.

Nevertheless, categorizing bilinguals depends mainly on the purpose of such categorization. This can result in a suppression or a maximisation of the reality of bi- or multilingualism. The idea of the balanced bilingual is often seen as an idealized concept. In fact, Fishman (1971) raises the issue of the rarity of someone being equally competent across all contexts (what some authors call an "equilingual") and spoke of the danger of low levels of competencies being considered balanced.

The monolingual bias comes into play again when defining and categorizing different ideas of bilingualism. Often in governmental policies and especially in English-speaking countries, the monolingual/fractional view is used, that of a bilingual being two monolinguals in one person. In this view, the bilingual individual's ability in the two languages is defined by comparing it to monolingual test scores, resulting in the classification of groups of individuals as semilingual, or of LEP (Limited English Proficiency). This ignores the fact that access to a language and opportunities for using it are tied to socio-economic realities. It is also important to point out, as Baker does, that "between half and two thirds of the world is bilingual, but the monolingual is often seen as normal whereas the bilingual is the exclusion" (2001:8). In fact, in many parts of the world, bilingualism is the norm, and even in English-speaking countries which like to see themselves as monolingual, bi- and multilingualism remains a hidden reality.[58] A more holistic view of bilingualism, offered by Grosjean (1985, 1994), considers that "any assessment of a bilingual's language proficiency should ideally move away from the traditional language tests with the emphasis on form and correctness, and to an evaluation of general communicative competence" (Baker 2001:8) This assessment should be sensitive to the different contexts and uses of language

[58] In the USA, for example, English is not the *de jure* national language, though it is perceived by many as the *de facto* language of the country. Studies on multilingualism in England in Early Modern and medieval times are few and far apart but this is a field with crucial contributions to discussions about monologic amnesia in multilingual anglophone contexts (see Fleischmann, 1996; Galbraith, 1941, Davidson, 2009; Jefferson & Putter, 2013, among others). According to Davidson, 2009: "monolingualist dispositions have already erased multiple language experiences from the national memory of American history, for it seems that "forgetting language difference [...] is still the urgent component of [. . .] anglophone America's understanding of itself." Thus, to be able to construct a historical narrative of the monolingual nation, American English must be amnesic of its multilingualism both past and present." (p.5-6)

by these subjects, evaluating then the multi-competencies of bilinguals (Cook 1992).

Work such as Hansegard's (1975) which tries to define deficiencies in the language competencies of bilinguals, considering people with such deficiencies to be semilinguals, have met with a great deal of criticism, mainly due to the fact that these ignore different contexts, qualitative aspects of language competencies, value-laden cut-off points and testing, etc. On the topic of deficiencies, Jeanine Treffers-Daller (2018) points out that:

> Differences between bilinguals and monolinguals are then labeled "the bilingual deficit," and bilinguals who have a stronger and a weaker language are labeled "unbalanced bilinguals" or even "non-proficient bilinguals." This deficit view is unfortunately still prevalent in both the field of second language acquisition (SLA) and that of bilingualism, in spite of Skutnabb-Kangas's (1981, p. 194) warning many years ago that simple measurements on which monolinguals and bilinguals are compared do more harm than good. (Treffers-Daller, 2018:290)

This deficit is heavily based on a native speaker as the centre and the yardstick against whom all learners and/or speakers of a language are measured. One point of criticism that comes up quite frequently is the fact that a comparison with monolingual language ability is not a fair one. Some scholars such as Ortega (2013) have called for a bi/multilingual turn in the field of second language acquisition, a difference in outlook that, according to Pearson (2010), still needs to be adopted by the field of bilingualism itself.

There is a difference, according to bilingualism scholars, between conversational fluency and academic language competence, as I mentioned above. Hernández-Chavez (1978) offers 64 separate components of language proficiency, while Oller and Perkins (1980) propose the concept of global language proficiency, with specific sub-competencies and aspects to individual proficiencies. Cummins (2000) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) also argue that there is a difference between academically related language proficiency and conversational competence. Some scholars also differentiate between Fishman's notion of functional bilingualism (1965), that is, the level of language competence as applied to use in different contexts, and language background (Baker and Hinde 1984; Baker 1985). Fishman also proposes the

concept of language choice in his foray into bilingualism, but Baker (2001:13) argues that in some situations there might not be many choices involved in using one language or the other. Li Wei et al (1992) consider that the degree of contact can be a factor in language choice, and code-switching – a research field that merits its own analysis – is a reality among bilingual individuals. In Baker's review of bilingualism, we can conclude that the "definition of who is bilingual is essentially elusive and ultimately impossible" (2001:15).

Considering the social aspect of bilingualism, where a bilingual is the result, "the circumstance of social access, and not just an internal trove of abilities" (Gramling, 2018:34) we have the inclusive definition of bilinguality by Hamers and Blanc:

> Bilinguality is the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication: the degree of access will vary along a number of dimensions which are psychological, cognitive, psycholinguistic, social-psychological, social, sociological, sociolinguistic, sociocultural and linguistic. (2000:6)

Therefore, taking bilinguality as the way forward, translators could be seen as embodying this bilinguality that Hamers and Blanc propose, not only exophonic, L2 but also L1, monolingual translators. Having this access to two or more languages and the ability to perform in these codes is what characterizes the translator, and more specifically in our case, the literary translator. With that in mind and considering that my aim here is not to dedicate too much space to discussing whether a certain L2 translation activity is carried out by a bilingual subject or not, I will try to think of the L2, or exophonic translator, as a bilingual. Rarely does a translator need to prove bilingual status, as per Bloomfield's definition, to work with two languages. They need to prove that they can navigate the idiosyncrasies and potential pitfalls that come up in the process of translating between two (or more) different systems of language and culture. For these translators to feel like they can perform in these different systems and codes, the question of fluency and language acquisition comes to the fore, and the question of how to define a

subject's fluency will appear in my interviews with L2 translators and will be discussed in what follows.

3.1.2 Fluency, Proficiency and Second Language Acquisition

Fluency, according to the Cambridge Online Dictionary, means "the ability to speak or write a language easily, well, and quickly".[59] The second meaning given for fluency in the same dictionary is slightly less specific to languages, defined as "an attractive smooth quality in the way someone or something moves". In turn, the OED defines fluency as both "the quality of being able to speak or write a language, especially a foreign language, easily and well" and "the quality of doing something in a way that is smooth and shows skill".[60] It is worthy of note here that there is no further definition or what "easily and well" means in any of the dictionaries, whereas COD adds "and quickly". These, however, are the lay meanings of fluency. If we investigate a specialist area like Sociolinguistics or Applied Linguistics, or more specifically, language acquisition studies, the definitions become more specific.

In the field of Applied Linguistics, and more specifically in second language acquisition, a definition of fluency goes into more detail on the requisites for a person to be deemed fluent. According to the *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*,[61] fluency is:

> a level of proficiency in communication, which includes:
> a. the ability to produce written and/or spoken language with ease.
> b. the ability to speak with a good but not necessarily perfect command of intonation, vocabulary, and grammar.
> c. the ability to communicate ideas effectively.
> d. the ability to produce continuous speech without causing comprehension.
> difficulties or a breakdown of communication.

[59] https://dictionary.cambridge.org/pt/dicionario/ingles/fluency (accessed 03.05.2021)
[60] fluency noun - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and usage notes | Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary at OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com, 2022) (accessed 01.05.2021)
[61] Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R.W. (2011). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge

> It is sometimes contrasted with accuracy, which refers to the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences but may not include the ability to speak or write fluently.

One can see here that when defining fluency in this specialist context, a distinction between fluency and proficiency is drawn. Here, fluency comprises a level of proficiency that is part of the whole, not equated to it. In the definition, you can find words such as "with ease", "effectively" and mention of fluency as communicative ability. At the same time, this definition does stress/underline the fact that fluency means good, not flawless ability. Finally, in this entry one is presented with a contrast between fluency and accuracy, meaning that grammatical accuracy does not equate to fluency or communication ease.

We first need to do a reckoning with the term (L2) fluency itself. We start with Lennon, whose seminal studies kickstarted many others and cemented early definitions of fluency for researchers (1990, 2000). Lennon proposes a distinction between a broad sense of fluency (higher-order fluency) and a narrow sense of fluency (lower-order fluency). The narrow sense of fluency looks at specific temporal phenomena in oral production (speech rates, pausing, for example) while the broad sense encompasses 'all-round oral proficiency' (Lennon, 2000:25). These distinctions, however, are focused on oral proficiency, as they reflect the idea that fluency is one of the three features of L2 oral proficiency in the Complexity-Accuracy-Fluency (CAF) framework.[62] However, often in using this ambiguous terminology, a higher level of CAF is assumed in different areas of language use, both productive (speaking, writing) and receptive (listening, reading), but including written, not only oral, language skills. From this assumption and from a study testing teachers' perceptions of L2 fluency arises Tavakoli and Hunter's (2018:14) addition of another layer of meaning for fluency: that of overall mastery or general proficiency in a language. This seems to be more in tune with the idea of fluency as a synonym for general language proficiency as we will see in some of the responses further on.

[62] See Housen et al., 2012.

Even in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), the term L2 fluency is somewhat subjective. In SLA it is quite well-known and agreed upon that the age of onset (AO), that is, the age at which an individual learns a second language, is negatively correlated with their second language attainment. That means, the earlier the AO, the better the learner's second language attainment will be, and therefore the better their L2 fluency. To establish this correlation, researchers put individuals through varied tests of the many linguistic domains involved in L2 fluency. These studies use the Critical Period Hypothesis, that is, that there is a period in a person's life, usually between birth and puberty, when there is a heightened sensitivity to linguistic input. These studies often prove that the older a language learner is, the further away they will be from native-level language attainment in that second language. In many of these studies, researchers use native speakers to help define these levels of language attainment. Native-speakerism is once again present. There are levels of fluency in which age of onset plays a more important part compared to others. In fact, even though under-researched and generally assumed with very little evidence, the native speaker is the starting point for measuring fluency in L2. In fact, according to the few studies on it, not even native speakers can produce equally fluently in all situations nor are they a homogenous group, with great variation in fluency being observed within native-speaker groups (Fillmore, 1979; Lennon, 1990; Riggenbach, 1991; Kahng, 2014; Peltonen & Lintunen, 2016).

Proficiency is defined as "the fact of having the skill and experience for doing something".[63] As we have seen, some definitions of fluency include mention of proficiency as related to it but not equal. And vice versa, any definition of proficiency would imply a level of fluency, or rather, fluency as being an integral cog in the proficiency machine. More specifically here, language proficiency is defined in a specialised dictionary as:

> the degree of skill with which a person can use a language, such as how well a person can read, write, speak, or understand language. This can be contrasted with language achievement, which describes

[63] https://dictionary.cambridge.org/pt/dicionario/ingles/proficiency (Accessed 01.05.2021)

> language ability as a result of learning. Proficiency may be measured through the use of a proficiency test.[64]

Despite several proficiency frameworks and official proficiency tests, there are ongoing issues when defining what is, in fact, proficiency. Any definition is highly dependent on these frameworks and institutional guidelines; however, most people equate fluency with proficiency. Even specialist studies in L2 fluency highlight the fact that fluency is under-researched and that there are even fewer studies focusing on the definition of the concept of L2 fluency or in how learners view the concept.[65] I believe the crucial difference between the two words is that proficiency assumes an official standing. To call oneself proficient, a language user is usually given a document, passes a test, gets an accreditation from official sources to prove that they fit into the mould of what language proficiency is for that language or institution. As we have seen, fluency is much less official and is rather slippery to define. This difficulty of definition comes from the fact that the reality of language use is much more heterogeneous and thus often escapes definition. Similarly, fluency and proficiency exist on a spectrum and change depending on the specific individuals, contexts, and repertoires we are referring to. Perhaps in not seeing language a monolith to be 'acquired', one can start unpacking its actual use in society. As Beeby and Hopper elaborated in *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure* (2001): "the notion of language as a monolithic system has had to give way to that of language as a massive collection of heterogeneous constructions, each with affinities to different contexts and in constant structural adaptation to usage" (Beeby & Hopper, 2001:3). The permanence of the L1 translation norm perhaps reflects how traditional literary Translation Studies, especially in the anglophone sphere, have ignored advances in other areas of language study that have already moved away from the 'language as monolith' myth. However, as we see in this chapter, even those areas are still

---

[64] Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R.W. (2011). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge page 321

[65] Some of the most relevant studies that focus on the variation of the definition of fluency and proficiency are, for example, Chambers, 1997; Koponen & Riggenbach, 2000. Studies focusing on the concept of L2 fluency include Prefontaine & Kormos, 2016; Tavakoli & Hunter, 2018) and on how language learners understand this concept we have mainly Prefontaine, 2013 and Lintunen & Peltonen, 2019.

steeped in the monolingual mindset, and even when the study of multilingualism is in place, there is an implicit bias toward a standardized and monolingual view of language, where multilingualism is seen as multiple monolanguages.

3.2 Multilingualism, Plurilingualism: Problems of definition

In the small and recent body of scholarship investigating multilingual language practice in pre-colonial times, another term has been proposed: plurilingualism. According to Canagarajah & Liyanage (2012), plurilingualism is a better term to deal with those pre-colonial linguistic realities, especially where it differs from multilingualism.[66] The Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe defines plurilingualism as "The intrinsic capacity of all speakers to use and learn, alone or through teaching, more than one language." (2000:168). It differs from both societal and individual multilingualism in that:

> Societal multilingualism refers to languages having their separate identities in (sometimes) separate areas of a geographical location. Individual multilingualism similarly refers to separate, whole and advanced competence in the different languages one speaks – almost as if it constitutes two or three separate monolingualisms. (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012:50)

At the same time, plurilingualism would imply that these several language competences are related in a more dynamic way. It is worth noting here that such a capacity is innovative in that it reworks the idea of language competence as using different languages and repertoires for distinctive purposes, focusing on integrated competencies rather than separate linguistic competencies for each language. According to Canagarajah & Liyanage (2012:50), this is because, as opposed to multilingualism, plurilingualism does

[66] All the while, some authors, such as Meir Sternberg, argue that literary works are either unilingual or polylingual, and that the terms mono- and multilingualism should be reserved as 'sociolinguistic terms used for speakers and communities' (Sternberg apud Lennon, 2015:145). I shall not expand on Sternberg's differentiation, so as not to confuse the reader further, but Sternberg's differentiation between written and spoken language is an important one, especially regarding literary translation.

not see the possible languages involved as separate entities. They define plurilingualism further as follows:

> However, in plurilingual competence the directionality of influence is multilateral. Also, the languages may influence each other's development. More importantly, the competence in the languages is integrated, not separated. In plurilingual communication, diverse languages may find accommodation in a person's repertoire. The person may not have any advanced proficiency in all the languages, and yet mix words and grammatical structures of one language into syntax from other languages to form an integrated composite. (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012:50)

In many instances, multilingualism is regarded as an elitist practice, partly because of societal limitations on multi- and plurilingualism. However, it is precisely because multilingualism is often used as an umbrella term for several very diverse plurilingual practices that such a view is still rampant in some contexts. This is because the different languages and language competencies are viewed separately, and their use is often viewed through an ordolingual, language-as-commodity lens (cf. Gramling, 2021).[67] This underlying thought can be seen in the terminology used around language learning and language use: to "acquire", "gain" language competence, to "master" a language. [68] Language is a commodity, and it is used as such, added to a curriculum to better the chances of a subject in the linguacene.[69] However, a similar privilege is not granted to heritage speakers, speakers of indigenous and other minoritized languages, or those who have learned their language because of colonial subjugation, migration, etc. Nevertheless, even those scholars who propose alternative terminologies for dealing with multilingual

---

[67] For more on the topic of linguanomics, see Hogan-Brun (2020).

[68] A multilingual person, when asked (at least in the UK context) how many languages they speak, often hears, after their reply, phrases such as "and I don't even know English".

[69] Linguacene is a term introduced by David Gramling in *The Invention of Monolingualism* (2018). He posits that "Whereas anthropocene designates an era of human action that alters the planet, linguacene accounts for an era in which large-scale discourse – translingually mediated – alters the planet in intensities and scalar trajectories unimaginable in the mid-twentieth century. [...] twenty-first century protocols for industrial distribution in the linguacene first project global saturation, and deal with the logistical and linguistic hurdles as a matter of course. Multilingualism is then the field of symbolic extraction upon which these protocols must necessarily succeed, by way of efficiently managed, increasingly auto-correcting translational monolingualism." (2018:215)

realities concede that the task of naming those differences and splitting the study of multilingualism into different realms might do more harm than good. According to Canagarajah & Liyanage (2012):

> The difference between multilingualism and plurilingualism is largely theoretical. These are not different practices. The terms connote different ways of perceiving the relationship between languages in society and individual repertoire. The dominance of monolingual assumptions in linguistics has prevented scholars from appreciating plurilingualism. For this reason, the understanding of multilingualism in the field is coloured by monolingual biases and fails to go far. (Canagarajah & Liyanage 2012:50)

This concession by the authors is important at this juncture: the main difference or goal in devising new terminology to deal with multilingual practices has more to do with providing a different outlook on the practice, devoid of concepts of homogeneity and uniformity, distancing this outlook from monolingual ideals.[70] However, any further attempts at categorizing and stabilizing multilingualism, albeit necessary and possibly fruitful, need to take into consideration the inherent instability and diversity of this topic. As Gramling (2021) puts it:

> Those who, for an apparently good-faith reason, seek to delimit multilingual experience for policy purposes may force their fellows, learners, and collaborators into consensus and compromise on a definition where there simply cannot be any - or cannot yet be any. In the coming decades, multilingual experience will likely become even harder to distil into a definition or policy platform than it is today. And perhaps it ought to be so. (Gramling, 2021:11)

Hence, and following Gramling's conclusion that multilingual experience is hard to distil into a definition, we will now rest these terminological discussions to focus on a history and critique of literary

[70] There are advantages to using multilingualism as an umbrella term. As Gramling states: "Despite its terminological vulnerabilities and its technological instrumentalizations, 'multilingualism" is usefully able to encompass complex, divergent and sometimes opposing experiences and ideas. It does so in a wide array of planetary contexts - fictitious and real, political and social, North and South, colonial and decolonial, individual and collective, oppressive and liberatory, embodied and prosthetic, present and past." (Gramling, 2021:10)

multilingualism, language as performance and as prosthesis, with exophony as a possible approach to the performative choice of another literary language of expression.

3.2.1 Literary Multilingualism

The name comparative literature implies that its aims involve a comparison. Both the names of Comparative Literature and its more recent development World Literature, contain these implications. However, there is something dubious about a discipline founded on the idea of monolingual national literatures of Western Europe in dialogue with each other, as is the case of the former, or in 'reading the world' while largely disregarding translation and as an attempt at creating what author Tiffany Tsao called a literary guidebook, as is the case of the latter.[71] Translation is central to the comparatist, yet it also suffers from a great deal of invisibility within the discipline and among comparatist scholars. As Spanish literary scholar Claudio Guillen outlines:

> The *littérature comparée* of the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, based partly on an excluding and centralising nationalism, and partly on a Romantic conception of the soul or of the unmistakable genius of each language, did not pay enough sympathetic attention to the phenomena of multilingualism, so important throughout the literary history of the West. (Guillen, 1993:260-61)

[71] See Tsao's 2020 interview for *Liminal Mag*, as well as my essay in *Violent Phenomena*, an anthology on decolonising translation, listed in the references as Collischonn (2022). For an example of the disregard for translation in World Literature studies, the Warwick Research Collective, in their book *Combined and Uneven Development* (2015) state that "Comparative literature's insistence on multilinguisticality is more often the leading edge of an unambiguous fetishism of language (and hence of the authority of professional experience) than of any commitment to cultural dialogue or social mutuality" (2015:27). Earlier on in the same chapter, critiquing Emily Apter, we see the following claim: "Apter's purported defence of comparative literature against 'national literature' programmes fails to hit the mark against English. For 'English' has never been 'national' in the sense evidently imagined by Apter. On the contrary, it has always, and for any number of reasons (not all of which do it credit, to be sure), been deeply invested in the worldliness of language and literature, in their political instrumentality and social power" (2015: 25). It is important to mention at this juncture that the authors' inability to see the 'national' behind English-speaking departments perhaps points to their own linguistic privilege.

Guillen points here to a lack of attention to multilingualism in literary studies and especially in European literary history. Looking elsewhere, and with the avail of postcolonial studies, we can see how multilingualism is a defining practice in pre-colonial and postcolonial times, in varying geographical regions, but literary studies in the West have preferred to ignore both the historical and the contemporary multilingualism of Europe. Or rather, to see them through a lens of multiple monolingualisms. This study is inspired by, in direct reference to, and dialogues with other studies on literary multilingualism. From medieval and Early Modern to modernist and postcolonialist lenses through which one can see literary multilingualism, it shows how such a phenomenon is varied and ever-changing, as well as historical. In this section, I will offer a brief overview of studies that deal with the history of multilingualism in literary texts in the European context, although the many examples provided by the scholars mentioned would extend this work beyond its scope. I will, however, endeavour to employ some of their conclusions in an attempt to illustrate how fraught a monolingual bias toward literature can be.

Catalan scholar Antonio Esposito denounced, in his study of bilingualism in Catalan literature, the fact that the examples presented by him would not fit the monolingual bias present in interpretations and histories of medieval language and literature. According to him:

> As for philology's contribution to sociolinguistics, the texts exist and as such represent an intelligible linguistic reality. They were destined for a bilingual reading community, in a bilingual kingdom, as an emphatic, culturally legitimizing gesture; they apparently contradict a medieval monolingual imaginary. It would serve both national schools of philology and linguistics well to learn each other's lesson: that both language and text, while maybe synonymous with an individual, are not always synonymous with the nation. (Esposito, 1995:137)

Esposito's denouncing of the medieval monolingual imaginary present in the philology and linguistics of his country could be extended to other national schools, not unlike Mary Catherine Davidson's (2009) study of multilingualism in medieval England. Both Esposito, Guillen, and other comparatists who deal with a history of multilingualism in European literatures

make direct reference and pay homage to Leonard Forster's seminal work on literary multilingualism.

Leonard Forster's de Carle lectures at the University of Otago in 1968, recorded in the book *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature* (1970), is not only one of the few examples of dedicated analysis of multilingual literature in Europe but the precursor for rich posterior analyses. Forster, in *The Poet's Tongues*, mentions a number of examples of poets in Western Europe from the early Middle Ages until the twentieth century, who used different languages as different mediums for literary practice. According to the author, "For Milton, as for Huygens, and the men of their time, there is no mystique about languages; they are simply different media in which a poet can work – and can be expected to work" (Forster, 1970:47).

Understanding that multilingualism is more present in canonical European literature than previously claimed in Translation Studies and Literary Studies is beneficial to this work's argument but also in helping us understand how the history of vernacular literature has always been influenced by a multilingual reality, and not a monolingual mindset. Forster uses throughout his short book the word polyglot, instead of other terms. To explain Forster's use of the word polyglot here, instead of other, more widely used terminology, he himself claims the term defines someone who can express himself with ease and fluency in three or more languages. Forster claims the term bilingual means someone able to do this in two languages, the prefix bi- means two, and only two. The term bilingual suffers from terminological inexactitude as we have seen previously in this chapter. According to Foster then, "the words 'bilingual', 'multilingual', or, to come back to our original term, 'polyglot', can thus be used to cover persons who have acquired some control of one or more foreign languages either at school or later in life" (Forster 1970:2). As we can see, Forster thinks of these as interchangeable, and other authors who have proposed similar studies since then take difference stances on terminology used to define these types of multilingual practices.

In Forster's study, being a polyglot, bilingual and/or multilingual individual is seen more as someone with an ability to change linguistic registers than a person with an equilingual character from birth. That means that being

bilingual meant using two or more languages in one's daily life or writing literature in different languages to serve different purposes, rather than just a state of having two first languages. In the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period, there were many polyglot poets. The poetry they wrote was not necessarily polyglot even if they were rooted in a polyglot community. At the same time, the fact that their poetry was polyglot did not necessarily mean that these poets were active users of all these languages in all functions in their daily lives. After all, as we have seen previously, in those days, language use and language fluency meant different things.

Forster claims that "In the Middle Ages and Renaissance, educated people spoke and wrote Latin in an uncomplicated matter-of-factness which most of us nowadays only achieve in our mother-tongue (sic)" (Forster, 1970:9). It is thus not surprising in the least to find bilingual and multilingual verses being written, with an alternation between Latin and a vernacular in medieval poems. Interestingly, Latin was a language of function, and "was not a mother tongue for anyone; all those who used it had to learn it. In one sense therefore the whole vast Latin literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance is polyglot poetry" (ibid:19).

Forster then shows off his breadth of knowledge of medieval poetry by offering examples of bilingual poems in Muslim Southern Spain (a part of Al-Andalus), in the eleventh to thirteenth century,[72] as well as examples of poems written in different vernaculars in alternate stanzas, especially where dialogue features, and of different languages being commonly used for characterization on stage.[73] According to Forster, however, in the case of the theatre and of certain types of poetry, this diglossia points to an interesting phenomenon, for "polyglot writing of this kind presupposes a polyglot audience" (1970:13). The audience, however, could also be, in most cases, the very few literates who also partook of certain literary conventions. In fact, in medieval literature, according to H.J. Chapter, there existed "a convention which laid down that the choice

---

[72] in which the languages of culture, Arabic and Hebrew, were mixed in a specific type of poem, muwassaha (Forster, 1970:12).

[73] For example, in early Indian drama, Sakuntala, where high-ranking characters speak Sanskrit and others a variety of different languages, whereas nowadays different languages and accents are more widely used on stage for comic relief (Forster, 1970:13)

of language was determined by the literary genre in question, not by the nationality of the author" (apud Forster, 1970:16). The north-Italian troubadours of the thirteenth to fifteenth century, for example, wrote lyric poetry in Occitan and narrative poetry in French. There was no necessity to write in Italian or guilt about doing so. Ramon Vidal de Besalú (twelfth century) did not consider his native language to be Catalán at all, he wrote in Old French (romans, retronsas and pasturellas) and in Occitan (vers, cansos, sirventes).

These examples show that poets in earlier centuries "had a much less developed sense of what linguists have come to call 'language loyalty'" (Forster, 1970:19). According to Mary Catherine Davidson, anxieties about switching languages are also typically absent in those days (2009:6). This is because poetry as a genre was much less about expression by the poet but more seen as a craft. Therefore, there were rules to be followed, a canon to be respected, and a presupposed audience which could be real, in some cases, but in others more of an idea, an interlocutor in the poet's mind. According to Forster, this is because "poetry operated with a relatively restricted range of subject matter, formulae and topoi, which were international and formed part of a general European cultural heritage" (Forster, 1970:19). So, to be a European poet at the time, one had to follow these rules in order to take part in this vastly multilingual literary scene. One can see these examples in several specific contexts. Antonio Esposito concludes that in the case of medieval Catalonia:

> All of this implies that by the late fourteenth century, the literate strata of Catalan-Aragonese society were profoundly bilingual, able to cope with a wide range of linguistic give-and-take and variation at the highest levels of linguistic representation. To imagine a monolingual, medieval Catalonia distorts a historical moment in which there was not a strong concept of the harmony of language and state. There was always in Catalonia a latent diglossia which dictated the relationship between language and genre. (Esposito, 1995:136)

As we have seen in other examples presented in this section by Foster, Burke and others, medieval Catalonia was not an exception in its diglossia. In

the introduction to her foray into multilingualism in medieval England, Davidson presents analyses of several cases of multilingualism in medieval England and "questions how disciplinary habits have self-interestedly constructed Middle English as itself somehow isolated from or uniquely resistant to that multilingualism that the literate contact between so many medieval tongues survives as compelling witness" (2009:1). In Burke's and Forster's studies, examples of multilingualism in continental Europe abound and, as Davidson puts it, English is often thought of as largely monolingual, isolated from the multilingualism of the rest of the continent. But cases of multilingualism in England were not the exception, as Davidson observes that "attitudes toward language choice and code-switching do not survive in the record as egregious behaviours of national nonconformity but as the practical matters of a multilingual society" (Davidson, 2009:6). All of these authors have proven how multilingual these European medieval societies were, even though the medieval monolingual imaginary has been and, one could argue, still is an incredibly strong myth.

In the Renaissance and Baroque periods, the purpose of writing multilingually was different: to reach wider audiences. A large part of the international reading public in that context was polyglot. It is worthy of notice that this does not imply a wide-reaching multilingually functional use of language: the reading public at the time was still limited to the educated few. Before the Romantics, poets were "concerned with statement and presentation of socially accepted themes" (Forster, 1970:27), speaking to society on behalf of society, whereas afterwards, and to an extent, to this day, poetry is the personal expression of personal experiences, highly individual and idiosyncratic. Writing literature before the Enlightenment and Romanticism was a question of possessing abundant linguistic equipment to talk to the learned society in whatever medium or language possible. The view was that different languages equated to different clothing, one's linguistic garments. You could also use the same analogy for different clothes as equating not necessarily to individual languages, but formulations (poetic genres, for example). Therefore, those who possessed abundant linguistic resources owned a "well-finished wardrobe". With that equipment, one could "change

one's language as one changes one's clothes, as circumstances may require" (idem:28). This assumes the availability of a ready-made means of expression, a stock of international formulae. In the Renaissance and later in the seventeenth century, literature was largely petrarchistic, and a foreign language was a cultivated language. In the instances presented by Forster, we are largely limited to multilingual literature and the way languages were seen in Europe. Polyglot writing, reserved only for the few literati, meant foreign languages learned as a tool for the writing of different literary genres, and for access to sources and information throughout the continent. As we have seen earlier in this chapter, such a view of multilingualism is still largely centred in the European context. But what happened when Europeans colonized the world and forced their, at the time still nascent, national languages unto the colonized populations?

Some postcolonial scholars, by pushing against the monoculture of colonizing European powers, have also proposed a different view of multilingualism in literature. One such example of this is the famous *Borderlands: La Frontera* (1987), a trilingual genre-defying seminal text by Gloria Anzaldua. An anthology of essays edited by Alfred Arteaga titled *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands* (1994) features important contributions from postcolonialists, comparatists and literary theorists defying nation and ethnicity coming from several different perspectives. A self-declared Chicano, Arteaga focuses on how Chicano poetry, emanating from the linguistic borderlands of the southern United States serves to defy the country's monological thinking, while others writing on Chicano literature in the same collection (Bruce-Novoa, Ada Savin, Luis A. Torres) follow dialogic paths in their essays, with Savin claiming that the "exceptionality of the best of interlingual Chicano poetry lies in the "contradiction-ridden tension-filled poetic utterance dialogizing two cultures" (Savin, 1994:223). While philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy explores the concept of hybridisation and mestizaje, in the same collection Norma Alarcón rebukes Lucy's conceptualisation of mestizaje, showing that these authors are openly in dialogue with each other throughout the collection. Similarly, Tzvetan Todorov, in his contribution "Dialogism and Schizophrenia", claims that his working languages (French and Bulgarian) are

in a hierarchical relationship to each other and exist in a power differential, thus the resulting dialogism of his bilingual existence. In counterpoint to Todorov, Savin, while analysing the Chicano poetry of Lorna Dee Cervantes, poses that:

> While Todorov, after an unsettling experience in his country of origin, seems to have found the key to a balanced bilingual self in a clear articulation between his two linguistic and cultural identities, Cervantes has a more difficult task to face in that she is confronted day after day with an ambivalent reality which throws her identity into permanent question. The historico-political context is burdensome, the cultural conflict is painfully alive. In her case then, it is impossible to keep the two identities clearly apart; hence, like other Chicano poets, she attempts to mix elements of both cultures in a move toward a hybrid, border identity. (Savin, 1994:218)

Here Savin is commenting on the fact that this dialogism that Todorov speaks of may not be a chosen one for subjects whose lives forced them to incorporate another language, by means of forced migration, those seeking refuge or linguistic minorities in strongly monolingual countries. What stands out in most studies of postcolonialism relating to language and power is a pointing out precisely of those instances in which there was no real choice involved, or rather when the dialogue between a person's languages is not so easily discernible.[74] In fact, as Tejaswini Niranjana puts it in his essay contribution to the collection, entitled "Colonialism and the Politics of Translation", postcolonial subjects 'live in translation' and 'at the site of translation' (Niranjana, 1994:35). Other contributions to this collection include those from Native American and Caribbean, and East/South Asian viewpoints. There is a rich body of work about multilingualism within postcolonial studies, far beyond the reach of this thesis.[75] The point here is to

---

[74] At the same time, the famous cases of Chinua Achebe's defence of his continuing to use English as a literary language and at the opposite end Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o choosing to change his literary language from English to Gikuyu serve as examples of postcolonial writers who make an informed choice of language despite the languages forced upon them by colonisation.

[75] On a major challenging of the concept of nation, see Chatterjee (1993). For another collection similar to that of Arteaga, see Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin ([1989] 2014]). Niranjana (1992) and Spivak (1988) are essential names for those wanting to understand language and translation within postcolonial studies.

draw on a few contradictions and critiques that postcolonial studies offer against a monologic thinking and theorising of literature.

Writing and the need for control and standardisation of languages pushed for a monolingualism that would better fit the demands of print capitalism. As Guillen put it:

> In countless places and times, multilingualism is the characteristic feature of a society and consequently determines the posture of a writer toward that society. Multilingualism is also common among primitive peoples; most aborigines of Australia, for example, know two or three languages or dialects. But the advent of writing caused a rift and required a choice of language. (Guillen, 1993:264)

However, with time and with the evolving nature of literary studies and the sedimentation of national literatures, some would view multilingualism and bilingualism in literature as something not to be attempted. According to Guillen:

> Turgenev (who was besieged by his French friends, or so I imagine, to write in French) stated in more than one letter that it was dastardly not to write in one's own language. And yet multilingualism is an important aspect of the nineteenth century. M.P. Alekseyev stresses that polyglotism was common in Russia in the 1700s and 1800s, and there were also numbers of bilingual writers: in French from Dmitri Kantemir to Feodor Ivanovich Tyutchev, in German from Hemnitzer to Count Tolstoy. (Soviet linguists have concluded that bilingualism will be an unavoidable necessity for future societies). (Guillen, 1993:264)

As Guillen comments, Turgenev himself, writing in French, condemned the practice, calling it 'dastardly'. Such an overtly negative view of writing literature in a non-mother tongue was not necessarily shared by other authors of the period. Later, the modernist movement of the twentieth century offers many widely cited examples of latent bi- or multilingualism, like those of Samuel Beckett, Fernando Pessoa, Vladimir Nabokov, Ezra Pound, Paul Celan, among others.

Studies of literary multilingualism, in whatever context they arise, often have as their goal to challenge monolingual national literatures. This points to a

still prevalent view of monolingualism as being the norm for literature, and multilingualism as the exception. The authors quoted in this section have given countless examples of cases of multilingualism in literature throughout different centuries and contexts which prove that 1. In some cases, this multilingualism reflected an equally multilingual audience. 2. Writing literature was seen as a craft and the choice of language in which to write was mostly initially imposed by literary genres and a 'stock of international formulae' and 3. that the imposition of national languages on literary craft did not erase cases of multilingualism, even if an imposed coloniser language hindered multilingualism in some contexts. Examples of multilingual literature that survived throughout history are very limited. This is largely due to, as Brian Lennon proposes,

> the organization of the book and other print publication industries, which all too often block the publication of radically multilingual literature at the point of entry to the market or even at the creative source, barring access to literary posterity of the library and archive or even dissuading multilingual writers from undertaking multilingual writing projects altogether. (Lennon, 2015:143).

In this section, I feature a few studies of multilingualism in literature which strive to fight the amnesia around multilingualism present in the discourses of literary theory and comparative literature. Many authors identify as key factors globalization and the increasing exchange of information and goods of our times for a growing need for multilingual practices, or rather, respect towards these. Many others could be overheard saying that multilingualism in literature is a feature of modernity. It may well be the case, but authors such as Forster, Davidson, Lennon, Esposito, Guillen, and others, have provided convincing evidence to suggest that multilingualism has been a reality and a feature of literature before the advent of national languages and the linguistic straitjacket imposed on literary language.

3.3 Language as performance

The difference between competence and performance was stressed by Chomsky, but even before that, Ferdinand Saussure offered these binaries with

his distinction between *langue* and *parole*. However, for the longest time, language studies have focused solely on competence. Even when these considered performance alongside competence, the former was often put aside, an afterthought (Hymes, 1972). Sociolinguist Alastair Pennycook, when proposing an approach to language as performance, defines it thus:

> What this does, crucially, is challenge the centrality of **competence** (underlying system) over **performance**. Thus, by looking at the performativity of language—how in the doing it does that which it purports to be—we can start to question the foundation of linguistic belief in system, and go beyond mere reporting of performance. Instead, this opens up the space to explore how sedimentation occurs (and can be opposed). More generally, we can start to raise broader questions about the whole ontological status of the notion of language and languages. Languages are no more pre given entities that pre-exist our linguistic performances than are gendered or ethnic identities. Rather they are the sedimented products of repeated acts of identity. (Pennycook, 2004:15)

In this section, we will look at discussions on language performativity ranging from the constellation of terms around languaging, ideas around mono- and multilingual drag and passing, and finishing with language as a prosthesis and exophony. These discussions are essential as they challenge fixed ideas about language and open possibilities for language to be seen not as an essence but as a performative practice.

3.3.1 Languaging: Bi, Trans and Multi

Previously in this chapter, the reader was presented with an overview of scholarly discussions around bilingualism and the limitations of the term itself. Using the same prefix, bi, but taking the discussion towards a more fluid view of languages, straying further away from bounded entities, is the concept of bilanguaging. To understand this concept, we need to look closely at the idea of languaging. Swain proposed the concept based on Lev Vygotsky's contribution, which determines that language plays a vital role in mediating cognitive processes. According to Swain, languaging is then "a process of

making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (Swain, 2006:98). This procedural outlook embedded in the very definition of languaging sets it apart from strict lingualist definitions that can sometimes be found in bilingualism studies. This term, together with translanguaging, is often seen in contexts of language pedagogy, from foreign language teaching, the multilingual classroom or even in relation to countries with two official languages. The term translanguaging comes from the Welsh *trawsieithu*, coined by Cen Williams, in a work about language immersion in bilingual Welsh-English classrooms (Wei, 2018; Williams, 1994). Languaging has several slightly different approaches. Tusting's (2013) use of the concept defines it as a social practice, in her studies of language in the context of the school or the workplace. On the other hand, Swain (2006) defines languaging as a cognitive activity, as a tool for constructing meaning. Lastly, Jaworski (2018) defines languaging as an embodied practice, a multimodal dimension of language use, where sensory experiences are central to language use. As we can see, the root word languaging implies language as a moving, constantly changing act or performance, rather than a static noun.

A concept coined and used in Applied Linguistics, languaging has been co-opted by decolonial studies to describe the types of active and emotive language use by postcolonial subjects. It has also been an accessory notion, in this area, as an active way through which postcolonial people can further decolonization practices. For Argentine semiotician Walter Mignolo, in his book *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking* (2012), the concept of languaging is central to denouncing the coloniality of power. As one of the main proponents of the Decoloniality (*decolonialidad*) school of thought, Mignolo also proposed important terminology such as epistemic disobedience, decolonial thinking and the coloniality of power, which are mirrored in the way he analyses examples of bilingual literature in Spanish-speaking Latin America. When debating Ambrosio Fornet's critique of "cubanity", Mignolo defines the issue of bilingualism, bilanguaging and their symmetries and asymmetries:

> First of all, Fornet assumes the monolanguaging principle and argues that bilingual writers have indeed a "choice" between languages and the possibility to decide

> which one fits better their needs (1997, 5). However, Fornet insists, while this scenario is viable theoretically in practice, the writer cannot always take advantage of the possibilities of one language without sacrificing the other. He is right to stress that bilingualism is never symmetric, but he is wrong in assuming that bilanguaging has to be symmetric. The asymmetry of languages is not a question of a person knowing one better than the other, but it is a question of power within the diachronic internal structures of the modern world system and of its historical external borders (the colonial difference). (2012:231)

Since power dynamics are never symmetric, bilanguaging also does not have to be symmetric. Could we perhaps think of L2 translators as performing a similar languaging aesthetic? The act of making visible such asymmetries would dialogue with the idea of making visible the exteriority of language, the choices and demands involved in language use and the underlying performativity of language practices. It is precisely because languaging is seen as language in use, language as a verb, that it can be connected to language performance and, in turn, to language drag. However, languaging is a term most used and applied in areas such as Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics and our topic will benefit from seeing languaging as tied to other types of performative language practices.

Related to the idea of language performance are the propositions within gender studies of gender performance. In the next section, I will offer an overview and a proposition as to how multilingual vs monolingual language performance can be tied to the process of queering language and translation.

3.3.2 Language Drag

In the field of Applied Linguistics but drawing from concepts of performativity in gender studies (Butler, 1990, 1997), linguistics (the speech act theory by Austin, 1962), and from other authors such as Habermas (1984), Bourdieu (1991) and Derrida (1986), Pennycook (2004) proposes that we see language from an anti-foundationalist perspective which takes the notion of individuals forging identities through linguistic performance. Pennycook's proposal that the "language concept has served its time" works when it is understood as a proposal that "would not mean that all conceptions of

linguistic difference should be discarded, but rather that the over-determined sense of linguistic fixity, with its long ties to colonialism and linguistics, needs to be profoundly questioned." (Pennycook, 2004:2). The author's questioning of linguistic fixity is shared by many of the authors cited in this chapter thus far and is reflected in the responses to the interviews conducted for this study. Performance, however, has direct ties with identity in language, as Pennycook asserts:

> This discussion of performativity, then, has opened up several significant ways for rethinking language and identity. Crucially, it provides a way of thinking about relationships between language and identity that emphasize the productive force of language in constituting identity rather than identity being a pregiven construct that is reflected in language use. (Pennycook, 2004:13)

Therefore, if performativity in language opens up avenues towards questioning the supposed interiority of language identity and towards language identity as a performative, productive force, what then could these possible forms of language performativity be? Our first set of approaches analysed are those of language drag and language passing.

The overlap between Queer Studies and Translation Studies has been strongly defended by Brian James Baer in the recent and ground-breaking volume *Queer Theory and Translation Studies – Language, Politics, Desire* (2020). In the introduction, Baer draws several links between translation and queerness as both pertain otherness, borders, difference. As the author puts it: "The abjectification of both translation and queer sexuality can be traced to the regimes of absolute difference that emerged in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, producing modern nations as monolingual and heterosexual." (Baer, 2020: 4). If monolingual is thus conceptually tied to the heterosexual, then the disruption of multilingualism could be placed with queerness as defiance to these norms.

One of the most well-known concepts within the LGBTQ+-related discourse is that of drag. The term drag is often related to drag queens, and the concept has entered the terminology of gender and sexuality studies together with queer/queerness. Once an artistic performance from the underground gay

culture in New York City, the concept of drag has spread and resulted in several television shows around 'drag races', the most famous of which is RuPaul's series in the US, UK, Australia, and Canada. In Brazil, for example, paradoxically one of the countries with the highest rates of homicide of LGBTQ+ population in the world, two drag queens have been, in the last five years, reigning in the country's music industry: Pablo Vittar and Gloria Groove.[76] The example of Brazil is to show that drag art, in its many forms, is a force pushing forwards for LGBTQ+ rights but that it is seen separately from the reality of being queer in a highly sexist society. This is because there is a latent tense relationship between normative, heterosexually biased societies and the disruption caused by drag performance. On the disruptive aspect of drag, Fenton Litwiller explains:

> Within the performance, gender categories of the everyday are challenged by artists who intentionally sculpt a gender and production that creates gender difference. To further explain, the drag artist, by producing a gender expression (e.g., dress, mannerisms) that does not match what is expected, contests the notion that several axes of gender, including sex assigned at birth, gender expression, gender identity, and sexuality are congruent (e.g., at once assigned female at birth, with feminine expression, identify as a woman and heterosexual). (Litwiller, 2020:601)

In this explanation by Litwiller, we can see how powerful drag can be to contest notions of naturalness and congruency of gender, sex, and sexuality. Here we start seeing the possible ties between disrupting gender binaries and the assumption of congruence in gender and sex and the disruptive nature of challenging language binaries and monolingual biases in translation. Similarly, the translator who goes against monolingual norms, native-speakerism and gatekeeping is also, in a way, disrupting the expectations involved in the many binary constructs of Translation Studies (eg. Foreign-domestic, L1-L2, domestication-foreignization, *telos-skopos*, original-translation, source-target, sense-for-sense vs. word-for-word, among several others).

[76] See, for example, Atlas of Violence 2019, groups like Transgender Europe (TGEU) for claimed figures. See also Mendes & Da Silva (2020).

Judith Butler, the scholar who spearheaded queer and gender studies, has defined gender as performative, as something that one 'does' rather than 'is' (1990). Lisa Nelson underlines that Butler, in presenting the question of performativity, creates new possibilities, and that "by interrogating implicit norms within enunciations of 'identity' and recognizing it as a process of identification, something that is *done over and over* instead of something that is an *inherent* characteristic, performativity opens up new terrains of analysis" (Nelson, 1999: 339). But the main theme within performativity in drag is how it ruptures and disrupts frameworks. In fact, as Litwiller puts it,

> Many renditions of drag (e.g., white drag Kings) rupture and differentiate the axis of gender because the imitative gender performance is theatrical, slightly imperfect, and campy (or so extreme as to be amusing) in ways that intentionally mock the gender framework (Moore, 2013) (Litwiller, 2020:601).

Butler (2011) puts forward the ties between drag and gender performance as "Drag is subversive to the extent that it reflects on the imitative structure by which hegemonic gender is itself produced and disputes heterosexuality's claim on naturalness and originality" (2011:125). Butler's definition is perhaps how we can strengthen the ties between drag's gender performativity and language drag's language performativity. Language drag comes from the idea of ethnic drag, which, according to Sieg (2002) offers some potential for us to think of language drag through the performative and disturbance lenses:

> As a technique of estrangement, drag denounces that which dominant ideology presents as natural, normal, and inescapable, without always offering another truth. As a ritual of inversion, it purports to master grave social contradictions, yet defers resolution through compulsive repetitions. (Sieg 2002:3)

Therefore, language drag could be seen as a facet of ethnic drag in that it denounces dominant ideologies about language, and inverts lingualist expectations. Language drag does disrupt monolingual frameworks and translation binaries through the use of language, and these language users who do language drag do not need to have an essentialist relationship to the

language, because it is an external factor, it is performative, and thus disrupts language norms. David Gramling, in the book *The Invention of Monolingualism* (2018), presents us with the conceptualization of monolingual drag as a "form of critical doubling, monolingual drag, or an otherwise performative divestiture from the unmarked doxa of literary monolingualism" (2018:152). Connecting Gramling's to Butler's definition, then, we can think of language drag, paraphrasing Butler, as disputing monolingual claims on naturalness and originality. Drag culture, even though it is, historically and culturally part of gay culture within LGBTQ+ groups, involves many different types of gender performance, and drag performers can be gay men, lesbians, non-binary, be it AFAB (assigned female at birth) or AMAB (assigned male at birth), transgender individuals, among a myriad of sexual and gender orientations. That is, the actual gender or sexuality of the drag performer is separate from their gender performance. Drag, then, is an added performative layer to that which is already performative, gender (siding with Butler's proposition that gender is social construct continually created and recreated through performative acts). If the researcher is allowed to make a connection here, one could consider that, if language is performative (Pennycook, 2004), linguistic drag is an added performative layer to that which is already performative in its core.

Gramling proposes that there also exists a "multilingual drag", although he sees this in a more negative light, seeing it as a somewhat "well-behaved" fake multilingual practice. Using Noorani's conceptualisation of soft monolingualism (or translational monolingualism, the term Gramling uses) as "more accessible than ever […] in that it remains within the confines of familiar linguistic norms" (Noorani, 2013:8), Gramling uses novelist Tim Park's disillusion with The New Dull Global Novel (2010) and its impatience "with anything but wall-to-wall pre-translatedness and aesthetic exogamy" (Gramling, 2018:148) to conceptualise what he would call multilingual drag.[77]

[77] To that we can add Ellen Jones's theorization on palimpsestuous writing and multilingualism in translation, present in her recent monograph *Literature in Motion: Translating Multilingualisms Across the Americas* (2022). In this book, Jones goes against the idea that multilingual texts are untranslatable. In fact, with examples of translation of multilingual texts in North America, but

However, not all that could be perceived as language drag could be in actuality conceived as such. Some language performance could be called, simply, "passing".

The concept of passing is often a complex one as it can be used in the context of gender studies but also on issues of race. A person who is straight-passing has privileges in that they are not so easily identified as an LGBTQ+, and someone who is white-passing retains similar privileges in that they are not so easily the victims of racism and police brutality, in comparison to those who cannot use of the same privilege. Similarly, with language, some non-native speakers might enact a type of monolingual passing when they are fluent enough as to be mistaken for a native speaker, as Alison Phipps puts it:

> I have moved to "Occupy multilingualism." This has meant unmooring my own languages. I love to speak French and German. I worked hard to learn the languages in which I am fluent and have earned a living as a professional teacher of these in universities, I worked hard to be able to more or less "pass," when I speak them. (Phipps, 2013:101)

This idea of working hard to be able to use and speak these languages is mentioned by one of the translators (T07) in the interviews and is seen, albeit less openly, in the other interviewees' answers. However, with T07's responses and positioning, perhaps the aim is not always to pass for a native speaker, or as a monolingual, even though, as we have seen, often in learning a language and wishing for fluent status, the native speaker is still the yardstick against which these L2 speakers are measured. People who enact this type of passing are often criticised for enjoying privileges not offered to those who cannot pass, in any shape or form. In the case of language, having a stronger accent is an impediment for this type of passing, as well as having a particularly foreign-sounding name, including other characteristics.

---

also in central and South America, the author instead proposes that 'translation is always to some extent implied in multilingual writing' (2022:2). By going against the grain and opposing fast reading practices, Jones argues that multilingual texts and their translations call for a different reading experience, a slower, more difficult one. According to Jones, multilingual texts have an unfinished/unfinalisable status that dialogues well with the multiple possibilities offered by translation.

Exophonic translator Anton Hur in an essay for the online *Litro Magazine* (2018), offers a manual on how to write queer Korean literature that has valuable ties to the work of exophonic translation. In this manual, Hur claims that most Korean literature, specifically in its thematising of suffering and tragedy, could be framed as queer literature. But most importantly for our purposes here is when Hur proposes that, to write queer Korean literature one must "write in translationese". Bringing up again the concept of linguistic drag, Hur proposes that writers who "perform" their style with translationese are "doing language-drag. They're subtly signaling their queerness through translationese". Claiming that disguise and performance in the language of heteronormative Korean society is a matter of survival, Hur suggests that inviting otherness in is a signal of queerness in literature. That is, escaping from a metaphorical (linguistic) closet and thus performing this otherness is an essential part of queering Korean literature and, could be said, literature in general. The ties with exophonic performance are clear here. Hur also broached the topic in an online talk hosted by the National Centre for Writing in the UK in 2020. When asked about how he deals with the insecurity around his position as a translator, he stated:

> I try to project a kind of Nietzschean, *übermensch* charisma in that, yeah, I am a translator, I am a big deal, I know what I am talking about. And I say it with so much aplomb and confidence and, you know, fake it till you make it-ness, and at some point, people started believing that.

Here, Hur may be enacting a passing of sorts, not necessarily language drag, although both are tied to performativity in the language. As we will see in chapter 4, translators also act in self-fashioning their status, identity, and position in the milieus where they act, and perform a type of language drag in the process. This performativity is also present in the translators' responses in the interviews conducted in this study.

3.4 Exophony and Language as Prosthetics

The idea of performance, especially when contrasted with competence, is thematically tied to something external, an addition, outside of the self.

Performance is how competence actually is realised in the world; a distinction similar to theory vs. practice. The term exophony, with the prefix "ex" presupposes a similar outwardness. Because of this, I will explore the concept of exophony and of language as prosthetics and how these two concepts tie to the many topics raised so far. These concepts will also be important in the analysis of the interviews in chapter 5.

3.4.1 Exophony: An outward motion

Exophony, from the Greek ἔξω, éxō, "out, external" and φωνή, fōnē, "sound, voice", is a term that has been recently used to refer to authors who write in a language other than their mother tongue. Exophony defines the act of writing literature in a tongue other than the author's mother tongue (see Wright, 2018, 2010, 2013; Tawada, 2003). The term is, in a way, at the same time broad and specific. Exophony *stricto sensu* would be the definition above, that of adopting an L2 to write literature in. Exophony *lato sensu* is taken by some, like Tawada (2003), to mean that writing literature is, in itself, writing in a foreign language, so any literary text could be exophonic from this perspective. The study of exophony can then range within this spectrum, between a strict and a lax definition. By being a wide-ranging term, it can include various contexts. Exophony is a phenomenon that is increasingly fashionable nowadays, due to the new migration waves of the twenty first century and globalization, contributing to a context in which multilingualism and multiculturalism are more valued, at least upon a first look. This reality favours the so-called transnational literature, a more general term that includes the study of exophony.

Notions of exophony and extraterritoriality are important for the study of Comparative Literature in a twenty-first-century context, where geographical and linguistic boundaries are more fluid, and the traditional notions of art and literature seem to be going through a process of deconstruction, in which different media, voices, languages and tongues are (or should be) in a constant dialogue. A recent term, exophony is still not part of a strong terminological tradition in many countries. The term exophony deserves a more profound

analysis and a well-rounded defence of its use as a substitute for other terms and paradigms used to define cases such as Yoko Tawada's, for example. Wright (2008) offers a rich argumentation for the adoption of the term, contrasting it to other ways in which these authors and their works have been defined and studied, in this grey zone between different languages and cultures. In the article, Wright presents a few terms that could be used to describe exophonic writing but which fall short for not being inclusive enough, or not doing justice to formal features of exophonic writing. She concludes with a defence of the term exophony and the adjective exophone/exophonic as a new approach that focuses on the text. According to Wright,

> In focusing on style and how meaning is generated by it, the term "exophonic" represents an important shift in how we approach writing by non-native speakers and a return to the of late somewhat neglected relationship between form and meaning in literature. (Wright 2008:39-40).

Exophony adds certain assumptions and socio-cultural contextual information that influence the reading and the translation of a text, making it a complex multi-layered literary phenomenon. Not only that, but exophonic literature

> foregrounds how all literary texts function. […] is striking for its lack of complacency towards language, for its ability to be self-conscious and innovative in its style, not so much by drawing on the resources of another language, […] but by ceaselessly interrogating the possibilities of the adopted language and the conventions of the adopted culture. This interrogation is prompted by an awareness of the fact of linguistic and cultural difference. (Wright, 2016:138)

The concept of exophony is especially important to authors who do not fit into the traditional literary categories which are heavily dictated by the author's mother tongue or nationality. These national identities are also regularly contested, making any attachment to the national in national literature fraught and any attempt at placing exophony within these national systems a failed enterprise. Considering exophony from a stylistic point of view which focus on questions of language choice and language performance is a valid

concept, even at times in which national identities were not yet fully formed or in existence.[78]

German literary scholar Ottmar Ette criticises other terminology already applied to classify exophonic authors, as well as Wright, but focuses specifically on the way in which these authors were classified in a German-speaking context. One other term proposed by Ette is ZwischenWeltenSchreiben (BetweenWorldsWriting) (2010) which can function as both a writing in between worlds (Schreiben zwischen den Welten) and as the writing of the in-between-worlds (Schreiben der ZwischenWelten) signalling the objective of maintaining the flexibility of the concept, as should be this writing proposed by Ette. For him, this new term:

> is not about the fixation of a new cartography of literature connected to the nomination of new literary spaces, but the awakening of new movement patterns which are transcultural, translanguaging and transareal beyond the categorisation based on a linguistically poor differentiation between a National Literature and World Literature. (Ette, 2005:15)[79]

The term "exophony", however, exists and has emerged in a world where strong national identities linked with a national language have been created and sedimented, a context in which exophonic subjects try to break free from these shackles. Exophony similarly destabilises language and makes visible a central feature of literature, that "All literary texts, and some non-literary texts, exist in a relationship of tension between a language which belongs to everybody and a language that is the writer's own" (Wright,

---

[78] Maybe one of the oldest examples of what we, in a postmonolingual paradigm (Yildiz, 2012) would call exophony is the case of the True Story (Ἀληθῆ διηγήματα) by Lucian of Samosata, from the II A.D., and written in Archaic Greek. The work, considered by many to be the first known work of Science Fiction, is a satire of travel writing, and extrapolates the local, by exploring extraterrestrial places. Its author, native to the Roman province of Samosata, in today's Syria, is an enigma when it comes to his mother tongue and life story, like many authors in ancient times. However, Lucian is even more interesting since he is someone who lived and was brought up in a Roman province, wrote literature in Greek and, throughout his *oeuvre*, makes several references to his Assyrian, 'barbaric' status, and there are allusions to his origins which give way to a theory that his mother tongue would be Aramaic (Swain, 1996: 299)

[79]"Es geht nicht um die Fixierung einer neuen Kartographie des Literarischen mit einer damit verbundenen Ausweisung neuer literarischer Räume, sondern um die Aufbrüche neuer transkultureller, translingualer und transarealer Bewegungsmuster jenseits der von Sprachverarmung geprägten Unterscheidung von National- und Weltliteratur."

2010:25). In an exophonic text this tension is heightened because the language that is the writer's own is in a different relationship to them, it is an L2. In the case of translation, and L2 translation, we add more layers of tension, making this text even more complex. Exophony is centred on the fact of creativity over fluency. It rejects that the notion of fluency is only accessible to native speakers. But beyond that, in exophony the creative possibilities trump a possible definition of fluency. Exophonic writing considers a literary language adopted by the author consciously, a move that is made external to expectations of naturalness, of linguistic nativity.

Yoko Tawada, in her travelogue-manifesto called *Ekusophonii: bogo no soto e deru tabi* (2003) (exophony: a journey outside of the mother tongue) defends some of the ideas already mentioned here throughout chapters two and three, when she considers the realities of multilinguality as basis for exophonic writing:

> To write literature is at the opposite end from repeating and recombining arbitrarily the words that you hear on a daily basis. It is an attempt to face and confront the possibility of the language in which you write. By consciously doing so, the traces of your memory are highly activated and your mother tongue, your older linguistic stratum, intervenes to transform the actual language you use for Creation. When I write and read aloud sentences in German by searching the correct rhythm, my sentences come out differently from the usual, natural-sounding German. People say my sentences in German are very clear and easy to hear, but still they are 'not ordinary' and deviant in some ways. No wonder, because they are the results of the sound that I as an individual body have absorbed and accumulated by living through this multilingual world. It is of no use if I tried to delete my accents or remove my habits in utterance. Today a human subject is a place where different languages coexist by mutually transforming each other and it is meaningless to cancel their cohabitation and suppress the resulting distortion. Rather, to pursue one's accents and what they bring about may begin to matter for one's literary creation. (Tawada, 2003:90)[80]

[80] 文学を書くということは、いつも耳から入ってきている言葉をなんとなく繋ぎ合わせて繰り返すこ との逆で、言語の可能性とぎりぎりまで向かい合うというこ

Here, we can see that Tawada does make some connections to language and individual essence that may go against some of my arguments in these chapters. However, it is through acceptance of this multilingual reality, of owning the accents and the interference of the mother tongue, as she calls it, that we can see the possible disruptions offered by exophonic writing. It is, in a way, performative as well, in that it shows how ordinariness and naturalness are fraught when used as yardsticks to define language ability, especially in the realm of translation.

3.4.2 Language as Prosthesis, language as Prosthetics

The idea of language as prosthesis was initially presented within a philosophical framework by British writer, translator, and scholar John Weightman in the article/essay *Language as Prosthesis* (2000). Weightman explores language and philosophy, and specifically how philosophers often take for granted that all humans are "psychologically prisoners of our native language" (2000:57). The author focuses on differences between external and internal features of language, and analyses different contexts and situations that complicate the simple assertion that language is a prosthesis, reaching the specific conclusion that "language is a necessary and unique collective prosthesis" (2000:55). Weightman's focus is on language as a collective, a constant negotiation. For this reason, it is prosthetic, not internal to an individual. According to him, we should not ignore the interiority of language,

---

とだ。そうすると、記憶の痕跡がたくさん活性化され、古い層である母語が今使っている言語をデフォルメするのかもしれない。だから自分がこれだと思うドイツ語のリズムを探して文章を作り、それを朗読する時には、いわゆ る自然そうな日常ドイツ語からは離れる。ドイツ語として聞いていて大変聞き取りやすいとはよく 言われるが、それでもどこか「普通」ではない。それはまず何より、わたしという個体がこの多言 語世界で吸収してきた音の集積である。ここでなまりや癖をなくそうとすることには意味がない。むしろ、現代では、一人の人間というのは、複数の言語がお互いに変形を強いながら共存している 場所であり、その共存と歪みそのものを無くそうとすることには意味がない。むしろ、なまりその ものの結果を追求していくことが文学創造にとって意味を持ちはじめるかもしれない。

but that the external feature is perhaps most important, or rather it should be acknowledged in its entirety.

Rey Chow, in her manuscript *Not Like a Native Speaker: On Languaging as a Postcolonial Experience* (2014) presents the reader with several epistemic intersections where postcolonial languaging practices, translation and multilingualism are concerned. Drawing on Derrida, Édouard Glissant, and Francophone postcolonial thought more broadly, Chow argues for a view of Language as prosthetics. Questioning Derrida's phrase "originally colonial" in *The Prosthesis of Origin*, which, according to Derrida, would apply to all cultures, Chow proposes we see the condition of coloniality as a "prosthetic add-on rather than, in line with Derrida's suggestion, as the authentic origin, as the original" (Chow 2014:33). Chow's reading of Derrida's phrase here is in line with other scholars, like Gayatri Spivak (1988) and Anne McClintock (1995), among others, who claim that, although Derrida's statement may seem at odds with deconstructionist philosophy's negation of an "authentic origin", his claim can be interpreted instead like a habermasian performative contradiction. In Chow's reading of language as prosthetics, the postcolonial subject's very linguistic existence and their use of languaging serve to trouble a reading of language as an unchanged, inherently acquired monolith. Rachel Gilmour, in her reading of Chow's proposition, questions the myth of the native speaker and mother tongue, as we did in the previous chapter, and posits that "operating far below the level of consciously held belief, these ideas about language work so effectively by appearing commonsensical" (Gilmour, 2020:101). The fact that these ideas about language are so effective and commonsensical is one of the reasons why debunking such myths is such a difficult endeavour. What language as prosthesis can add to this is the foregrounding of the aspect of addition, of an external languaging aesthetic that can be used in counterpoint to monolingual myths and norms.

For the longest time Translation Studies could get away with studying the history and the theory of translation based on these monological concepts we discussed in the previous chapters. As we have seen from chapter one, the L1 norm in Translation Studies also caused L2 translation and its practitioners

to remain invisible, chastised for attempting to go against the grain. When any area of study turns to human beings as subjects, it becomes necessary to consider the idiosyncrasies of working with the varied and unique experiences of each individual. In the chapter that follows, I will present an overview of an incipient area of Translation Studies dedicated to the study of the agents involved in translation, called Sociology of Translation, or TranslaTOR Studies. This sociological turn in Translation Studies considers the agents and external factors that influence the way translations are received in different cultures, as well as the role of the translator within different cultural polysystems. Studies that focus on the translator cannot be bound by outdated, prescriptive norms and based on idealised subjects. These studies must deal with the real translators behind a translation act, and with these some of the monotopical, restrictive language norms behind translation theory will hopefully fail to hold their ground.

Chapter 4 - For a Sociology of Translation, or TranslaTOR Studies

Another essential aspect of humanized Translation Studies is the role of the individual. As the overview of past developments has shown, translators have long been excluded from theoretical models of translation, regarded as machine-like translator-ideals or as a homogeneous collective. In an effort to find common denominators and universally valid general principles, the translatorial individual was lost. This resulted in translators not being regarded as active individual agents but rather as – to use an analogy from Star Trek – passive Borg, beings that are half machine, half human, devoid of individual personality and collectively pursuing a goal assigned to them. In contrast, the humanizing approach does not see translators as abstract units, but as "people with flesh-and-blood bodies" (Pym 1998: 161). Consequently, they are perceived as individuals against a social and cultural background, who are subject to contextual and situational constraints, and thus become visible as real people. (Kaindl, 2021:11)

4.1 And who translates the translator?

Many consider James Holmes's 1972 essay "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" (1972/1988) to be the birth of the discipline of Translation Studies.[81] Andrew Chesterman proposed a new respect for sociological studies in translation, in the essay he called "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies" (2009), referring to Holmes's seminal work. In it, he argues that, while many translation scholars have talked about the function of translation, based on the now well established Skopos Theory (Vermeer, 1978) many use the concept of skopos, the function, while disregarding the other element which is originally present in the theory, that of telos, the translator's approach. It is precisely within telos that translation sociology can be found. Holmes himself, in his seminal essay, was one of the first ever to talk about the need for a translation sociology (1988:5). The sociology of translation, or rather, as Chesterman calls it, TranslaTOR studies, is more interested in understanding the agent(s) behind the translation process, rather than the translation product. It thus focuses on the person behind the text. Translation sociology, according to some of the founding names behind its establishment, would dedicate its attention to, among others, the translation

[81]The date of reference for the speech which originated the text is 1972, however the available published edition is dated 1988, in a collection of essays by the author.

market, publishing industry, patrons, agents, the social status and role of translators, translation as a social practice and the translation event.[82]

For a long time, translation studies "chose to ignore the cognitive, social and cultural constraints under which translators operate" (Prunč 2007:40). According to Prunč, not even Descriptive Translation Studies did enough to acknowledge the agents involved in the act of translation and still focused on a systemic view. DTS, however, did unravel and reveal power structures involved in translation (Toury, 1995) but, as Prunč puts it: "the concept of norms defined the social space in which the translators acted *ex negativo*, i.e., as a reactive space that is subject to constraints and restrictions, and not as an interactive space in which the translators as social beings act and interact." (2007:41). With the cultural turn, translation cognition gained space, and with it, Translation Process Research, which involves psycholinguistic experiments on the translation process, started to develop (see chapter 1 for more on TPR). Lately, some TPR studies have used the notion of situated cognition (Risku 2000, 2004), in which interaction between the agents and the artefacts in the context of translation and cognition takes into account the social determinants of this practice. That is to say, cognition does not exist in a vacuum, but rather is conditioned by social structures. In the late 1990s, another turn took place in translation studies, the Sociological Turn. Represented by some scholars in DTS, but more importantly by Theo Hermans (1997), this turn sought to put the translator and their social, cognitive, and cultural resources, as well as power structures, into this context. Hermans tried to define translation as a self-referential institution. Scholars, then, started to deal more closely with sociology in translation studies, and applied some of these concepts in the study of translations and translators. Parks (1998), Gouanvic (1997; 2005), Simeoni (1998) and Wolf (1999) are among these. Names such as Simeoni, Gouanvic and Wolf, more specifically, tried to apply Bourdieu's concepts, among them *habitus*, to analyse many different instances of translation, including of literary works, in the case of Wolf (Wolf 2002a, 2002b, 2013). Other names that paved the way for a

[82] For some of the early studies on translation sociology, see Toury 1995: 249; Lefevere 1992; Hermans 1999; Wolf 2002; Heilbron and Sapiro 2002.

sociological analysis of translation include Sapiro (2002), Heilbron (1999, 2000), Chesterman (2007) and Buzelin (2005, 2007). More recent studies include Angelelli (2012), Sapiro (2010), Sela-Sheffy (2014), Wolf (2015) and Vorderobermeier (2014). In translation sociology introductions one can often find studies cited that do not consider themselves works of translation sociology, but which are considered by other scholars as part of the scholarly literature of this subarea. Many include, for example, feminist translation and postcolonial translation studies as well as issues such as Venuti's (2008) translator's invisibility. However, there is a clear tradition stemming from the early propositions on sociology of translation and specially centred around Michaela Wolf as well as Bourdieu-centred translation sociologists like Sapiro, Buzelin, Gouanvic and Simeoni, in addition to system-focused scholars such as Heilbron, which suggest there is a more well-rounded and established field of translation sociology with studies that are overtly sociological.

How do translation theory and translation studies help cement and disseminate concepts associated with translators and their practice? Translation studies have helped conserve and spread an idea of subalternity surrounding translation. Since translation theory was originally a sub-area within Linguistics, for much of its life it concerned itself with translation as a process devoid of cultural and cognitive constraints, basing itself too much on definitions of ideal speakers/ideal translators and idealised language abilities which in turn saw the translator as a machine. The cultural turn has helped bring these issues to light and turn Translation Studies into a real and evolving interdisciplinary force, uncovering, and critiquing, among others, the invisibility of translators, power struggles and identity issues brought forth with translation, as well as diverging theories of translation for specific groups or minority groups. Early Descriptive Translation Studies uncovered power structures in the translation milieu as a reactive, rather than interactive space, as Prunč (2007:40) mentions above, still largely ignoring the agency of translators and other agents, like publishers, editors, funding bodies, readers, academics, booksellers, etc.

Michaela Wolf (2006), in her introduction to a multilingual collection of essays on the sociology of translation, proposes that there are in fact three sociologies of translation. These are: a sociology of the agents involved in the

translation process, a sociology of the translation process, and a sociology of the cultural product (2006:11). The first, a sociology of the agents, would have the human translator as the protagonist, both seen as an individual but also as a member of a community. Some authors, like Gouanvic (1999) and Wolf (1999, 2003), have explored the role of translators as agents in the translation field, considering their position, postures, and patterns of behaviour across different groups and contexts. These authors draw on Bourdieu's theory of cultural production, highlighting the sociologist's influence on translaTOR studies. A second sociology of translation is the sociology of the translation process, which came about after the cultural turn in translation studies highlighted power relations involved with and essential to the world of translation. Studies that fit into this category explore the "constraints conditioning the production of translation in its various stages" (Wolf, 2006:11). These include, but are not limited to, the issue of the translator's invisibility, brought to light by Lawrence Venuti, and the position of translators in a broader conceptual frame, with, for example, Lefevere. A sociology of the translation process sees translation as a social discourse and can also focus on the relation between institutions and the translation process, and the transformations brought about by the former on the latter (Robyns 1994; Brisset 1996). The third one, a sociology of the cultural product, holds a more systemic view of the flows of translation across different contexts, inter- and transnationally, focusing on the translation product as exactly that – a product – albeit a multifaceted one, that traverses in specific ways in different context, systems, and subsystems.

In addition to the tri-faceted distinction made by Wolf, one could also see translation as a social practice as research focused on micro-, meso- and macro-structural factors, as Schögler (2017) puts it. Schögler equates the micro-structural to Wolf's sociology of the agents and gives as examples of this the study of translators, clients, publishers, agents, and readers and how they interact with each other. The meso-structural level, however, concerns itself more with studies on censorship, and self-censorship by translators. The macro-level would concern itself with systemic dynamic relations, flows, globalisation, and other larger societal developments. Whatever stance one

decides to take, these subcategories help understand the field and limit the scope, but they are by no means exclusionary.

A recent collection highlighting the specific field of Literary Translator Studies, edited by Klaus Kaindl (2021), contains studies that are in response to a call for more research on the specificities of a literary translator's *habitus*, practices, and positionalities. This does not mean that literary translation had been previously excluded from translation sociology, but that it is important to differentiate, as the labour of literary translators is fundamentally different from that of technical translators. We will see more on literary translators' *habitus* and self-fashioning and how they see their practice as more artistic than their fellow non-literary translators in the last section of this chapter. Kaindl's volume reflects the relative recency of scholarly focus on literary translator studies, as well as how some areas of translation studies are adopting more interdisciplinary approaches for understanding and supporting the intricacies of literary translation.

We have seen how rich the field of translation sociology, or translator studies, can be. However, it is still important to place the current thesis within these many different definitions and different translation sociologies. The three main strands of translation sociology: a sociology of the agents, of the process and of the cultural product, that is, looking at the people behind the translation, the study of the process and therefore the power dynamics and specific contexts, and the study of the translated book, the cultural product resulting from this process carried out by all the agents involved, respectively, are all included in translation sociology in some way or another. It would be reductive to study the agents without accounting for the context, the product and the systems involved. So, if translation sociology is such a rich and heterogenous field, how can we find the tools, theoretically and methodologically, to understand who the L2/exophonic translator is? It is necessary to expand on some of the field's basic concepts and see where those can help in studying exophony and all the other issues and topics raised thus far and their connection to L2 translation, and, more specifically, L2 translators.

4.2 World-System of Translation and the Poly(systemic) view prevalent in Sociological Translation Studies

Heilbron (1999), in what many in the field consider to be the first attempt at a sociology of translation, and drawing on, but also opposing, Wallerstein's (1991) world-system theory, proposes the concept of world-system of translation (1999:432). The many linguistic communities of the world and the multilingual speakers that can transit between these are understood as an emerging world language system, in the words of De Swaan (1993). An analysis of translations then offers the possibility of indirect access to this system, but the process of translation, albeit an intriguing object of study for social sciences and many others, is largely ignored by them. Over time, Translation Studies has shifted its discourse, from an early translation commentary-heavy field to a conceptual switch from source to target-based, from belletristic to linguistic to cultural. However, if observed through the systemic lens that sees translation as transnational cultural exchange, then "translations are a function of the social relations between language groups and their transformations over time" (430). Moreover, with the book as a cultural object, the translation of books and the translation market also constitute an international system on its own. Heilbron proposes that, in order to understand the different roles and levels of agency that a translator may have in this world-system, it is essential to comprehend the many subsystems and the core-periphery tensions that are at the centre of the flows of translated books on the global scale. Such an understanding also helps us appreciate the many power structures involved in the flow of translation worldwide. Not only that, but the polysystemic view of translation helps us analyse, comprehend, and compare what is happening around translation in different contexts and target cultures.[83]

[83] My use of polysystems here is in reference to Even-Zohar's (1990) proposition of literary and cultural polysystems. In his theory, polysystems are dynamic and heterogenous in nature. For Literary Translation Studies, polysystem theory's view of translations as being in dynamic connection with the national polysystem, thus making visible how much translated works influence and construct national canons, it helps broadening Translation Studies' claims on more traditional synchronic views of national literatures.

4.2.1 Varying role of translation in different language groups

According to Heilbron, "considered from a sociological perspective, translations are a function of the social relations between language groups and their transformations over time" (1999:430). This would mean that, to sociologically consider any type of translation, we must also consider the languages and cultures involved, and the dynamics between them within a larger system. These dynamics vary, however, since relationships between certain languages are tarnished by colonial history, as some are the language of minority groups who suffered ethnic cleansing or historical erasure, the so-called linguicide.[84][85]

Heilbron suggests that the new social significance that the printing press gave to translation increased its status as a token of geopolitical relationships: "With the formation of national states, standard languages were codified and much of the translation activity in early modern Europe was bound to the evolving relations of cooperation and conflict between nation states." (1999:431). Of course, these evolving relations were not limited to Europe, spreading beyond Europe, making any generalising statement about translation across cultures flawed because it does not specify the cultures and languages involved, or because it fails to consider the historical relation between agents in the translation field. In the particular context of book

[84] Linguicide is not a phenomenon reserved for colonial experiences only, as there are claims that linguicide happened and still happens to many minority languages in Europe, like Occitan, for example, which has a term, Vergonha (Shame) to refer to the insistent attempts by the French government to annihilate what they deem a 'patois', based on a report (Rapport sur la nécessité et les moyens d'anéantir les patois et d'universaliser la langue française) from 1794. Other examples include the rule to suppress languages other than Castilian in Francoist Spain, the Welsh Not policy, and the suppression of Ryukyuan languages in southern Japan. For more on this topic, see, among others, Janse & Sijmen, 2003; Crystal, 2000; Mufwene, 2001; Aitchinson, 2001; Drysdale, 2001. For more on linguicide, see Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2013), Andrea Bear Nicholas (2011) and Phillipson (2013) who define it as language extermination, corresponding to genocide.

[85] When discussing the current status and future of multilingualism, one can also think about sustainability when referring to languages. Phillipson (1992), a major proponent of the term linguicide, has also proposed that languages be seen in a similar way as human populations are regarded. The author proposed the term linguistic imperialism. In response to linguistic imperialism, according to the author, researchers and policymakers should push for linguistic human rights.

translations, these products become cultural goods that in some way or another acquire an importance and a role as transcultural mediation tools, and translators therefore become mediators.[86] This can be seen by analysing the book market and the flows of these cultural goods across different markets, cultures, and literary systems. It is safe to say that the most general issue studied within the sociology of translation is the idea of book translation as an international system. More specifically, using Bourdieu's terminology of the cultural field, Heilbron proposes that, in fact, the translation of books is the transnational cultural field par excellence, and, in De Swaan's (1995) terminology, it is an emerging cultural world-system. In his now seminal article, Heilbron proposes a structural analysis of the international flow of translated books, and how it affects the translation process. This has several characteristics. The power dynamics, relationship, and importance of translation between different language groups and within languages influences any analysis of this market. It is important to see this as an interdependent, international system, as well as a very specific one.

In his criticism of world-systems theory, Heilbron posits that the exchange of cultural goods which is at the centre of translation has an autonomy, it does not directly reflect world economy structures, and that

> instead of conceiving the cultural realm as merely derivative of global economic structures, it is more fruitful to view transnational cultural exchange as a relatively autonomous sphere, as an international arena with economic, politic and symbolic dimensions.(432).

In order to analyse this system, we need to clarify the units and objects of analysis under consideration. In this case, the units are the different language groups, and the object is the structure of the translation flows between these languages. These language groups, suffice to say, are not always consilient with nation states. The object of analysis, the flow, can be analysed

[86]A few examples of early sociological studies of translation include: Schoneveld (1983) on the relationship between countries and cultures; Dirkx (1995) on the role of intermediary centres; Oz-Salzberger (1995) on the complexities of cross-cultural (mis)understandings; Heinich (1984) on translators as a professional group; Sorá (1998) on social organisation of the market for translation rights, and the agents involved, in the particular context of book fairs.

through publishing statistics, although figures for translation statistical material need to be critically examined beforehand, since statistics are both too recent and too flawed and uneven across different countries. Official translation statistics date back to the 1930s, when the Institute for International Collaboration, part of the League of Nations, published the *Index Translationum* (1932-40), aiming at better international collaboration. After World War II, UNESCO took over with their Statistical Yearbooks. There is, however, a problem of definition when using these statistics for analysis and research. The definitions for "book" or "title" vary greatly between countries. Moreover, Heilbron reminds us that UNESCO's data do not seem to be highly reliable, as there are drastic fluctuations to be seen within short periods of time, which differ from national statistics and therefore are not comparable. Unfortunately, these data are the only ones readily available, so they can only be used in an indicative manner, to highlight structures. This means that an analysis is based on flawed data sets and should not be accepted uncritically. Heilbron proposes that an appropriate model of the structural dynamics of the translation system could be constructed by combining international statistics, national statistics, and case studies (1999:433).

The international translation system is hierarchical, with centre, semi-periphery, and periphery. But what can be considered central in this specific system? In this case, centrality means having "a larger share in the total number of translated books worldwide" (433). By that definition of centrality, English is, without any doubt, central, being the language most translated from. The international translation system is thus unevenly distributed and dominated by English. English is, in Wallerstein's terminology, not only central, but hyper-central and six other languages share a semi-peripheral role. As proposed by Kachru (1992), even English, the hyper-central language, has different levels, or "circles of English", ranging from the inner circle (eg. UK, USA, Australia), outer circle (eg. Singapore, South Africa, Nigeria, India, etc.) to the expanding circles (which encompasses the rest of the world, countries that use English as a means of communication in specific contexts, but which do not have English as an official language). This is to show that there are several other layers of difference and dynamics between these different linguistic polysystems, which

complicates an estimation of the state of affairs even further. Differences between semi-peripheral and peripheral languages are more gradual than differences between central and semi-peripheral languages. In this case, the size of language groups is not decisive for their centrality in the translation system, as, for example, languages such as Portuguese, which has a great number of speakers, but which occupies only around one percent of the market. However, this system is not static, but rather dynamic. The centrality and peripherality of these languages changes over time. The dominance of English is a recent one, if we consider the history of humanity: Latin was for many centuries the language of literacy, French used to dominate for a while, declining at the end of the eighteenth century and giving space to German and English.[87] And even during a specific period of dominance, different strata and groups in society might favour different languages over time. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, in Brazil, for example, the French language was the dominant language of influence for the literate classes, and greatly influenced architecture, art, and literature, among many other areas (Viotti da Costa, 2000; Cândido, 2005).[88]

These changes in the centrality and peripherality of languages and language groups almost never occurs abruptly, it takes at least one generation for these cultural shifts to take place, and they are often not completely independent of geopolitical factors. In the case of Russian, as Heilbron points out, the change can happen abruptly when it is connected with a specific political regime, and when this regime suffers a coup, or similarly substantial changes.[89] This also points to the intrinsic connection between Politics and the literary-linguistic polysystem. Even though Heilbron's world-system of translation is more independent from economy than in Wallerstein's

[87] And this is only in Europe, not considering the different histories of language and writing in other parts of the world.
[88] For more on that specific example, in English, see Caparelli (2016)
[89] "The central position of Russian, for example, which is clear from the UNESCO statistics for the 1980s, will undoubtedly have declined rapidly since 1989. Its predominant role in the system of international translations was based on the domination of the Soviet Union over Eastern Europe, implying obligatory and quasi-obligatory translations in nearly all fields, not merely those which were bound to the Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. Since the fall of the Soviet empire, the use of Russian has declined sharply in Eastern Europe, just as, undoubtedly, translations from Russian have" (Heilbron, 1999:435).

conception, it is still influenced by what is happening around the specific cultural milieu of book production, and book translations. This can be seen also in the cultural exchanges that happen via an intermediary central language, often a European one, like French or English. The centrality of a language often means that it will act as a relay language for book translations.

The centre-periphery paradigm means that books are often translated from the central language into the several peripheral languages and those languages are translated into English. But what about the interaction between these peripheral languages? Often in the history of book translation there was no translator who could translate between peripheral languages, and this called for a more central language to act as an intermediary. Russian literature and, more specifically, Dostoevsky, went through a shift in perception and reception in Brazil in the last decade, mainly due to retranslations of the Russian classics, but this time translated directly from the Russian into Brazilian Portuguese, where formerly these were relay-translated via a French or English translation (thus an indirect translation). This affected the way Russian literature in Brazil has been read through the decades. Such an anecdote also hides political and historical explanations. For the longest part of the Soviet Union's existence, Brazil was in a strict right-wing extremist military dictatorship which was a result of the Cold War and therefore relations between Russian culture and Brazilian readers had to have cultural and linguistic diplomacy (and censorship) via French and English. This also affected the source language for translations that were published in Brazil from the 1960s onwards, since then a shift occurred, favouring works of fiction from the USA, a country closely tied to the political developments and cultural imperialism in Brazil in the last fifty years.[90]

---

[90] Paulo Bezerra and Boris Schneidermann are the most famous and award-winning among a group of Brazilian translators whose goal is to re-translate Russian fiction, this time as a direct translation from the Russian, and have talked about the situation and the many problems encountered in early translations which were indirect, from French or English editions. They, and other scholars of Brazilian literature, Russian literature, and history of translation in Brazil, say that translations of Russian authors into French and English suffered major changes in their style and even whole paragraphs cut out because of ideological and cultural constraints in these literary polysystems, therefore also influencing the translation into Portuguese. These new translations have as a goal to bring two cultures and languages which were forced apart for many decades closer together, and in this case, as an example of the peripheral-to-peripheral relationship which now does not need a relay.

These types of indirect translations are no longer that common, but the publishing success of a work in translation into a central language helps inform the publishing contexts of peripheral languages in their choice of new titles. Olga Tokarczuk was only first translated into Brazilian Portuguese in 2020, partly because of the Nobel Prize awarded to the author, but partly because of this success in the English translations. Even though indirect translations are no longer common, they still exist, and it might be simply because there are not enough known literary translators in that specific language pair, or even because the language pair does not exchange these cultural goods among themselves. However, some new connections between peripheral languages that did not engage in conversation previously are arising, as for example, with the work of Maria Puri, translating Olga Tokarczuk and other authors of Polish literature into Hindi. In this case, even though still looking to the centre for some kind of guidance (Tokarczuk's book *Flights*, for example, was published in Poland in 2007, and in translation only a decade later), peripheral languages can create cultures and flows of translation between them without having to pass through the centre. In any case, language groups around the world tend to follow the steps of the international market, centred around English and a few slightly less centralized languages.

With examples from Dutch literature in translation, Heilbron points to the importance of "prominent cultural centres in the international diffusion of books from the semi-periphery" (1999: 437). Symbolic and economic factors play a part in this. Often these cultural centres act as a literary ambassador of their countries. Among these we can find, for example, Goethe-Institut, the Ministry of Culture (in countries such as Czech Republic, Croatia, Italy, Spain, among others), Biblioteca Nacional (Brazil), Japan Foundation, Pro Helvetia, Institut Ramon-Llull, LTI Korea, Institut Français, Danish Arts Foundation, etc. The symbolic part is played, that of representing the literature of a country/language abroad through translation grants or working closely with publishers. They also have an economic counterpart. Publishing is a risky and costly business, and there often is a lack of initial capital to kickstart a translation project, which costs more than an original work because there are double the costs to be paid, having another author, the translator, working on

it. At the same time, a translation is not a wild guess, as often there is market research carried out before the publisher chooses to commission a translation, and therefore there is already evidence that a work of fiction has worked well in other markets.

In the world-system of translation, centrality and variety are closely connected. The more central a language is, the greater the variety of different languages and works that are translated from it. This variety affects literary genre and text types as well. English is, undoubtedly, the more central in this respect. One could say that not only are translations from this hyper-central language related to its diversity, but also into this language. It is often easier to find indigenous literature from around the globe translated into English than into the national languages of the countries in which these indigenous groups reside (Brazil and Spanish-speaking Latin America is a strong example of that). In saying this, I am also affirming that English, as the hyper-central language, still plays an essential role in being the centre to which these markets look and from which they often must be translated in relay mode.

According to Heilbron, this monopolization of English has its limits. English has profited from the growth of translation markets in peripheral languages, but other languages also did so. Even though it is still the centre, the growth of the translation market was not limited to the hyper-central language, rather it benefitted many other language groups in national book statistics of several countries (Heilbron 1995: 439). It is interesting to note, however, that in this systemic view, we can find an inverse correlation between the centrality of English and the number of books translated into it, or rather, the importance and percentage of book translations in the publishing market of the UK and US, for example. Statistics from 1945 to 1998, for example, show that across the decades, the percentage of translation in the main English-speaking countries has remained at less than 5%. More recent ones, from 2004, still conclude on a similar percentage of 3% (Cummings, 2011). Some people, companies and institutions in the UK have, in recent years, strived for a more substantial number, and this can be seen in the creation of several independent publishers specializing in translation in the last decade, as well as translation awards and a stronger community for translated fiction in this specific literary

system.[91] Twelve years later, the statistics for the UK and US market mentioned by Heilbron are largely unchanged. The market for translated fiction in the UK is growing, but it is still weak when one compares it to other countries. As Erich Prunč observed: "Hegemonic and prestigious cultures […] are reluctant to invest in translation because they believe in the dominance of their culture and expect that weaker cultures will undertake the translations if they want access to information and cultural goods." (Prunč, 2007:44-45).

However, in other European countries and prestigious cultures, like Germany, Italy, France and Spain, the numbers have been consistently at around the 10-20 per cent margin, in others, like The Netherlands, with 25 per cent and Greece, with around 40 percent, with translations playing an important role. This suggests "an inverse relationship between the centrality of a language in the international translation system and the proportion of translations in national book production" (Heilbron 1998:439). English being a hyper-central language in this system, with such cultural dominance, these numbers start to make more sense. Such a disproportion and this inverse relation can give us clues as to the level of cultural importation going on in and between these different systems. We should not, however, rush to the conclusion that the more translations a country has in its repertoire, the more cultured it is, or the more heterogenous its culture. The level of cultural importation is, according to Heilbron, more connected to the relative importance of a language group/country in the world-book-system than to the value of cultural goods within the national borders. I would argue, however, that the level of cultural importation also has something to do with different levels of overt nationalistic discourse in the countries mentioned. Even though it is a recent context, will Brexit impact on the numbers of translated fiction in the UK, specifically from European countries? If it does, will it be a negative

[91] Apart from the big names in the publishing market, such as Penguin Random House, Bloomsbury, and similarly big conglomerates, which have a small part of their catalogues made up of translations, some of the most well-known and award-winning publishers of translated fiction in the UK are a recent phenomenon. For example, a list of publishers and their year of foundation: Fitzcarraldo Editions (2014), And Other Stories (2010-11), Tilted Axis (2015), Charco Press (2016/17), Europa Editions (2005), Comma Press (2002), Maclehose Press (2008), Orenda Books (2014), and some like Scribner UK, part of Simon and Schuster for over 150 years and revamped in 2015, now publishing titles in translation, among many others.

impact, as expected, or will the book market publish more in response to the closing of borders and hostile environment in the country? This is still an ongoing process, but the world-book system, even if it has some level of independency and its own mechanisms, responds to geopolitical moves in the real world.

For L2 translation this complex literary translation eco- and polysystem has important implications. When minority, endangered, indigenous, or otherwise less widely diffused languages are translated into a hyper-central language such as English, the risks of cultural appropriation, exoticization, and erasure, among others, are high and must be debated. In World Literature there is already an ongoing debate about this topic, and translators of colour have spoken publicly about these risks as well. At this juncture, it is important to make clear that L2 translation presents itself (both in theory and in practice) through translators of less widely diffused languages, known by fewer (or no) native English users capable of translating from them to a high standard. In these contexts, historically relay, or indirect translation has been used, but maybe more interestingly, collaborative translation has turned out, in some cases, to be an answer to these "problems".[92] The collaborative aspect has only been overtly mentioned by two translators, T06 and T14, when they mention their L2 translation experience. Pokorn (2005) presents a more in-depth analysis and defence of collaborative translation regarding L2 translation practices. Perhaps in future research a specific question about collaboration in L2 translation would be beneficial to understanding this practice better and framing it in a way that dialogues with exophonic translation.

4.3 *Habitus* and the translator

In analysing the cause-and-effect relations in Translation Studies in "Bridge Concepts in Translation Sociology", Chesterman (2007) argues that translation research can only provide quasi-causes, that is, not based on lawlike

[92] The use of problems between quote marks here is because, even though I do not believe L2 translation is necessarily a problem, many in the industry and within translation studies would not agree with me or with the L2 translation scholars mentioned in chapter 1. Pokorn (2005) presents a more in-depth analysis and defence of collaborative translation in regard to L2 translation practices.

regularity, because those are filtered through the translator's mind. According to him, "if translation sociology places people centre-stage, and uses a causal model, it can also highlight genuine human agency and give space to the translator's subjectivity" (2007:176). Translation sociology therefore is structured around the practice, discourse, and *habitus* of translators. The last of these, *habitus*, is a direct reference to Bourdieu's use of the term, which has become a cornerstone of sociology. According to Costa and Murphy: "The conceptualisation of *habitus* is a reflection of Bourdieu's attempt to overcome the dichotomy between structure and agency whilst acknowledging the external and historical factors that condition, restrict and/or promote change." (2015:3) This means *habitus* as a term seeks to take into consideration external and structural factors but also includes the actor's agency in this process and how these two dichotomic pillars connect to each other.

The term *habitus* can be traced back to an old philosopheme, as Aristotle's term *hexis* in *Nicomachean Ethics* reworking the ancient Greek word ἕξις and transformed into a philosophical concept meaning a tendency or disposition, a state of moral character, induced by our habits, to have appropriate feelings, orienting one's conducts. It was then consequently reworked by the medieval Scholastics, more specifically Thomas Aquinas, in *Summa Theologiae* (1269) linking it to the Latin word *habere*, to have, to hold, to possess, to consider, with an "added sense of ability for growth through activity, or durable disposition suspended midway between potency and purposeful action" (Wacquant, 2018:2).[93] Pierre Bourdieu reworked the concept in the 1960s to transcend the opposition between objectivism and subjectivism and turn it into a sociological concept. Bourdieu's *habitus* mediates and revokes the duality between the individual and the social, showing how a subject's disposition is the outcome of the influence of society's sociosymbolic structures. Not only are dispositions, but also capacities and thought patterns influenced by it, informing the subject's response to the demands of their

[93] Similar conceptualisations were used by the likes of Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss, Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen, among others. It then resurfaced in phenomenology, with Edmund Husserl, through Habitualität (translated as habitual knowledge) "the mental conduit between past experiences and forthcoming actions" (Wacquant, 2018:2). Maurice Merleau-Ponty also used a similarly worded concept, habitude, but this time including the idea of a lived body.

social milieu, and the creative response to specific constraints of their context. Bourdieu thus "activated *habitus* to capture the discordance between the culturally given capacities and proclivities of people and the requirements of the emerging social system, leading to historical rupture and societal upheaval" (Wacquant, 2018:2).

Criticising both Levi-Strauss's structuralism and Sartre's phenomenology, Bourdieu elaborated the concept further in the 1970s in *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977). In it, he postulated that practice is "the product of a dialectical relationship between a situation and a *habitus*" (1977:261). The *habitus*, thus, can be conceived as a system of dispositions, a "matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions" (idem). It is a practical competency, but not static, fixed, eternal, rather dependent on other factors, variable across social contexts, time, place and power dynamics and distribution. *Habitus* can also be transferred to different domains. As it is built by dispositions, and these dispositions can be affected by various factors, *habitus* itself "can be eroded, countered, or even dismantled by exposure to novel external forces, as demonstrated by situations of migration and specialised training" (Wacquant, 2018:3).

According to Wacquant, "*habitus* tends to produce practices patterned after the social structures that generated them" and "each of its layers operates as a prism through which later experiences are filtered, and subsequent strata of dispositions overlaid" (Wacquant, 2018:3). *Habitus* is a way through which social conditions can reveal the individual's beliefs, internalised behaviours, and perceptions that inform their practice, that is, that are translated into their practice in the social spaces in which they interact. It allows the researcher to understand and explain social agents and their roles in conceiving and constructing the social game that they take part in, and the social context in which they are included. It contains a systemic view of the social world that sees its agents as complex, multifaceted individuals who also work within a collective. Individuals' beliefs and perspectives are tied to their context and to this collective: they do not exist discretely, as they are informed by it and brought forward because of it. According to Costa and Murphy:

> *Habitus* is thus more than accumulated experience; it is a complex social process in which individual and collective ever-structuring dispositions develop in practice to justify individuals' perspectives, values, actions and social positions. Just as importantly, *habitus* can be seen as much as an agent of continuity and tradition as it can be regarded as a force of change. (2015:3-4)

If we consider the literary translator an important actor in the publishing world, we could also consider the literary translator's *habitus* and their views on the practice and their status in this context. In fact, some scholars of translation sociology applied Bourdieu's framework to their analyses of literary translation. Michaela Wolf, for example, who also was one of the first to bring Bourdieu into translator studies while they were still in their infancy (1999), has used it to provide an analysis of translations of *Harry Potter* (2002a), of ideological contexts (Wolf 2002b, 2003), feminist translation (Wolf 2006) and literary translation in general (Bachleitner and Wolf 2004a). Some scholars have carried out studies which focus on gender issues, as with Sabina Matter-Seibel (2006) in her study about women writers as translators and their enrichment of cultures. In fact, feminist translation is an area that draws a great deal from the sociological approach in translation studies (Simon 1996, von Flotow 2000, 2009; among many others).

How can we see the translator's *habitus* in action in translator studies? The symbolic power of the translator's *habitus* is exemplified in studies such as Schweiger's (2006) study on how the translator's *habitus* influences the author's position in the target market/culture, with his study on George Bernard Shaw and his German translator Siegfried Trebitsch, for example. Elsewhere, Sabine Matter-Seibel (2006) has written about the US nineteenth-century author Margaret Fuller's translations of Goethe and other prominent German writers of the period, including Bettina von Armin, into English, bringing these new German thinking avenues to New England and the transcendentalist movement, as well as influencing her own practice of writing and translating of other works. Taking a feminist translation studies perspective, the author shows how the importation of ideas from a more liberated bourgeois and cosmopolitan German society into the early nineteenth-century East Coast

literary culture in the US bolstered the cause for gender equality and influenced Fuller's famous work *Women in the Nineteenth Century*. In this sense, her own practice of translation has helped her formulate and adapt new ideals into an evolving society, as the identification that Fuller felt in relation to the German literary and philosophical scene has informed her translation and writing practice. In a similar fashion, Hannes Schweiger (2006) investigates the relationship between author and translator and how the translator's *habitus* as opposed to the author's *habitus* can influence the position and entry of an author into a foreign literary polysystem. Sociology of translation studies make claims for the possibility of the translator's *habitus* being influential on not only the translation decisions on a micro-textual level, but also on the positioning of the work as well as the translator in a different language and system.

Applying such a view of *habitus* to this work, for example, we could say that the L1 translation norm entered these social strata of translation theory and practice resulting in dispositions through which the practice of translating into a second language became discouraged. L1 translators who are also monolingual anglophones have been discouraged from trying this direction of translation and thus also assume that such must be the reality of all translators. To put it simply, if I cannot do it, no one can. However, L2 translators seem to fight against such restrictive, normative views. The *habitus* of translators, in general, as we have seen, can be changed when exposed to external forces. What would be the external forces necessary to change such a strong *habitus*-informing rule like the L1 translation norm?

4.3.1 The translator: real or ideal?

The two historically known *habiti* of the translator are, as defined by Erich Prunč (2007), Priests and Pariahs. The author points out two diametrically opposed and somewhat schizophrenic expectations placed upon translators and translations, both within translation studies and in wider society. Translators are both at the centre and at the margins of our transcultural exchanges. Prunč proposed that, historically, translators position themselves somewhere on this spectrum where the poles are either subservient or carriers of the truth. According to his definition,

> The translator-priests see themselves as the guardians of the word and as the gate keepers and constructors of culture. They know that they have the power to select, to transform and to define, which also provides them with the key to socially accepted values and truths. The *habitus* of the translator-priest first emerged in Mesopotamia where the priests guarded and interpreted the interlinear translations of the Akkadian texts (Vermeer 1992 :52). It was later adopted by the great bible translators St. Jerome and Luther and also by literary translators whose creations have become an integral part of national literary canons. (Prunč, 2007:48-9)

Therefore, translators can act as gatekeepers as well, choosing who can enter their realm and be accepted as their peers, as well as defining the limits and quality of literary culture and practice. This translator-priest holds power in his/her literacy. In literary translation, this is a translator who can become a mentor for emerging translators, win awards and get competitive grants. In publishing, sometimes a successful literary translator may become the head of a publishing house or an acquisitions editor, for example.[94] Translators who enjoy prestige, be it because of their connections, the language they translate from/into or other factors, often hold what translation sociologists call a "symbolic capital" over others in the profession. As Prunč puts it:

> But not only the negative prestige that is attached to a culture affects the status of translators and interpreters. Translators may also gain significant symbolic capital if they choose prestigious languages as their working languages – even if this may run counter to the requirements of the market and the dominance of supply and demand. A good example is the demand for the less widely spoken and less widely taught languages and the prestige of translators, working in these languages. (Prunč, 2007:45)

Therefore, this prestige that Prunč speaks of may also come from some translators' access to highly coveted language combinations and is also dependent on some contextual determinators. For example, after the recent

[94] This is the case of, for example, International Booker prize winner Deborah Smith who started Tilted Axis Press, although recently she stepped down and made Kristen Alfaro sole publishing director of the publishing house.

International Booker Prize win by translator Daisy Rockwell and author Geetanjali Shree for the Hindi novel *Tomb of Sand* (2021), we can expect a renewed interest in literary translation from Indian languages, akin to what happened with International Booker Prize and Nobel Prize winner Olga Tokarczuk (in translation by Jennifer Croft) in 2018/19. Similar external factors that may affect prestige and demand for certain language combinations include the status of the translator; for example, Ann Goldstein's decades-long work for the prestigious *New Yorker* magazine and her translations of Elena Ferrante's Neapolitan Quartet which resulted in the recent Ferrante Fever.[95] Another example presented by UEA researcher Motoko Akashi (2018, 2021; Hadley, J. and Akashi, M. 2015) is that of Haruki Murakami's work as a translator of US literature into Japanese and his celebrity status in Japan. His celebrity status is so substantial that a book series with his translations was created in Japan, titled Haruki Murakami Translated Library, which is often mentioned in the cover of books translated by Murakami in order to boost sales.

There is, however, a deep precipice between literary and technical (or often called "professional") translators, especially in their self-fashioning. Some studies in Translation Sociology deal with literary translators constructing an image of themselves as very distinct in their practice when compared to translators of non-literary texts. Sela-Sheffy (2016), for example, looked at Israeli cases, but some of their conclusions could be expanded to other contexts:

> I argue that at least in the Israeli case, which may be analogous to other cultural settings, the status structure in the field of translation and interpreting is shaped by a prevailing counter-professionalisation ethos, and that this ethos is nurtured by a restricted circle of elite literary translators. This means that the occupational identity and sense of personal agency cultivated by this small sector is what prevents the construction of institutional tools and determines the hierarchy in the field at large. This further means that despite the loose structure of the field and its division into different branches, it is governed by a more or less 'unified symbolic market', to use Bourdieu's

[95] For more on this, see the documentary Ferrante Fever (2017).

> terminology (1995), in which literary translators are those who set the symbolic prices. (Sela-Sheffy, 2016:57)

This counter-professionalisation ethos that Sela-Sheffy speaks of works well with the image of literary translators as artists but does not do much for their professionalization. The very fact that Translation Studies creates the same division between literary translation and "everything else" does not help us see that, if we look closely, there is an underlying translationality to all translations, no matter if they are technical or artistic (in fact, some interviewees, like T14, even claim that a good translator should at least be able, or, to put it in linguistic terms, have the competence to, translate anything in their language pair).[96] On this gap between literary and non-literary translators, Sela-Sheffy relates:

> The two archetypes that fuel the counter-professionalisation dynamics in the field of translatorial occupations, the artist and the natural translator, are promoted by the two sectors most remote from each other and from the mainstream of active translators and interpreters — high-status literary translators, on the one hand, and lower-ranked community interpreters, on the other. Yet unlike the latter, top literary translators have a sound vision of their role and privileges. Therefore, their authority as the producers and regulators of the symbolic capital of this occupation is not challenged. This also means, however, that the artisation ethos — what in the eyes of top literary translators distinguishes them from the majority of non-elite translators — actually permeates the field at large beyond their own circle. (Sela-Sheffy, 2016:68)

Here, Sela-Sheffy creates a further two archetypes: the artist and the natural translator, putting the community interpreters at the opposite end of the spectrum compared to high-status literary translators. In between, we may have anything ranging from literary translators who are published by smaller presses or have publications in not-for-profit journals to audiovisual

---

[96] In fact, as translator Tim Gutteridge posted recently on Twitter: "Been thinking a lot about productivity and one thing that strikes me is that literary translation discourse really needs to move away from perfectionism: "I spent 30 mins thinking about a comma!", "I do 7 drafts!" etc. Sounds arty but it's a recipe for financial unsustainability." Gutteridge, Tim (TimG_translator). 14 July 2022, 10:27 a.m. Tweet.

translators, localization professionals and court interpreters. In the pool of translators interviewed for this thesis, at least half of them are literary translators whose main source of income is, according to them, non-literary translation. These subjects, then, are found somewhere in between this spectrum, aspiring to a translatorial occupation that encompasses the artistic but who, most of the time, for financial sustainability, need to do non-literary translation.

Prunč also defines the other end of the spectrum, that of the translator-pariah, as follows:

> The *habitus* of the pariah is the most extreme version of the *habitus* of the "quintessential servant", as Simeoni (1998:12) puts it. This *habitus* is the relic of the historic marginalisation of translators and the result of their other or self-imposed invisibility. Translators who adopt this *habitus* consider the author and poet as their master, the customer as the king. They continue to work for ever lower prices and rates and are both the victims and originators of the current price-cutting spiral (cf. Prunč 2003) which threatens not only their own existence but also the reputation of the translation profession. (Prunč, 2007:49)

It follows that Prunč and Sela-Sheffy's categorisations are not equivalent. There are those in the literary translation world who act as the 'quintessential servant' and claim translation is merely a labour of love, as much as there are others who see themselves as the artist-translator. Sometimes, whether consciously or unconsciously, literary translators may position themselves as superior to their non-literary colleagues, or, to use Prunč's terms, position themselves as the priests/artists to the other's pariah.

4.3.2 Levels of consecration

On the degrees of consecration and the work of exophonic translators, Lindqvist (2006) offers, in her analysis of the Swedish field of literary translation, a model which will be useful and taken into consideration in this study. Positioned agents in the field of literary translation have control over the symbolic capital, in this case the cultural capital of translation, and assign value to other agents. Therefore, the agents' position and status in the field is

determined by their level of access to cultural capital. According to Lindqvist, "an interesting step towards a description of translation as a social practice is to map out the consecration mechanisms of the posited fields under study" (2006:67). Consecration, taken from the Catholic tradition, means to bestow upon someone a merit, usually to be made or considered sacred. A specific field can have a structure of consecration mechanisms for the agent in that field to reach the highest point of consecration.

In the case of literary translators in the UK, for example, we have the OBE recently awarded to translator Daniel Hahn. Being accepted as a fellow of the Royal Academy or British Academy can also work as consecration mechanisms. These peaks in the consecration scale are context-specific, as Lindqvist points out that in the Swedish context of high prestige literary translation these would translate to an appointment as honorary professor of translation by the government. However, these are also bound by source-language prestige in the specific context. In the UK, for example, most of the high prestige literary translators translate from European languages such as French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian and Scandinavian languages. If it is true that in order to describe and analyse translation as a social practice these mechanisms need to be mapped out, then in order to have a sociology of translation it is necessary to carry out analyses of the fields in which translation circulates and of the agents involved in the process.

In this sense, investigating the positioning of exophonic translators in these power dynamics and different systems can be fruitful for understanding who these participants in the translation world are. This informs my interviews and analyses discussed in chapter 5. Here, it is worth expanding on Lindqvist to highlight the consecration mechanisms in the specific case of exophonic translators. Inspired by Bourdieu's autonomous fields, Lindqvist constructs a general model for reconstruction of consecration mechanisms, which she separates into four phases, in order from a lower degree to a higher degree of consecration: the investment phase, the initiation phase, the recognition phase and the confirmation phase. In order to be considered a translator, a newcomer needs to invest, in education, visibility, improvement, networking, and alliances with positioned agents, be those colleagues, publishers, professors

and in general opinion-makers. In many cases this comes in the form of professionalization courses, at universities or specific translation institutes, and in the form of workshops. Of course, translators usually come to the profession via different routes, but this is one of the most traditional. The initiation phase usually consists of similar steps as the investment stage, it means for most contexts entry-level jobs, some freelancing and pitching books for publishers and journals. When a translator has a published work, they can be considered to have entered the recognition phase. With a few published works, the translator, according to Lindqvist, then becomes a positioned agent in their field, able to influence, at least to a small degree, others. After moving beyond the recognition phase, and

> Entering [the recognition stage] of consecration, the translator becomes subject to appreciative awards for his/her work in the form of scholarships, prizes or prestigious appointments. He/she will at this stage be asked to write prologues or epilogues in connection with his/her work in order to explain his/her translational practice. The translator's practice is thus deemed worthwhile. The moment the translator is asked to join the board of one of the institutions responsible for the scholarships, prizes, or prestigious appointments, he/she has reached one of the possible peaks of the consecration scale. (Linquist, 2006:69)

This discussion on consecration takes us back to high-status literary translators and their symbolic capital. It is not difficult to see how those who possess such capital do not necessarily want to part with it and will inevitably decide on those who can and cannot make the same art largely through norms based on their own subjectivity. That means that some consecrated, high-status translators who do not feel comfortable translating into an L2 might unconsciously assume this is true for the whole profession, and result in gatekeeping literary translation basing it on the trite L1-direction dictum.

4.3.3 Norms and dispositions

Since *habitus* is a term that deals closely with dispositions of social groups, often professional, as is the case of translator habiti, then a discussion about norms, albeit brief, needs to take place at this stage. Gideon Toury and

Theo Hermans are the two main contributors to the idea of norms in translation. In Toury's theory, translation is a norm-governed activity which considers two sets of norm systems: that of the source and of the target language —what he calls 'initial norms' — (Toury, 1995:56). Toury splits these norms into Preliminary Norms (viz. translation policy and directness of translation) and Operational Norms (viz. matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms). Since Toury's proposal, these norms are seen as product norms and process norms. Andrew Chesterman, in *Memes of Translation* (1997) takes Toury's translation norms and proposes his own: expectancy norms (equivalent to product norms) and professional norms (equivalent to process). According to him, expectancy norms are those which are largely dependent on the target language and culture of a translation and could determine whether a translation is considered acceptable or not. He concludes by saying that "Expectancy norms, then, are not static or permanent, nor are they monolithic. They are highly sensitive to text-type — not all text-types are necessarily expected to conform consistently to fluent standard usage — and they are open to modification and change" (Chesterman, 1997:67). The other type of norm, the professional norms, according to him, are those often voiced by certain actors in the translation process. As he puts it, "the norm authorities par excellence are perhaps those members of the society who are deemed to be competent professional translators, whom the society trusts as having this status, and who may further be recognized as competent professionals by other societies also." (Chesterman, 1997:67). These norm authorities will then set the standards which others in the profession will follow. Such standards include textual and linguistic strategies, for example.

Following this categorization, the L1 translation norm would find itself within the Preliminary Norms that Toury speaks of and both of Chesterman's proposed expectancy and professional norms. The present study, since it looks more at how the translators interviewed deal with norms against their practice, which are external to the micro-decisions of the actual texts involved, concerns itself then with the behaviour, normative or not, of L2, or exophonic translators. To conclude, as Toury asserts:

> non-normative behaviour is always a possibility. The price for selecting this option may be as low […]. However, it may also be far more severe […]; which is precisely why non-normative behaviour tends to be the exception, in actual practice. On the other hand, in retrospect, deviant instances of behaviour may be found to have effected changes in the very system. […] Implied are intriguing questions such as who is 'allowed' by a culture to introduce changes and under what circumstances such changes may be expected to occur and/or be accepted. (Toury, 1995:64)

Therefore, the existence of norms is necessary to regulate a system such as that of translation, but we must never ignore the fact that there is non-normative behaviour. In the case of L2 translation and the question of directionality, one must ask perhaps if this non-normative, disruptive behaviour of translating against the grain would not have the potential to change the very norms they are fighting against. However, again, coming back to Toury's citation, not all are 'allowed' to introduce such changes.

4.4 How to incorporate L2 Translation in TranslaTOR studies?

Therefore, translation sociology helps us shed light on the subject doing the translation, and the context in which it happens. Since the aim of my study is to see how exophonic translation can be innovative because it focuses on creative aspects, attitudes and relationship to the text and languages/cultures involved, the field of translation sociology will play an important part, theoretically as well as methodologically.

Toury accounts for the fact that normative formulations "imply other interests, particularly a desire to control behaviour— i.e. to dictate norms rather than merely account for them." (1995:55). This occurs partly when descriptive turns into prescriptive. Scholars are yet undecided on when exactly the L1 translation norm turned from descriptive to prescriptive, perhaps it was born the latter. However, as Toury puts it: "Normative formulations tend to be slanted, then, and should always be taken with a grain of salt" (Toury, 1995:55). The translators interviewed in this thesis all challenged this formulation. This is

why they were invited to be interviewed, and the questions were devised to understand what these translators thought of such formulations. The *habitus* of the L2/exophonic translator is where we can see a major difference between these and other translators. The fact that this group of translators are going against the directionality norm in translation studies and the translation market points to an overall influence on their beliefs about language and translation.

Chapter 5 - Interviews with L2/Exophonic Translators

a lot of this is a product of my cultural alienation and, by some tricks, it could be very straightforward English is my L1, Chinese is my L2. The end. Like, that would be the case. And the fact that I resist that is, I think, my resistance to the neat linguistic categories. But also, I think it doesn't sit right with me, but it's not necessarily a linguistic thing, it's a cultural thing. And it's a resistance to cultural hegemony, I guess, or the idea that we can be put in neat categories like that when colonialism has left me dislocated. And in some ways, I use language as a proxy for that. So, it's something that I'm still processing. (T09)

5.1 Overview

Through interviews with a small sample size of literary translators who have worked into a second language or non-mother tongue, I will try to understand how these respondents approach directionality in translation, their ideological stance on issues of bi- and multilingualism, as well as their specific professional and educational contexts in relation to their translation practice. These interviews were structured around open-ended questions which touched on the translators' experience and thoughts on the aforementioned topics.

These interviews were devised under a phenomenographic approach. Phenomenography is used here as a qualitative method aiming to grasp how people's experience informs their understanding of certain concepts, and how they express that. In the case of my study, these are concepts such as fluency, creativity, mother tongue, foreign languages.[97] In this line of enquiry, the focus is on experiential rather than categoric knowledge, and in their experience of a phenomenon, in this case, L2 translation at large and topics such as gatekeeping, linguistic identity, etc within that bigger topic. At this juncture, it is important to point out that phenomenographic research considers the researcher as an integral and influential part of the data collection process, and thus my own experience and relation to the object of study will also inform my motivation, analysis, and the way I collect data and relate to the subjects. There should always be a relative neutrality in the interviews, avoiding value judgement towards the interviewees and their responses, however it is important to recognise in this case that the researcher is also, in a way, part of this group of L2 translators under scrutiny. My education in Translation

[97] For more on phenomenographic research, see Marton, 1981; Sin, 2010; Tight, 2016 and Lintunen & Peltonen, 2019 among others.

Studies was in my L1 and my higher education in the field of literature and linguistics was conducted in a mix of Portuguese, English and German. This is, again, a personal anecdote that, however, informs my research and my analysis of the data. In a way, as this research is also an attempt at an auto-theory of exophonic translation, my experience and that of my subjects will coincide and dialogue with each other on many occasions.

The interview questions were devised by myself with feedback from my supervisors to hone them to better fit my purposes, and I delivered them in the form of semi-structured interviews. The interviews did not have as fixed time allotted, but most took around one hour on average. Interviews were recorded (audio-only) and later transcribed.

For the professional literary translators, the sampling strategy was purposive: I sent a call for translators in different professional association mailing lists, I also contacted translators in a case-by-case approach, based on research I have been carrying out for the last four years. Because the number of professional literary translators who translate into a second language and are published in the English-speaking market is small, the number of participants is also somewhat limited. Participants were based both in the UK and in other countries, namely: Korea, Spain, the US, Germany, France, and Sweden. Due to the freelance nature of translation work, and due to the small number of literary translators in the English-speaking world who work in both directions, or into their L2, and who are open about their position, the geographical boundaries of the study go beyond the UK context. The fact that the interviews were carried out online also broadened the geographic scope of the research. Nevertheless, at least five of the respondents are permanently based in the UK.

5.2 Participants

The fourteen translators interviewed for this section of my doctoral thesis are so wide-ranging in age, gender, class, and linguistic background as to make it difficult to fit them within one category. This has both advantages and disadvantages. Considering that one of the aims of this study was initially to find out who the exophonic translator is, this wide variety makes it difficult to

answer this question in a straightforward manner. Perhaps it would be more fruitful to define these translators in terms of what or who they are not rather than for who they are. The vast majority of the people interviewed had no straightforward answer to any of the questions that one might assume invite less complex responses. They were most of all willing to discuss language and to go beyond the issue of directionality. Initially, when thinking about the questions I would ask, I imagined the questions about directionality would elicit longer responses, but that was not the case for the majority of the translators. This is to say that perhaps directionality is not the most important feature, or rather that the difference in the process for different directionalities does not play as important a part for this group as I had expected. It is also important to mention that most of these interviewees had much more experience translating into an L2 than into their assumed L1.

The inclusion criteria for participants in this group was as follows: 1) that they should have experience translating into an L2 or what would be considered to be their L2 2) that this experience should encompass literary translation. This would mean that the interviewees could have experience of translation in both directions and with non-literary texts, but that they should be able to prove some experience in the L2 directionality and in literary translation. Initially, I was looking for published translators as opposed to emerging translators, to keep a clearer distinction between professional and student translators. With the difficulty in finding enough established literary translators who are open about their exophonic status and willing to be interviewed, and with the fact that several technical/commercial translators who have experience in L2 translation came forward willing to be participants in this study, I broadened the criteria to include some emerging translators as well, or rather, emerging in the specific field of literary translation into English. Furthermore, the definition of what an established literary translator is, in the field of translation into English and specifically in the UK and US markets, is rather elusive. As we have seen previously with consecration scales, they are highly dependent on the specific context one is looking at, and some markets are so small and niche that even established literary translators might need extra sources of income to make sure they can sustain their career. Therefore, I

focused on subjects who fit my criteria of having had a published translation or experience of L2 translation that has been through an external editing process or an outside acceptance. Thus, I felt the variety in the group of interviewees satisfied the aims of my research.

Out of the fourteen translators interviewed for this study, we have four whose L1 is Italian. These four would not be considered by Bloomfield's (1933) maximal bilingualism standard to be bilinguals, but rather, taking Valdés and Figueroa's definition (1994), as sequential or late bilinguals. They learned the L2 language in mid to late childhood and developed their advanced language skills in adulthood – three of them (T04, T11 and T14) by living in an English-speaking country (the UK, in this case) for at least two decades. The youngest of these (T06) has acquired proficiency in their area of expertise, which is Physical and Life Sciences, and was influenced by learning and working with Serbo-Croat as a translator and proof-reader. All four are highly educated, and two of them, the older ones, subscribe to a more linguistic-driven view of language and translation (being chartered linguists and freelance technical translators). These four translators also approached me asking to take part in the study, rather than the other way around.

A second slightly smaller cluster was that of BCMS (Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian) translators. Both translators interviewed who work with these languages live and work with other major European languages apart from their L1. One of them, T02, resides in Berlin and lives in a German-speaking household but has Australian English as their L1 and works in different directionalities between German, English and BCMS, more specifically Macedonian. The other, T06, is an Italian L1 speaker who works mainly with Serbo-Croat and English and resides in the UK. These two translators recommended each other for this study. T02 also works in multiple directionalities, that is, they also translate regularly into their L1, but that might be because this translator is an English native speaker, thus holding some prestige and power when using English as a lingua franca. It is also noteworthy that out of these translators, T02 is the only one who translates into an L2 that is not English, whereas the others mostly translate into English as an L2, L3, etc.

As far as clusters go, among the interviewees there is also a Brazilian and Latin American cluster, which is comprised of T03, T05 and T10. In this group, T05 and T10 come from multilingual and multicultural backgrounds, having grown up either in several countries or been brought up in a multilingual family.[98] T03 has a more straightforward answer to the mother tongue/L1 question, identifying Brazilian Portuguese as their L1 but stressing that all their higher education and, more specifically, their education in literature and translation, has been in their L2, English. The two Brazilian participants did not have their university education in Brazil. One of them (T03) was educated in Brazil until the end of high school, and then moved to the US to pursue a higher education degree, while T05 has never been educated in a Brazilian setting, having left the country as a small child, and studied in international schools in several countries. These translators were recommended to me by other interviewees before being approached. I tried not to assume anything when choosing these participants but being Brazilian myself and seeing a translator's name on a book with a Brazilian name did call my attention to the possibility that this translator was indeed Brazilian and translated into English as an L2. These assumptions were necessary to be able to approach the prospective participants and have opened my eyes to possible L2 translators in the marketplace. As you will be able to read below, even though T05 has a Brazilian/Latinate name, it does not mean that they consider Portuguese to be their dominant language. T10 is Argentinian but from a Jewish-Russian family and mentions five languages in the interview.

The remaining participants were speakers of Korean, Swedish, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Spanish, Basque, Chinese, German, and French. As for their location, five of the participants live in the UK, three in the US (T03, T05, T09), and one in each of Ukraine (T08), then Basque Country (T07), Germany (T02), and South Korea (T01). One resident in the UK has moved to the US and then back to Sweden in the interim (T12).

The majority of participants were women with eleven out of 14 identifying as such. As a disclaimer, I did not take the participants' sexualities

[98] T05, for example, also translates from Spanish and Catalan.

and gender identities into account when asking the questions nor will I focus on that in the analysis.

Ages range from 28 to 61, with a higher number of participants older than 40 (8). The sample is not statistically significant, but I believe some hypotheses can be drawn here. These hypotheses are formed by general assumptions and experience of working around translators, not from the interview sample. Emerging, young literary translators into an L2 exist but there is an older generation that has been doing this type of work in the background for a while. However, at least half of the 40+ group does mainly technical translation and were only recently able to break into the literary translation world, more specifically with their L2 translation practice. They needed decades of experience with the language and professional accreditation to then add literary translation (into L2 or not) as part of their professional practice, and it is usually the case that other types of translations form their main source of income. The younger group also benefits from the path forged by their predecessors, as well as from the new initiatives and better visibility that literary translators from minority backgrounds and languages have begun to benefit from in the translation field. So much so that in the 40+ group, half (4) of the translators do literary translation and other mainly creative work as their main professional practice/source of income.

Further generalisations would not be fruitful for the scope of this study. The attempt here is not to create another linguistic straitjacket to dress these translators with. However, as analysed below, even though such a small sample is not statistically significant, within this group certain patterns and trends emerge.

5.3 Reasoning behind questions

The present section briefly exposes the reasoning behind the questions being asked of the translators, and how they reflect my expectations and the findings reached with these interviews. I divided the questions into sections, the first of them being Approaches to Language. The first question in this section, "*Do you consider that you have a mother tongue, a first language, or more than one? If so, which one(s)? If not, why not?*" anticipates a fairly straightforward

answer.[99] For this group of translators, who mostly deny the monolingual bias and *habitus*, the main characteristic that unites them is their inability, or rather, refusal to conform to these fixed linguistic definitions. This, in turn, resulted in lengthier, more complex responses, some going into detail about their linguistic background and upbringing, anticipating questions that would come *a posteriori*. I opted to use 'mother tongue' because of the affective/emotional quality of this term and for the fact that this term still has currency in non-expert milieu as well as in literary language. Not only that, but I chose to keep this quite problematic and widely discussed term in the question because I am also interested in the metaphors used by these literary translators to define their linguistic experiences. However, I have added "first language" as well, to make sure they understood what I meant by the question. Furthermore, I openly asked for the interviewees to comment on any terminological choices made throughout the interview. With this I aimed to see how they fit in the spectrum, or universe, of linguistic affiliations, emotive and affective responses, and personal linguistic relationships.

The second question in the first part was "*What is your language of education? Is it different from your mother tongue?*". This question was added to take into consideration the fact that one's mother tongue or L1 might not be one's dominant language, working language, or language of education. I aimed to see what languages of instruction these translators had in their lives, in a school context, or in different higher education contexts. As with the case of T03, for example, a translator might spend most of their life in the country where their L1 is widely spoken, and then study their specific field, in this case, literature, entirely in their L2, therefore considering themselves to be fluent enough in L2 when it comes to their chosen field, but not feeling like their L1 proficiency in the same field is at a similar level.

The third question in this section is "*Do you translate into a non-mother tongue? If so, what is your experience of it?*". This question is the one which introduces the issue of directionality in the interview. The first part of the question asks for a straightforward answer, while the second is very open-

[99] Interview questions are presented here in italics to highlight them and differentiate them from the rest of the text. Quotes from the interviews in the analysis will not.

ended and in itself elicits different types of response. The former part is created solely to gather information about experience translating into an L2, and in order to confirm that this participant fulfils the requirement of being an L2 translator or rather considers themselves as such. The latter part of the question gives the respondent more time and space to elaborate on these experiences.

The next question, still in the Approaches to Languages section, is a more general one, "*How would you describe your relationship to the languages you can speak/write/translate*?". With this more open-ended question I aim to find how these participants relate to the languages they speak and what they call these languages. The issue of terminology returns here, as these questions were designed to elicit different metaphors for the languages translators use.

The final question in this section was "*Have you ever been able to express something in a language that is not your first language more satisfactorily? How so?*". This question was added to investigate whether these translators perceive different contexts of language use. It was important to also see what different sub-competencies these translators perceived they had in the different languages they use. Even for subjects who speak and work with an L2 but who would not be considered bilingual, as is my case, it is often the case that they will feel able to express certain things, topics, emotions, better in their L2 than in their L1. Such is the case of T03, as I explained above.

The next section was called Directionality and was comprised of questions about the translator's experience translating into different directions. The first question in this section was "*What is the difference, for you, between both (or more) directions of translation? How would you describe your translation process (and types of challenge, linguistic or otherwise) when you are translating into a mother tongue and into a foreign language?"*. Due to the length of this question and the fact that it was more open-ended, the responses to it were varied, enough so I could not reach conclusions about a common process among these translators. Most of them focused on the first part of the question rather than the last, with a few commenting on some linguistic challenges they faced when translating either into L1 or L2.

The second question, "*Do you have preferred genres/text-types for L2 translation? How, if at all, do they differ from your L1 translation practice? Please explain the reasons for this.*" was devised because as much as there are sub-contexts and competencies, translators have preferences when it comes to literary genres. This came to be because of advice I found in translation manuals and encyclopaedias that conceded that L2 literary translation was possible but that it would be impossible to translate poetry into L2 because of the aesthetic and stylistic sensibilities that such a literary genre demands. Roman Jakobson famously distinguished poetry from prose claiming that poetry is metaphoric while prose is metonymic (Jakobson, 1956). Perhaps these authors who discourage L2 poetry translation are arguing that the metaphoric nature of poetry cannot be rendered correctly when the translator is not a fluent user of the target language. In this case, the strong discourse against doing L2 translation of poetry may result in these exophonic translators doing a type of self-gatekeeping of sorts. With this question I wanted to tap into the possible exceptions that literary translators impose on their directionality practice.

Gatekeeping is one of the main topics involved in the practice of both exophonic authors and L2 translators. Therefore, I have added a section with two questions on the issue. The first question was "*Has your translation work been criticised, rejected or disregarded because you are not a native speaker of the Target Language?*". All translators deal with feedback from editors, proofreaders, clients, but it was my suspicion that L2 translators are faced with a greater level of this type of criticism or feedback. Such criticism, or gatekeeping, would be because of an assumption that a non-native speaker's choice of an odd or non-standard word would be due to their non-nativeness, and that this would mean there is an assumed degree of sub-optimal competence or stylistic sensibility when producing the target text. The second question, "*Have you ever been overcorrected on a linguistic choice or specific form that was consciously made by you? How so?*" ties to the first in that it expands on this gatekeeping practice. These questions were based on personal experience, informal reports from fellow L2 translators and the concept of *Obrigkeitsdeutsch*, as discussed by Franco Biondi, in that a form of authoritarian linguistic policing is used to diminish or devalue the work or the linguistic competence of exophonic writers. My assumption is

that exophonic translators, belonging to a group which is often already the focus of suspicion and untrust, would suffer more from this type of linguistic prejudice.

Prevalent arguments in the field of Literary Translation Studies suggest that a translator is an active participant in the writing process, a creative writer on their own terms (Wright, 2016; Scott, 2012; Perteghella & Loffredo, 2006, among others). These are theories of translation, especially of literary translation, which see the role of the translator as more critical and creative (see Venuti, 1992; also on calls for humanising translation theory by Pym, 2009; Kaindl, 2021). I wanted to explore these views further through my research, and to frame exophonic translation in dialogue with creative writing and creative expression, considering creativity as central to the practice of L2 translators. Therefore, the first question in the section Creative Writing, Fluency and Translation is "*How do you view the relationship between fluency and creativity in the languages you use?*". This question is thus posed because I am interested in understanding the relationship between fluency and competency in L2 and (literary) creativity in that same language. The choice of the word 'fluency' caused some confusion and very different responses due to the possible interpretations it offers, and I will discuss this in the next section.

The other question in this section was "*Do you also do creative writing outside of your translation practice? If so, is it only in your first language or do you experiment with other languages? How do you feel your creative writing relates to your translation practice?*". With this question, the aim was to create a more complex portrait of these translators by seeing how they engage with creativity in other forms, and specifically with creative writing, and to see how they believe creativity in writing and in general relates to their translation practice. I consider this to be an important piece of information because it gives insight into the expressive, creative side of this group of translators, tying it together with the exophonic approach which is centred around creativity and expression rather than on level of fluency or strict lingualist definitions.

Finally, I have added a small section on Training and Professional Status. The first question was created with the aim of discovering more about these translators' educational backgrounds, and more specifically, their

education in translation theory and practice. My own educational background in Brazil is what motivated this question, as I have a bachelor's degree in Translation from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. The BA in Translation that I studied is one of few existing in Brazil, and my course had the same number of modules of practice in translation into L1 and L2. This could, in a way, reflect a different outlook on directionality, especially in translator training, which could be the case with other non-anglophone and/or postcolonial contexts. This is certainly the case in some countries in Europe, like Croatia, Slovenia, Spain, as can be seen from the bibliography of L2 translation studies presented in chapter 1. I also intended to gather the connectedness between the formative experience of translators in higher education and the realities of the market. The question posed to try and assess this was "*Did you have formal translation training? If so, did it include different translation directions? If you did receive training in different translation directions, has there been a change in the direction(s) that you practice since completing your training? Do you still translate in both directions, in only one, or in one much more than another?"*. Since it is a long cluster question, I did not always need to complete the question because it depended on the subjects' answer to the first part of the cluster.

The second and last question in the interview was "*Are you a member of a professional association? Which one?*". With this last enquiry the aim was to understand how this group of translators position themselves in terms of a professional community of literary translators and to establish their ties to professional associations, institutions, or unions in their field. This comes more out of statistical curiosity but also to see how these exophonic translators might feel regarding their belonging or not-belonging to translators' groups. Some of the reasoning behind the questions posed will reappear in the following section, whilst analysing the answers and seeing how they fit the researcher's expectations.

5.4 Interview Analysis

The fourteen interviews conducted for this study total around eighteen hours of audio, and transcribed, these fourteen interviews amass 150,000 words. The order in which the questions were asked is changed slightly in the

analysis. This is because questions that were not initially grouped together resulted in similar issues raised for the discussion here. At times, the interviewee would respond or even add crucial information about a theme or topic much later on in the interview. Therefore, I chose to group the responses into greater thematic trends. In the analyses that follow, different questions will ask for different lengths of analysis, thus why some questions receive lengthier scrutiny than others.

5.4.1 Approaches to languages

For the first section, Approaches to languages, question one elicited similar responses to questions two and four, which is why I have grouped them together in this analysis. As you will be able to identify below, there are several instances and levels of language use which dialogue with the discussions on mono and multilingualism explored in chapters two and three.

5.4.1.2 Mother tongues, first languages: metaphors and relationships

Chapter 2 of the present thesis broached, among others, the subject of mother tongues, native speaker and familial metaphors used to identify a person's linguistic background. We have seen calls for a post-native speakerist pedagogy (Holliday, 2006; Houghton & Hashimoto, 2018) where we could similarly call for a post-native speakerist translation theory. Therefore, the translators interviewed were selected on the basis of their attitude/approach to L2 Translation, their position as 'other' in anglo-normative Translation Studies, and therefore it was important to see how these subjects positioned themselves when asked to define their L1, or their mother tongue. The majority of interviewees did not have a straightforward answer to what they considered their L1, mother tongue, L2, and similar terms. T05 said that "I, by virtue of, I think, my mother's insistence, consider Portuguese to be my mother tongue. But I consider English to be my dominant language. It's the language I was educated in formally." This mention of a different language of education to the one learned at home can often be found in the responses. Some translators call their dominant, working language their "adopted mother tongue" (like T04, for

example). Some translators, like T01, had a somewhat straightforward answer to the first question:

> I consider my mother tongue to be Korean, and I consider it to be my only mother tongue, my entire family lives in Korea, I am not an immigrant, my family is not an immigrant family and no part of my family is an immigrant family, like even my uncles and aunts, they all live in Korea, my parents were both raised in Korea, so, and I've spent my entire adulthood in Korea, I went to college here, I went to school here, I spent half of my childhood here, I went to the military here, I went to law school here, so I am like (laughs) very very thoroughly the most Korean person you'll meet. I mean, if you ask me "What is your mother tongue?" Of course, it's Korean. (T01)

This translator is one of the most successful by a simple definition of success (consecration), meaning they have had several of their translations published, have been awarded funding and prizes, and have name recognition in their field. That does not mean they see themselves as non-L2, non-exophonic, they do say that without a doubt their L1 is not English, even though they very frequently translate into English, or rather, only into their L2. However, they add:

> English is just this other language I happen to be very good at, because of, by accident, because my father happened to work overseas. And because I just happened to really like English literature so as a child I would read a lot, and you know, the very typical story of, you know, literary translators, they all loved to read as children, they keep reading, are bilingual, and they happen to grow up in some kind of multilingual household or have a multilingual education and then decide to express their appreciation for their language, for their literature, through their language abilities, so that is a very typical story, that's my story. (T01)

T01's use of the word bilingual raises a few questions here. They consider themselves to be bilingual but say that without a doubt Korean is their L1. This is more attuned with Hamer and Blanc's (2000) definition of

bilinguality[100], rather than bilingualism, or rather of a more open definition of bilingualism. This social access to English represented by their multinational upbringing is presented by T01 as an important feature of their language use and literary translation career. This reflects Chow's (2014) idea of Language as Prosthetics: it is both artificial and added.[101] It does not hail from any notion of naturalness, it was learned and acquired through external contextual demands. At the same time, it reflects Todorov's dialogism of a bilingual existence (cf chapter 3.2.1), in that Korean and English, outside of the subject, exist in a power differential.

This social usage or rather sub-directionalities and contextual language usage come into play when analysing T02's answer to the first question. They had a lengthier response to the question because even though English is their L1 ("I do have a language which I consider my first language, if you'd like, quite definitely and that's English, sometimes I say the Australian variant of English, which is closer to British than American"), they question their abilities in certain domains of English, as in the following excerpt:

> when I think about it I realise that everyone changes and develops in the course of their lives and I have a lot in a linguistic sense, as well, in that my English perhaps wasn't completely formed, it wasn't really, sort of, stable and well-developed when I left Australia when I was 22 and I've lived abroad ever since, in modern English-speaking environments, for example, a lot of spelling and punctuation rules weren't really clear to me when I left, so I sort of started unconsciously adopting German rules and Russian rules and things like that, which I didn't realise at the time, and here's a generalisation for you: I think my English, although it's very deep inside me, has become a little bit weak or wobbly or, there are areas of terminology, for example, where I am not firm at all in English, where I am much better in German, for example, which is my everyday language, I call that my language number 2, Second Language.

The social aspect of German for T02 and the geographical and temporal space between their formative years and the decades spent pursuing

---

[100] Following Hamers' (1981) and Hamers and Blanc's (2000) definition of bilinguality. See chapter 3, on bilingualism, for more details of the definitions.
[101] Refer to Chapter 3 for more on the idea of Language as Prosthetics.

translation and writing work in non-anglophone spaces have made it especially difficult for T02 to feel that they still have a total grasp of English. This distance has made the translator feel that there are areas of language use, contexts, and terminologies, which are more accessible for people who have more recent, lived experiences in contexts where these variants are used. And, at the same time, German as their language of everyday use gains a more important status in their linguistic experience.

T03 also mentions the question of skills and abilities in some areas and contexts of language use as opposed to others when answering question one:

> that's a tough one. I do consider that I have a mother tongue, which is Portuguese, but I also think that my concept of mother tongue is not that that language must be stronger than all. I think, though I have one mother tongue, Portuguese. I do have two dominant languages, English and Portuguese. I feel like my English is stronger in a professional environment or academic environment than my Portuguese could ever be. For example, my Portuguese is more familial. That kind of thing, because I only really studied up until high school, that kind of thing. So, though I do consider Portuguese my mother tongue, it doesn't mean necessarily that it's always my strongest language. (T03)

Again, this translator also felt the need to point out that they consider English to be a dominant language for them, especially in a professional context, due to their specific language background. When asked about their opinion on the term 'mother tongue', related to the way they commented on it in the first part of the answer, they go into more detail about their emotive ties to the concept:

> I do think I do have a mother tongue. A mother tongue is a useful term. But, you know, the assumption of the mother tongue is always someone's main language is not entirely true for me and for a bunch of people. But yes. So, I do think of myself as having two dominant languages as like being fully bilingual. Yeah. And my mother tongue being Portuguese.

Thus, we can see that this individual does not equate one's mother tongue with one's dominant language.[102] It is noteworthy, furthermore, that T03 defined themselves as being 'fully bilingual', whereas, by the prevalent definition of bilingual still used in many bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition studies, they would be considered late-onset bilinguals, having learned the language in late adolescence. Of the translators interviewed, many have a lived experience of bi- or multilingualism, dependent on external factors like national linguistic policies, a multilingual family or multicultural/national upbringing. For T07, for example, it is a question of mixed education and the societal usage of their two languages:

> I know that I spoke only Basque till I was five and then I learned Spanish at school, but I don't know, I like to think that, you know, they're both my mother tongue, in a sense, both Basque and Spanish. Because I don't remember actually a time when I didn't speak Spanish, you see what I mean? I know that I didn't. But I don't remember it. So, in my lived experience, really, I always had two languages in my memory of lived experience.

Translator 07 details further their experience with both Spanish and Basque against the background of the Franco era in Spain, and how important the tension between the two languages is for them. They, however, also point out that this means that translating into English is translating into an L3, not an L2. At the same time, they do not define which language is their L1 or L2, meaning that these languages are on equal or at least very similar footing. On the issue of state bi- or multilingualism, we have the very specific case of T09, who is Singaporean, and goes into a detailed explanation of the significance of the term mother tongue in the Singaporean context:

> And I don't know if this is a legacy of British colonialism, but in these places, and this is embedded in the school curriculum, mother tongue means your heritage language, as assigned by the state, rather than your first language.

---

[102] Here I find it worthwhile to at least raise the question of whether this would be the case of more traditional anglophone literary translators. Would they also identify their mother tongue (English) as their dominant language most of the time? I believe this would be true of some native English users living in a non-English speaking country, in a country that speaks their L2, out of which they translate. But would the same be for non-native English users who live in an English-speaking environment and translate into their L2, English? If their dominant language is English, could we still call them L2 users?

> (…) But because I'm mixed race, when I started primary school, I was essentially allowed to choose my mother tongue. Which is quite an odd concept and I think from an early age showed me the hollowness of it. So, my dad's Sri Lankan Tamil and my mum's Malaysian Chinese, and they kind of pushed me towards Malay, even though it is neither of their languages, because that's the easiest language, supposedly. And I chose Chinese, and I'm not sure, I mean, I can't fully be sure if this was my reasoning at the time because I was six, I think it was because I'm Chinese passing and I knew I would be expected to speak specifically Mandarin, in the Singaporean context. Because language is a very racial issue. We happen to speak English at home, because it's my parents' common language, because... But also, English is a signifier of privilege in Singapore and many other countries where if you speak English at home, and often if you're Christian, that automatically places you in the upper-middle class. So, it's a very aspirational thing.

Here we can see the 'hollowness' of the term mother tongue in some contexts, like that of T09's upbringing. English was the lingua franca of T09's household, and not any English, but Singaporean English. Globally, speakers of Singaporean English are speaking a postcolonial variant of the language (Schneider, 2007). Singaporean English is a unique development from Singapore's English-based bilingual policy (Tickoo, 1996:438) and it is thus heavily influenced by the other languages that form the country's linguistic context. T09 at another moment in the interview defines Singaporean English as a "patois". It is, however, considered to be an acrolect, as opposed to the basilect widely referred to as Singlish.[103] English was the dominant language in T09's household, and speaking English in Singapore is considered highly prestigious and informs linguistic choices. Still, the country's mother tongue policy considers that T09's mother tongue is another, Chinese, one that is not the language spoken in T09's household, nor is it truly the language spoken by T09's mother. In this context, T09's choice for Chinese-language instruction in a country that values English so much ('in fact, the worst insult about a fellow

[103] On the concept of acrolect in general, see Bickerton (1975). For more on Singapore English, see Lim (2005), Foley (1988; 2001) , Hickey (2005), among others.

Singaporean is "and he doesn't even speak good English'") adds another layer of meaning to their choice of language. In their words:

> I kind of grew up with that English is this aspirational thing and as my home language, but also feeling resistance to it, so opting for Chinese in primary school and then choosing to go to a Chinese secondary school, which my parents discouraged because, you know, English is the elite language, so why wouldn't you go to an English school. And so, I grew up, I think, more bilingual than most of my generation. People tended to split along class lines into which the strongest language was, where I was speaking English at home and Chinese at school, although a lot of the lessons were still in English, because Singapore now has English as a dominant language. And I know a lot of Singaporeans who are just very comfortable saying "English is my first language" or "I only speak English, really", whereas I think because from an early age - although I did grow up using English, in many ways English is my dominant language, my native language, whatever you call it - I feel more of a connection with Chinese. And I guess that is how I found my way into translation. It was the only thing that really made sense of this disparity.

It is noteworthy that T09 mentions translation as being 'the only thing that really made sense of this disparity'. For a person such as T09, whose linguistic background involves a lot of languages, the choice to translate and the choice of language to translate into/from also signifies an active, personal choice rather than a language that just 'happened to them'. Adding yet another layer to an already-layered linguistic background, T09 explains that their mother speaks Cantonese, not Mandarin. As they put it themselves:

> I spoke Cantonese as a very young child. And then that mainly stopped. And now my Cantonese is really vestigial, like, I was never, after the age of five or six, I was never allowed to use Cantonese to communicate with them. Because Mandarin is the elite version of Chinese, even though that's not a language they speak. So, I would hear them speaking to each other in Cantonese and I would hear my father speaking to his Sri Lankan family on the phone in Tamil, but that was not... Those were not languages I had access to. And I was speaking Mandarin at school.

So, to paraphrase Chantal Wright (2010): which language is T09 abandoning when they eventually chose to translate from Chinese into English? What mother tongue/native language are they turning their backs on when they choose to adopt English as the language they write in, translate into? This disparity is more evident in the case of T09, but this question would resonate with many of the participants.

Other participants, like T10, consider themselves to have mainly two languages, but their household or family speaks a variety of languages. T10 comments on this situation thus:

> my parents were both Argentinian. I was born in Argentina, but their parents escaped from Russia, so they speak a whole range of languages. They spoke Polish, Russian and Yiddish, so... And a part of the family had also come from France. So that was the whole range of languages that were known in the household.

Such is the case of many families in Southern South America, especially those of the Jewish diaspora. Even though T10 would classify themselves as Argentinian but has lived in the UK for the last 42 years and speaks English fluently, one can see from their interview that they consider that many other languages live within them and contribute to their linguistic identity. This goes against the monolingual notion that is so pervasive in literary translation, especially in the anglophone context. Political-linguistic nativism cannot hold its ground here, and glossodiversity looms closer than any civic monolingualism would dare to in the context of these exophonic translators. T10 presents a bilinguality that is the result of their social life, and like others in these interviews, refuses the term mother tongue:

> my problem is with calling it a "mother tongue", because I certainly have one, the tongue of my mother. Um, so Spanish is my mother tongue. But in terms of my competence, I suppose, is, English is probably my second language, and I'm actually quite fluent in English. (…) I think that the use of "mother tongue" can be quite misleading, and in terms of my mother tongue is quite, if I may, is quite an interesting concept because my family escaped to Argentina towards the turn of the previous century and their mother tongue wasn't Spanish either. So, what is the mother tongue? That has always been an

> interesting and fluid concept in my family. People spoke all sorts of things.

As we can see here, T10's reaction to the term mother tongue is not so much a refusal as it is a criticism of the essentialism that the term might suggest. Yes, they have a mother tongue, but their mother tongue in itself is more multitudinous than the concept of L1 as mother tongue. T04 stated that "My mother tongue is Italian. But I consider English my, I always refer to it as my **adopted mother tongue**." (emphasis added).[104] T04 also said that they no longer consider Italian to be their "main language" for some decades now. T06, another Italian speaker, said that Italian is not only their mother tongue but their "father tongue" as well. In turn, T11, also an L1 Italian speaker, defined Italian as their "baby language". In their response to the other questions in the interview, L11 goes into more detail about their experience with English and Italian and their trauma, which influenced their perception of the languages used. It is also worthy of note here that T11 has spent the last 30 years living in an English-speaking environment and has an affective relation to English that we will investigate further on. T12 seems to have a clearer distinction between their L1 and their L2 but takes issue with the term mother tongue. According to T12,

> I know I'm not the first person to have this thought, but it struck me recently that the phrase "mother tongue" is also, you know, very peculiar and very, sort of... You know, it makes all kinds of assumptions, like why could we... You know? **We need to queer that phrase**. I think we need to think about, you know, like people have more than one mother.

Further on in the interview, T12 mentions that, in fact, apart from some lexical and minor grammatical changes, translating from Swedish to English does not involve too many drastic changes, that "you can really, like, replicate a sentence and keep the syntax and pretty much do a literal translation. Either direction... You get, you get like a, you get a sentence that works" (T12). This also highlights the fact that some language combinations

[104] For ease of reading, and to avoid unnecessary repetitions, the reader should assume that, when quoting from the interviews, all emphases are added by the researcher.

are more formally aligned. However, now, I want to focus on the last part of T12's answer, namely when they mention the need to 'queer' the concept of mother tongue. Previously in this thesis, I explored at length the term mother tongue and its implications, and the aspect of queerness has also been mentioned, nevertheless, the fact that T12 uses queer as a verb and to question and destabilise the mother tongue is an interesting point to analyse. Would exophonic writing and translation work, at times, as a method for/of queering the L1 norm in literary translation? Or rather if we take queering as a process of destabilising norms then queer translation strategies are akin to a translingual, exophonic practice.[105] Further on we will focus more on cases of trauma and the L1 and different relationships to the L2, almost as if these translators' second language worked as a lifeline (as would be the case with T11 and T13, for example). T13 is a speaker of Bulgarian, born and raised in Bulgaria, but who claims to have had a strong immersion in German due to their educational background. They explain it as such:

> I call that my first language is Bulgarian, because I was born to Bulgarian parents, grew up in Bulgaria, but I started learning languages from the age of 12. I went to a German language school where for two years we only were allowed to speak German. So, it was a full immersion into the language. So, all subjects were in German (T13)

As we can see, the immersive educational experience in a foreign language at the age of twelve has impacted T13 so much that this experience comes to the fore when asked about their mother tongue/first language. T13 is born and raised in Bulgaria, however, they have lived in English-speaking countries for two decades, and claim English as their dominant language. When asked about a possible hierarchy of languages in their repertoire, T13 claims:

> I find them at the same level. Is that making sense? Because of the way I use English and the way I use Bulgarian. I often find myself it's easier for me to express myself in English. And I would, I suppose, because I

[105] See chapter 3, subsection 3.3.2, of the present thesis.

> worked so hard twenty something years ago to leave Bulgaria and to leave everything behind, I struggle to nowadays, particularly if it has to be... If I have to express myself in a more creative way, I find it difficult if... I finish first of all think of it in English and then I'm finding myself translating myself. (T13)

Here we can see T13 mentioning their effort to learn English and that they "worked so hard" to learn it and to leave Bulgarian behind. The effort involved in learning a language and assimilating into another language and/or culture, is expressed in these subjects' view of their own creative abilities in the L2. T13 claims to feel more creative in English, their L2, and that might be because of the more conscious effort that speaking English has involved for them.

To conclude these queries into mother tongue and first language, it is worthwhile recalling the idea of the 'linguistic family romance' (Yildiz, 2012:12). Some of the interviewees, in their responses, refused to accept terms like mother tongue. Others used the term to criticise its own fraught nature. And some, like T14 used and expanded on metaphors to describe their complex linguistic background. T14 creates a web of familial connections tying all their languages together. According to them:

> it's a very complex situation because the perception of language can only and only ever be very subjective. I remember years ago writing a poem called My Language Family and playing on this double meaning of language family to give a sense of what my language, my subjective language family was. I'd have to say I'm mother-tongue Italian, but it's a bit of an official definition, it's more it's more that... I guess, well, I guess translation is a mother tongue, really. That's not an extreme, an extreme statement. The reasons for this are that I grew up in a mixed language environment where the main everyday language was Italian or Italian, which is, in fact, Tuscan, and also one of the languages of northern Italy, which is considered a dialect and also with the presence of the less preponderant, but nonetheless quite vivid of French as well. So, at about the age of six, I began approaching and studying English so that the formal answer to your question would be I'm mother tongue Italian and my second language is English, but the real answer is of grandmother tongue is Alpine, Father-tongue Tuscan, mother tongue, Italian, -English and... (T14)

And in the case of T14, one could argue they are speaking from an experience of only two major languages: Italian and English. T14 defies lingualist assumptions about named languages and includes and refers to regional varieties of the languages they speak, when they mention Alpine and Tuscan, for example. This linguistic family metaphor can go beyond the biological, blood ties, as, for example, T04 claims to see English as their 'adopted mother tongue'. On a similar note, as we recall from earlier in this section, T11 calls Italian their 'baby language', yet another tie to a linguistic familial metaphor.

The answers to question number 4, namely "How would you describe your relationship with the languages you can speak/write/translate?" were extremely varied, and some of these responses were either a repetition of the answer to question one, a continuation of that, or slightly off-topic. To say that an answer to a phenomenographic interview was 'off-topic' is a slight risk I am taking, as we did not expect such an open question as this to elicit to-the-point answers, but at points it seems that responses given to other questions might work better to answer this one than the ones the interviewees offered to question number four.

My assumption as a researcher was that such a question would result in a myriad of language familial metaphors, like question one did. However, since most of the interviewees did not see this connection in the word 'relationship' contained in the question, the responses varied into different nodes. I will focus initially on those responses that did elicit the family language romance we talked about earlier in this analysis, and then look deeply into other types of answers.

Translator number fourteen again brought up the family romance trope when they claimed:

> **T14: But it's totally like we were talking, you know, like we were saying earlier, they are as different, literally, as different members of your family or as different limbs in the body. I think the family analogy or metaphor is more accurate.**

> L: So how, in your case, how would the family... So Italian is which one, it is the mother?
>
> T14: No, I'd say more say more Italian is more a father tongue, English, more mother tongue. **But that's a very risky thing to say because I'm illegitimate. I'm an illegitimate child.** [laughs]
>
> L: Do you have any adopted mothers or stepmoms?
>
> T14: I have, well, two grandmother tongues which are French and the dialect and certainly a sister tongue. that's Spanish, you know what I mean? [laughs]

As one can see in the excerpt above, the interviewee thinks the family analogy or metaphor is accurate in describing their relationship to the languages they speak, and I, the interviewer, encouraged them to explain these relationships/metaphors. T14 gave a more detailed breakdown of their linguistic family tree in their response to Q1 (see Q1). It is interesting to note, at this juncture, that T14 used the term 'illegitimate child' when they claim English to be their mother tongue. T14 here claims it is 'risky' to assume a familial relationship with English, as they have no blood relations with it. T14 themselves, after drawing on familial metaphors to answer questions 1 and 4, somewhat contradicted what they said by attesting such a metaphor is "not fully accurate because, again, I would stress this, I think to shoehorn a reality like language into metaphors of this sort is not what we should do". Following on that trend, T09 claims that, in trying to learn Cantonese and Tamil, the languages of their parents, that "I don't know that I necessarily feel more connected just because these are the languages that my parents speak" (T09), pointing out that the family or blood relation to a language does not mean one needs to have a particularly strong relationship with such a language, as T09 defines their relationship to the languages they can speak as 'contentious'. As we have seen, these relationships can make a very clear image of a family tree in the minds of these translators, negative or positive or both, but they also at times negate the importance of the family connection to their use of languages, or rather, they negate that one would feel more connected to a language just because it is the language of one's parents, as T09 puts it.

A contentious relationship with language can go further, to include traumatic ones. As T11 addressed:

> I think my relationship with languages is tangled up with a history of childhood abuse, which meant that, over time, Italian, for all that it is my baby language, when you have a history of childhood abuse there's abuse kind of woven into your relationship with language. While English is very much a language that I chose for myself, the way that London is a home that I chose for myself. And that means... It's interesting. There's this idea that if you choose something for yourself, you obviously need it to be old enough to make that choice. Therefore, it's not innate, it's not natural. There are all these kinds of issues of naturality around language, and because it's not natural then it's not seen as intimate as your relationship with the place that you come from and with the language you learned at birth. And I think that's rubbish! Because, actually, to choose a language for yourself, to choose a home for yourself, and a country, and a city, it means that you are very intimate with that, because you made a conscious choice to adopt that language, that city, that country as your own.

In the case of T11, who has a traumatic relationship with their L1, being able to choose another language is an important factor. English, in their case, was chosen, and as we can see in the quote above, they do not accept the idea of naturality around language, claiming that, even though English was an adopted language, a choice, they can still feel intimate with it. To keep translators like T11 jailed within an idea of language that would claim Italian (their L1) as the only language they should translate into would be to further a violence that this person has been subject to, in having to redefine their linguistic allegiances. By steering away from the essentialist view of language and translation, exophonic translators are defying expectations and uncontested language relationships. Similarly, as with the authors analysed in Yildiz (2012), who see the Mother Tongue as a site of alienation, identity, exclusion, inclusion, and violence, these translators question, through their answers to an apparently simple question, the homogeneity of linguistic experiences still prevalent in anglo-normative Translation Studies.

As is often the case in the discourse around learning languages and fluency, the ideas of mastery and ownership of a language have been present

throughout the interviews. Some translators, like T02, and T07, used the words 'mastery' or 'ownership' to describe their language use. Both T02 and T07, however, use the words to partly criticise them. T02 comments that to demand perfect mastery, in those words, is problematic. Meanwhile, T07 criticises those who say "that it's not really important that you have mastery of the source language. And this drives me up the wall, like, what do you mean? Like, if you don't have mastery of the source language, then you do not understand the nuances of that text" (T07). In the same topic, T01 mentions a political/ideological factor, claiming that Korea, as a "vassal state of America" (T01) highly values an individual who is fluent in English. According to them:

> To be able to speak English is actually a very politically powerful thing in Korea, it's a huuuge (sic) **intellectual commodity to be able to speak it**, it advances you in your career, exponentially, there's no comparison between someone who is fluent in English and someone who is not, it gives such a leg up. So, with me, my relationship to English is that I always knew that it had this kind of **political power** (T01)

If translators such as T01 are kept from translating into English, via gatekeeping, for example, they are similarly being denied access to this intellectual commodity they spoke of. Having the concept of 'nativeness' as a given in the access to this political power must be, then, contested, again and again. As Pokorn (2005) stated, the golden rule of L1 Translation keeps some people out, the real, non-idealised translators, and ethnocentrically defends the natural native speaker while rejecting those in the margins, the peripheral, considered thus as inferior, suboptimal. Those marginal, peripheral translators who take part in a marginal, peripheral translation practice (L2 Translation) are therefore, like the authors of the post-monolingual paradigm, "destabilising the connection once thought inherent and indivisible between language and ethnicity" (see page 87) and thus contesting the linguistic utopia (Pratt, 1987) still prevalent in Translation Studies.

5.4.1.3 Diverging from the L1

Question number 5, namely "*Have you ever been able to express something in a language that is not your first language more satisfactorily? How so?"* elicited different

responses. Some translators talked about their use of each language, some have contrasted their different personalities in each language, some others have pointed out how different languages are in a different affective relationship to them. T01, whose working languages are mainly Korean as their L1 and English as L2, has focused more on English and its political implications, when they observed:

> I feel like English is a really flexible…It's a very generous language. Yeah. I've never felt, but I've never felt that there's something in English that can't express in Korean. The thing is my spoken Korean is better than my spoken English and I feel more comfortable speaking Korean than English. […] Korean is also, like, really economical, much more so than English. (T01)

Others, like T02, focused on their expressive abilities in each language, and

> I'm really happy when I can express myself in a way that makes my counterpart or the person I'm communicating with laugh or smile or say, "that's witty" or "I hadn't thought of that". So being able to simply express myself in some nuanced, original way and I'm able to do that occasionally in, for example, in Serbo-Croatian, which I have a fairly good grasp of now because it's been my main working language for 10 years now. I am sometimes surprised and happy at how nuanced I can express myself there, in English and German sometimes as well, of course. Macedonian is my baby language. It's the one I perhaps speak the least well of the six. And I don't know if I've had that sort of moment of elation in Macedonian, but I have it in Russian sometimes, I have it in Esperanto, Serbo-Croatian, English and German, obviously. So yeah. Yeah. I think it's that sort of moment of successful communication with another person that makes me think, yeah, I'm part of this, this is part of me. I'm living this language, if you see what I mean. (T02)

The moments of successful communication that T02 speaks of, in whatever language, and focusing more on the ability to be witty or humorous in a second language is an important feature of living in a second language. Humour is very context- and culture-dependent, and relies on verbal and non-

verbal cues, references, expectations, and what pragmatists call a theory of mind (Premack & Woodruff, 1978) and of relevance (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, 2002). Therefore, it feels, for T02, to be especially significant when they can be funny in one of their other languages. T02 mentions Serbo-Croatian as being their 'main working language', meaning that it is the language most used in their daily professional life, or rather the language they have to access most. This question of specific language uses comes again in T03's answer:

> Yeah, totally, I have. I do it all the time. I think it comes with, I am significantly more well read in English than I am in Portuguese. I have more access to a wider variety of books in English as well. Right. I can read all kinds of literatures, all kinds of thoughts in English, whereas in Portuguese, partly because here I live right next to both a public library and a university library. […] there are tons of topics I am I feel I can express more satisfactorily in English. I can talk about literature, any kind of politics or current events or. Yeah. Anything academic in English. I teach a translation class. I can't even imagine teaching that class in Portuguese. (T03)

The answer that T03 gave for this question would also in some way dialogue with the question about language of instruction. Since T03 has learned about literature and translation in an English-speaking environment, in that specific language usage they are not necessarily "fluent" in their L1. These different language domains might represent different ways of representing one's linguistic identities. Some translators equated their different language to different personalities, like T06, for example:

> I know there's that saying that says that we have one personality for each language that we speak. I think in that way it's true. […] I think my Italian personality is angrier, more of the fighting type, whereas my British personality, I think is very much influenced by my status as an immigrant. And therefore my... Not that every immigrant has that, but I certainly do, my sort of need to fit in and not to make a fuss about myself and therefore try not to upset. (T06)

As we can see, T06 mentions something similar to what T09 poses, about "domesticating their English". Specifically, T06 points out to the fact that their immigrant persona is quieter than their Italian persona. This is again closely related to cultural differences within and among languages. T06's experience in English is in the UK, in London, so the specific context they find themselves in would influence the way an immigrant has to adapt, 'domesticate'.

To conclude on this section, I would like to quote T08's answer to this question, which summarises some of the motivation behind this question:

> Yes, I have, many times. I can't provide a concrete example off the top of my head, but in most cases it happened because English could express a particular thought or emotion in a clearer, more concise way than Ukrainian. It could also be that a certain phenomenon existed only in the English-speaking world or that a certain English word incorporated some meaning or different possible shades of meaning more aptly than a Ukrainian word. Or, an English word/phrase could get the necessary meaning across more efficiently, whereas in Ukrainian, a couple of words or even a whole sentence was needed to convey the same. (T08)

The differences between languages would account for these instances in which it was easier to express a feeling or a thought in a language that is not one's first language. This is, again, dependant on the languages in question. As T01 put it, Korean, their L1, may be less flexible than English, but it is also more concise, making it easier to express more complex issues in fewer words. However, as we have seen with the other translators, this difference may not be due to the inherent features of the languages involved, but to a difference in usage, medium of education, identitarian and contextual issues.

5.4.1.4 Language of Education, Language of Instruction

Question number two was "*What is your language of education? Is it different from your mother tongue?*" On the issue of the language of education and instruction, responses were varied. Some respondents had a mix of L1 and L2,

some were instructed mainly in their L1, others in their L2, and some have a more complex path. T01, even though their answer to question one was more or less straightforward, considers their education to have been carried out in a mix of languages. They said:

> the way my childhood was structured was my dad was moved outside of Korea every two or three years, so every two or three years we left Korea and lived in another country for two or three years, in Korea I went to Korean schools where I spoke Korean, of course, but overseas I went to international schools, or their local schools if the country happened to be English-speaking, for example, when we lived in Hong Kong, this was before the handover and Hong Kong used to be part of the UK, and so I went to a British school and when we lived in America for three years I went to an American school there, so aside from those two cases overseas I would go to international schools where the language of instruction was English, though I consider my primary education to be half Korean half English, everything after that, like, my graduate, postgraduate, all of that, has been in Korean. (T01)

We can see a pattern here, starting from T01's response to this question. In the group of respondents, we can see a clear mix of at least two languages across different levels of education. If the language, the medium through which a person learned their profession, their area of expertise, is different from their mother tongue, this already brings up the issue of possible sub-directionalities, or rather different translation and linguistic relationships. Even though T02 says they feel that their English is somewhat frozen in time, to when they left Australia, they did claim to have been educated primarily in English. Another respondent, T06, has also attested to having had all their education in Italian, including their master's degree in Translation. The other interviewees had either a mix of languages throughout their various levels of education (T08 had English and Ukrainian, T10 had Spanish, English and French, for example) or they were educated in their L1 mainly until a certain age and then switched to an L2. Some of the respondents had Foreign Language Teaching in their basic schooling and consider that to have been the start of their education in an L2 (T02, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14). Of the

respondents who had different languages as a medium depending on the level of instruction, T03, for example, points out that:

> Yeah. So, my literary education has been all in English. So, you know, all the critical theory and whatnot. I've never read that in Portuguese and it shouldn't really matter much. But I do sense a difference. (T03)

This response, where you can see that specific linguistic domains were not readily available for the individual in their L1 because they did not have formal instruction in that area, points to the importance of seeing beyond national languages and into the poly-systemic nature of language use. Other respondents, such as T11, T02, T08, T13, T12, have had similar experiences. T04 used the term 'dominant language' when referring to English, mostly due to having moved between different countries and continents in their childhood and adolescence and therefore having English as a *lingua franca* alongside different languages, but also to having studied in an English-medium university course and using English for most social situations: "*I was educated up to university entry-level in Italian, but then I did my degree and my postgraduate education in English.*" (T04). T10 points to the fact that, even though they have a clear L1, Spanish, at

> a cognitive level [these languages] work differently because I left Argentina when I was 19 years old. So all my adult life has been lived abroad. So all my sort of emotional background, if you like, is in Spanish. My family still live in Argentina, or my closest school friends are still in Argentina, and I still have very close contact with them, but my language got stuck in nineteen seventy something. Um, so my Spanish is totally valid up to 1978. (T10)

This notion of their L1 being stuck somewhere in time and having become outdated was mentioned by other participants (namely T02, T04, T11, T13, as well as T10). This difference in the language of adult life versus that of the respondents' emotional background, to use the terminology mentioned by T10, is an interesting topic to explore. A difference like this can be, in the case of many people, a chasm. A chasm such as this could, I would argue, have several ramifications for a person's language identity, and would affect their perceptions of language and translation significantly.

There are also those whose language background involves state-level multilingualism or language policies affecting their medium of instruction, such as T07, T09, T13. T07 claims to have three languages of education, explaining thus:

> Well, I have three languages of my education. My primary schooling was carried out in Spanish because it was, you know, Franco's time and there were no other languages allowed but Spanish and then, you know, with the transition to democracy, then programs emerged to be able to learn in Basque. So, I did my primary in Spanish, my secondary in Basque, and then my university education, including my B.A. I went to Northern Ireland, then I did in English.

Some of these participants, as is the case with T05, were brought up internationally, moving countries, and ended up seeing their education as mainly having taken place in English, which would be their L2 officially, but which is, in practice, their dominant language, as they claim: "(…) it has been the language of my social life at various points in my history. And the one I've read most widely in. (…) And the one I feel most comfortable writing in as well.". Socialisation is an important factor here. As many bilingual and heritage speakers in countries with a hegemonic monolinguistic culture know, speaking a language at home with family members and using a language in social contexts external to the home, such as in school, for example, are two very different things.

In the case of multiracial/cultural societies that also happen to be officially multilingual, language policies in education and policies that change according to generation affect language users in different ways. Once again bringing to the fore the complex case of mother tongues in the Singaporean context, T09 delineates their experiences with basic schooling as such:

> I suppose my language of education is English. Although, as I say, in secondary school, I went to a school where more emphasis was placed on Chinese, and... Maybe this will show you the priorities of Singapore. It was a Chinese language school, but most of our classes are still in English, but the classes they considered unimportant, like art or PE, were taught in Chinese. Which is still quite unusual because in most Singaporean schools, all the classes would be taught in English except your mother

> tongue class. So, in regular schools a couple of times a week, because Singapore is a multiracial society, everyone gets up and splits into their racial groups and the Chinese kids go off to learn Chinese, and the Malay kids go off to learn Malay, and the Indian kids go off to learn Tamil. And the downside of going to a Chinese school like I did is that I grew up in a completely Chinese environment, in contrast to how multiracial Singapore is. And that is an issue. So, we had a couple of rogue teachers who taught in Chinese, even though they were not supposed to, like, legally. So, math and geography were taught in Chinese, even though that really wasn't supposed to happen. So, I kind of got a more well-rounded education, a proper bilingual education in that sense. (T09)

We can see here that T09's linguistic background defies monolingual expectations. Their education looks like it was, at times, translingual rather than bilingual. Again, at this juncture, I return to the question posed earlier: "what language is T09 renouncing when they choose to write in English and translate into English?". When inviting T09 to be interviewed I made clear that I did not intend to spend a long time trying to define what the translator's mother tongue is or trying to define a specific place they belong to or are native of, but that my research is concerned with translators who do not fit these static definitions, and who challenge these monolingual, target-text focused ideals, and who have something to say about language and translation with this in mind. I aimed to show that the goal of this research was not to necessarily define the L2 translator in such strict terms. And, as I put it in a personal e-mail exchange with T09, I also know that there is a debate about who this L2 translator is and who can call themselves a native speaker, and I did not want to assume that I knew T09's position in these debates. However, T09 was very open to being interviewed and appreciated the flexibility involved in not placing subjects in strict lingualist definitions, going further to say that, like many postcolonial subjects, they have a complicated relationship with their "mother tongue".

T09 mentions going to study in the UK for their university degree. Here, again, we can see how T09 was able to switch their repertoire and register according to different contexts in their use of English as a target

language or as a language of everyday use. As they put it, they went to the UK on what was:

> just a government scholarship that I could take to go to the UK, from the Singapore government. So that's kind of how entrenched the English language is in the system. But then I kind of got to the UK and then felt **quite alienated** because the type of language, **the type of English we speak in Singapore isn't quite British English. It's almost a patois.** So, it's a slightly odd position I'm in, I guess, where my work language is English, but I've come to use a much more British form of English - and you can hear it in my voice - than the English I grew up speaking. And this is this thing that I'm navigating, like, it's been very useful to me in my translation work that I have this ability to move between languages, between cultures and I've been in the States for eight years now, and I can translate into American English if required, like, I'm sure there are areas where my English is not quite British and not quite American. I shift in either direction, and that seemed enough for editors on either side of the Atlantic.

I chose to end this section with the above quote by T09 in order to illustrate how complex it can be to try and pin down on a subject's linguistic background, even in a question I assumed would be a straightforward one: that of which languages they were taught, or taught in, throughout their education. The aspects of directionality that assume two major language standards without looking at the specifics of each of these varieties ignores that there may be sub-directionalities, and the interviewees challenge any straightforward assumption about language hierarchy, making it difficult to define a L1, L2, L3 in order to fix rules about directionality. As we will see next, directionality, in fact, may not be the most important feature for a clear understanding of exophonic translation.

5.4.2 Directionality

When devising the interview questions and indeed at the beginning of my doctoral research, I assumed that question number three "*Do you translate into a non-mother tongue? If so, what is your experience of it?"* would be the most engaging, interesting and would elicit the most crucial responses. Through the

course of the interviews, I realised that these individuals' views on language and their gatekeeping experience provided more insight and opened new avenues of research about L2 translation and exophony, going beyond the topic of directionality (that is, the specific translation directions in different language pairs, and a comparison of the different processes). The second part of the question is more open in that it gives the interviewees a looser base from which to elaborate. This question comes before the section on directionality; however, it raises issues that come to the fore again in the two directionality questions. For this reason, even though question number three and questions number six, seven, and eight do not directly follow each other, I choose to place them together under the umbrella of directionality in this analysis.

Correspondingly, questions six, seven and eight deal with Directionality and preferences in textual genre. Question six asks directly if there is a difference between directionalities process-wise, whereas questions seven and eight are not so focused on process, but rather on the translators having genre-preferences when translating into L1 and L2.

5.4.2.1 Exophonic translation: Directionality demands and the influence of place

When asked the question '*Do you translate into a non-mother tongue? If so, what is your experience of it?*' the respondents had varied responses. Some of the subjects took this opportunity to describe the difference in directionality in their translation process, anticipating questions that come further along in the interview.

A sub-section of the group of interviewees claimed to translate exclusively into their L2, or into what is considered by others to be their L2 (since T05's or T09's English could be considered their L1). T04 has claimed to translate exclusively into their non-mother tongue, both for fiction and non-fiction texts, because, as they claim, they were trained exclusively in this directionality. T11 and T14 also professed to work exclusively into their L2, for different reasons (T11 because he/she/they do not feel like their mastery of their L1 is to a good level, and T14 because they 'live in English' and thus it

makes more sense). T14 claims their reasons for translating into English are partly because of the place where they happen to live:

> I suspect that if I were to, for instance, return to Italy or to living in France, the daily practice, the daily full immersion into another language would make so that, you know, whatever or whatever skill with English would become... Would sort of go like a river, more under the surface because, you know. I don't know if you felt that, when I go back to Italy, which is where I was born and where I lived until the age of 20, and I'm often told it takes me a few days to return to speaking Italian cause I would speak English when I am here, so... (T14)

The case of place and context related to target-language choice in the question of directionality comes up in T10's answer as well, when they claim they "translated for many years mainly into Spanish, but I feel more comfortable translating into English, because I know if it's right, I can check it because I'm living in the UK so I have easier ways of verifying that something is appropriate." (T10). However, T10 says they work as much and as easily in both directions. Another translator who has had a brief experience of translating into another L2 is T05, who mentions translating into Spanish, but whose work comprises mostly of translations into their L2, English. A group of translators among the interviewees did not use the word 'exclusively' but did claim they work primarily into their L2: T01, T03, T12, T13. Then, we have examples such as that of T09, who claims that their translating into Chinese, their supposed mother tongue, would only be acceptable in the Singaporean context, as their use of Chinese differs greatly from the one used in Mainland China and that their English has been put through more domestication processes. Here we see again the question of place: T09 has studied in Britain and has resided in the US for years, so being in an English-speaking country helps. They also claimed the directionality into English pays better, hence there are economic questions to consider. One could claim that T09 translates predominantly into their L1, or into their Lx.[106]

[106] The use of Lx as an alternative has been proposed by Dewaele (2018), who used it to claim that the dichotomy between L1 vs Lx user is a proposition that, as opposed to that of "Native vs. non-native speaker", does not assume a problematic position of one user defined by what

Some translators, like T02, T06, and T08 claim to have experience with both directions, but that they work predominantly into their L1. T02 is a native speaker of English and has vast experience translating in several directions. In fact, they have experience translating from BSCM into German, Russian into German, German into Macedonian, so L2-L3 or Lx-Lx as well as the more traditional directionalities. However, they claim that recently most of their work is into their L1. They live in a German-speaking country, but they state that their native speaker status in English helps with finding translation opportunities into that language. This is due to, as stated earlier, in Heilbron's structuring of the world-system of translation, English's hyper-central role, thus an English native speaker is offered more work in that direction. T06 mentions that their work into L2 is mostly collaborative translation, and that their solo work is mostly into their L1 (from both English and BSCM), and in the field of technical/non-literary translation. T08 claims that L2 translation takes up about 20-30% of their translation work, while the rest is into Ukrainian, their L1. They claim to have experience translating into L2 in both fiction and non-fiction texts, but that nowadays they prefer L1 translation where literary texts are concerned. They made the following observation:

> I think it should also be mentioned here that Ukrainian is a "small" language, which means that there is only a handful of English native speakers working with Ukrainian-language fiction. There's a growing demand for translations, though, and for this reason, non-natives with a near-native English language ability step in. Another thing I should mention is that when it comes to translating fiction, I always work with an English-speaking editor. When I work with non-literary texts, in most cases I work solo. (T08)

We can thus see that the availability of and demand for different directionalities in translating both fiction and non-fiction is highly dependent on specific aspects such as the languages and language pairs in question, the place where the translator lives and their interconnectedness with other

---

they are not (non-native), and also would go against an ordering or hierarchy of languages in a user's linguistic repertoire. In here, Lx could also work as an alternative to having to choose an order/hierarchy to T09's languages.

translators in their language pair, country, professional associations. Sometimes the question of a choice of genre depends on the text itself, that is, the choice is on a text-by-text basis for some of these translators, and not dependent on a specific directionality. Some of these translators give economic/financial reasons for working more within a specific directionality, like T01 and T09, for example. This is mainly because certain languages publish more in translation than the anglophone world. Other translators claim to either feel insecure about their fluency of their L1 (like T11, for example) or have personal reasons for preferring not to translate into their L1 (T11 and T13 have had traumatic experiences with their L1).[107]

5.4.2.2 Different directionalities, different processes

For question number six, namely '*What is the difference, for you, between both (or more) directions of translation? How would you describe your translation process (and types of challenge, linguistic or otherwise) when you are translating into a mother tongue and into a foreign language?*' the difference in the responses made it a challenge to outline a clear pattern. This is partly because not all translation practitioners have thought at length about their processes or have the metalanguage to talk about it. Evidently, translators who said they work exclusively in only one direction are not able to compare the processes in terms of directionality. Some of them, however, gave alternative reasons which I will summarise at the end of this section.

Directionality or specific language pairs did not seem to be of much importance to translators such as T01, T03 and T05, for example, who claimed that aspects such as the client, reading audience and the specific text at hand were more influential in the difference in process than the language itself. For

[107] T13 claims that "*I prefer translating into English than into Bulgarian because, as I said to you, it gets me really* ***angry*** *when I translate into Bulgarian. It brings flashbacks, which... I know I have to be very grown up about it and face the realities, you know, accept as a professional language*.". At the same time, and at the same point in the interview, they claim "*I am yet to convince people that I can translate into English, because of the stigma around translating into a non-mother tongue. Interestingly, I do get jobs to translate from Bulgarian into English, but not necessarily from German to English, and I think "what difference does it make?!*"".

every source text, a substantial amount of research and other parts of the translation process beyond the translation itself are involved, therefore the differences in processes are tied to differences between individual texts. T05 explains this issue thus:

> There's a lot there. So, as you know, I predominantly translate into English. I mostly translate literature, and because I mostly translate literature, my process varies from book to book and from language to language. But, like, the process of translating Geovani Martins was completely different to the process I recently had translating Luiz Ruffatto. And the process I had translating, I guess it depends where the book is from as well, because I just translated a few months ago an Argentinian novel that is set in the outskirts of Buenos Aires. And so, I had to do a lot of research into some of the terms that the author had used and also just actually similarly to how I did it with Geovani, like reach out to her on WhatsApp and get her to explain things to me. So, in that sense, translating, when I translate literature into English. Every case, every situation is new, you have to sort of almost reinvent the wheel every time. (T05)

This sense of 'reinventing the wheel every time' is replicated in others' responses as well. In fact, T02 with their attempt at analysing their own processes arrived at an explanation that would apply to most of the translators interviewed for this project:

> I'm not aware. I'm thinking aloud here. I don't think there's any really definite clear pattern of problems or issues that I have. Obviously, there are difficulties. Obviously, there are things I don't know or can't do terribly well or efficiently. I think a lot of it's to do with practice and use. For example, if I've been working in a particular combination intensively, like, let's say, from Serbo-Croatian into English, I'll have a lot of those connections, the phrase, as what you can translate one to one and what you can't, etc. I'll have a lot of that, sort of, at the front of my mind. And even if I switched then to another combination that I know fairly well, take Russian to English. Despite the similarities between the two Slavic languages I've mentioned, I won't be, sort of, on my toes and won't have that same sort of immediacy and fluency and skill. It's as if having recent practice makes all the difference. And then if I switch to another combination that's not quite as well-oiled, the machinery can really creak. (T02)

This well-oiled machine that comes from recent practice, as T02 puts it, seems to be reflected in other translators' view of their process. T10, for example, details their process, which involves a great deal of research and several drafts in a specific order, but claims that the process is the same whatever the direction. Similarly, T14, even though claiming to work exclusively into their L2, says that they do not feel there is a difference in practice, and that:

> There's also a lot of talk about what different skills are needed to translate, for instance, poetry versus theatre versus this, and in reality and from a strictly linguistic point of view and from the point of view of your training, the skill is always the same. And part of, a big part of the skill is your adaptability. (T14)

For the translators who claimed to have differences in their processes depending on directionality, differences were related to specific language skills and with feeling confident in their fluency in the languages at hand. T06 claims the differences in directionalities come more from a challenge of comprehension depending on the source language, for example, when they translate from BSCM into English as compared to translating from Italian-English. In this case, the biggest difference is not between into-L1 and into L2-translation, but in the case of into-L2, when the source language is not the translator's L1, there are clear differences. Not all L2 translations are translated from the translator's L01, the SL could be their L3, L4, Lx, as is the case of T06, T02, T07. T08, on the other hand, claims to feel 'freer' when translating into Ukrainian, their L1, and having a bigger 'moral right' when translating in this direction, as opposed to feeling more constrained and doubtful when translating into English. In contrast, T05 claims in their own response that

> I think I've learned that a positive trait of translation is just sort of doubting yourself quite often. I doubt my understanding. I sort of cast doubt on my understanding of a text when I can to make sure that I've gotten to the meaning and not just assumed the meaning. If that makes any sense. I also because my language learning has been different to that of most translators, also have to cast doubt on my English words and make sure that I doubt myself probably more than one translator who

> grew up speaking English and only learned another language later in life. (T05)

This doubting oneself as a positive trait of translators mirrors T03's response, when they claim that their use of English is more conscious and deliberate, and does not rely on instinct, but on a 'carefully curated craft', to paraphrase T12.[108]

Some of the translators interviewed mentioned major differences between the languages they use in terms of level of colloquialism and a greater chasm between written vs. spoken language. T01, for example, claims that written Korean is very different to spoken Korean and that this presents a challenge when translating from or into a language that has a narrower gap between these two language forms and which allows for more colloquialism, such as English.[109] This takes us back to T12's claim that Swedish and English are not so different in a lot of aspects and that not all language pairs are made the same. When there is a bigger chasm between languages, aspects such as the nature and difference between these linguistic structures come into play. Similarly, T07 explores the major difficulties for a translator working between Basque and English mostly in terms of stylistic differences in the languages. They explain it thus:

> The main challenge is that the order of things is completely inverse in Basque. (…) the direction of things, the way in which the narrative is ordered goes, in Basque, it goes from the general to the concrete. Whereas in English goes from the concrete to the general. So Basque pans in and English pans out. And very often when we are translating literature, especially maybe poetry, you know, there is more... well, in both senses, really, both

[108] This conscious aspect of translating into an L2 is also raised by T12. Even though they claim to be equally comfortable in both directions, they mention having some anxieties when translating into English, questioning themselves: "'oh, am I using this word wrong? Is that going to sound like a non-native speaker?' Those things I don't worry about when I translate into Swedish." (T12). At the same time, T12 says they often feel more excited when translating into English, and that this excitement bleeds through and makes their L2 translation a "more inspired craft".

[109] "In Korean we use a completely different conjugation for written Korean. […] It's a much more formal Korean. So, there's that extra process, I guess, when you're translating into Korean where you have to, kind of, like, make it more formal because English is a more informal, more colloquial language, whereas written Korean and spoken Korean to an extent, but written Korean definitely is very, very, very formal and kind of have to add that layer of formality and the way things are done."(T01)

> prose and poetry, very often the development of a scene is really reliant on that progression from the general to the concrete until you reach the resolution. Right? Cause you reach the resolution at the end in Basque. Whereas in English, if you were to translate that in a natural way, that would probably come at the beginning of the sentence. So, this is the big thing that I have to think hard about and sometimes, like I, you know, I play with English. Luckily, English is a very flexible language.

On the flexibility of the English language, this idea comes from the fact that, in order to become a global language or a *lingua franca* such as it currently is, English has become complex and variable because of processes of diverse contact and use around the world.[110] Because of this complexity, English is seen to have become, as T01 mentions, a flexible target language. Is English threatened of becoming a non-vernacular (Widdowson,1994), as the lingua franca target language for L2 translations? This would therefore explain the fears sustaining the L1 translation norm and would be an important fuel for gatekeeping practices employed against L2 Translation and L2 translators. Gatekeeping practices are at play specifically to try and avoid that the language bends too much, making sure that the non-standard varieties are seen as imperfect, bastardised or substandard forms of English.[111] Brazilian writer Luis Fernando Verissimo once said in a *crônica* that "grammar must be beaten up every day so that it knows who the boss is" (Verissimo, 1982:10), and similarly normative language practices must be confronted with variety constantly so that they change and adapt.[112] Gatekeeping is precisely the conscious or unconscious attempt at protecting such practices from those who aim to destabilize them.

5.4.2.3 Directionality, literary genres, and sub-competencies

[110] Writer Salman Rushdie has proposed a 'chutnification' of English in his writing, mainly in reference to his postcolonial novel *Midnight's Children* (1981).
[111] See Crystal (2003), among others.
[112] "A Gramática precisa apanhar todos os dias para saber quem é que manda" (1982)

The two questions that focus specifically on literary genres and translators' preferences regarding directionality came about due to a caveat that anyone interested in L2 translation comes across quite often. Even when an author or a translator admits that translating into a non-mother tongue is an acceptable practice, many still add that poetry and poetic language, in general, would be the exception. According to Ivanovic & Matsunaga (2011), when discussing Yoko Tawada's manifesto about exophony, Tawada mentions the case of W.G. Sebald, who when questioned as to why he would not write in English, claimed that he could write a few texts in English, which was not his first language, but that poetry was another matter altogether (2011: 119). Tawada comments on this claim, saying that she does not see poetry as particularly distinct from other literary genres and that, in fact, literary language is a unified language, including different genres. These two questions also come from an awareness that professional translators often specialise in genres, both technical and literary, and different genres offer quite different challenges. In my experience as a professional translator and having studied translation at university, few of my friends and colleagues, even those who practice literary translation, attempt poetry translation. It depends on how poetry is taught in an individual's first language context. For example, in the Brazilian context, there is a heavy focus on meter and poetic syllables and very little on practicing the writing of poetry or on having a less formal approach to the genre. This goes against the historical development of the genre both in writing and in translation, as we have seen in the previous chapters when looking at the tradition of writing lyric poetry and plays in medieval and early modern Europe.

Of the translators interviewed, some mentioned specific literary genres and others focused more on the different texts that were offered for them to translate depending on directionality demands. Some others mentioned more general differences in areas of language and literature and not specific genres. Only a couple of translators claimed not to see any difference in their experience of genres connected with directionality (T02, T12, T14), and most of them expressed a preference for more creative types of texts, which is not surprising since this is a group of literary translators. Some translators talked

about their experiences of translating technical texts as well. T01, for example, mentioned hating the film industry, some others affirmed they would never translate texts such as manuals, diet books (T03), etc.

A strong trend among the answers is that the genres these translators have had experience with depends more on the external demands of the specific translation markets they work with than on personal preference. For example, T03 mentions that, in terms of directionality, the into-Portuguese literary translation market is more difficult to enter than when translating into English. As we can see, the type of literary text offered depends on the specific markets. Another translator, T12, mentions working with YA and Children's Literature, but because of the specific opportunities they were offered, not out of personal preference. A more frequent trend in the answers is that in some directionalities, depending on the translation market, the translator may have to act as an ambassador, or a curator, of books that may be of interest to the target-language market. T01 confirms this ambassador trope of literary translators in the following quote:

> My L2 translations have been, as a Korean talking about creative things and talking it up and hyping it up. I'm sure you noticed on Twitter like I'm always talking about, oh, this book came out. Go read it. It's about this. So, there's more of that kind of energy going on where I feel like I am always trying to sell something [laughs] when I translate from Korean to English. When I'm doing something from English to Korean, it's always like, this is the information from the outside world that many of you Koreans may find interesting, so it's less of a sell and more of like information conduit kind of thing going on. I think that's because of my particular position (…) I am Korean. And so I'm going to understand Korea better, in terms of probability, better than, say, a foreign translator living overseas who is also translating Korean into English. (…) And I think that's what ends up happening. I basically become this purveyor of this heightened Korean culture and a purveyor of information for, yeah... anyone. (…) So, yeah, there's definitely a kind of cultural diplomacy going on.

Some of the interviewees, namely T07, and T14, mentioned preferring poetry, or at least having a tendency towards choosing poetry or, as T03 mentions, more poetic language. The issue of genre and directionality did not

yield such substantial responses. Many of the interviewees, however, mentioned demand as being more important than a personal preference. There is also a distinct difference in the opportunity to choose a preferred genre between the translators who do not also do non-literary technical translation (T01, T03, T05, T07, T09) and those who do. The participants whose main work is writing or literary translation, in general, seem to be in a position where they do not need to do 'diet books', as T03 said. They seem to have acquired a certain status, a stage in the consecration scale that allows them to have the privilege to choose the texts they translate. In general, in the other group, there is a sense of, as T14 put it in their response to the previous question, a 'general skill in adaptability', where a translator 'should' be able to translate everything. Again, this might be because technical translators have more blueprints and general training for their trade, whereas, as T05 puts it, literary translators have to 'reinvent the wheel every time'.

5.4.3 Market and Gatekeeping

The next section of the interview focused on the market and gatekeeping practices. The majority of the translators interviewed noticed strong linguistic gatekeeping with respect to their work but feel that this has lessened as they have become more established in the profession. Both questions asked in this section concerned external gatekeeping and the subjects' reaction to and understanding of it. However, some translators presented a sort of internal gatekeeping towards their own language abilities.

5.4.3.1 Gatekeepers and Gatecrashers

The first question in this section was "*Has your translation work been criticised, rejected or disregarded because you are not a native speaker of the Target Language?*" (Q8). In this analysis, I will start with the responses that name/point out blatant or obvious gatekeeping stemming from the translators' non-native status. T01 points out that because the process of obtaining financial support for translation from Korean funding bodies is extremely bureaucratic, that means that sometimes, on paper, because they are Korean and their education was in Korean, there is nothing that proves their

proficiency in English during the auditing process. They point out, however, that winning awards and prizes such as the PEN/Heim helps their case, and that the situation has improved with time. When talking about these instances of gatekeeping, T01 mentions the question of race:

> There are sometimes, like, the kind of racism that I see in publishing. I can't tell if it's because I'm Korean or the work that I'm trying to publish is originally Korean. And there are moments when I can't quite tell the difference between those. But then I see people who are basically like Korean funding bodies who will... they especially love white men. So, they would give all this funding to these white men who, you know, maybe translate one book and then they're never heard from again, like so many instances of that, that I feel like it's just so, I mean, it's demoralizing. I mean, there's nothing that I could... if there was a problem with my English, I could improve my English or whatever that means. But if this is a problem of my race, then there's really nothing that I can do about it. It's been a journey. It's hard. (T01)

This reality of being overlooked in favour of "white men" is often seen in the cases of exophonic translators who are speakers of a language that has an idea of colour as race and of gender attached to it. For example, even though they are southern Europeans, the cluster of Italian translators in the interviews did not mention the issue of race because that does not seem to be a major factor in the gatekeeping practised against them. Something similar can be said of T12, who is Swedish. In my personal experience, as a white Brazilian I have had to come to terms with my privileges in the Brazilian context, and with the fact that, if I do not open my mouth, I can pass as a European. During the interview with T09, when they invited me to join the ALTA BIPOC caucus, I was dumbstruck. I would not consider myself BIPOC (an acronym for Black, Indigenous and People of Colour), mostly because of this European-passing and the privilege-check I have had to do in the Brazilian context. However, speaking from a US-American context, T09 invited me because, as they put it, I am "racialised". Because of my accent and my native country being in South America, I am automatically, in the US-American context, a racialised translator, a token. This anecdote illustrates the fact that skin colour is not the only factor driving racialisation in extremely stratified,

white-majority societies like the US (and similarly in the UK).[113] T05 mentions, in their response to this question, that since their name is a Latinate name they are more easily identified as an outsider in anglophone contexts. In their case, a clearly non-white or non-anglophone name may also act as a tool for gatekeepers to assume a translator's ability or nativity in a language.

However, some of these racialised translators also put into practice strategies to perform a sort of non-racialised, monolingual passing. T09 mentions their training as an actor in the UK as a reason for their passing, because of a standardised accent they acquired. They, however, mention that they have not experienced any blatant gatekeeping, or rather, as they put it, "not to my face". The issue of being a consecrated translator or having a portfolio to show comes to the fore here once again:

> I think my publication record stands for itself. But also, the way I went about building my translation career is, I published the first six translations I did in Singapore. Where, of course, I wasn't questioned, and then when I started approaching British and American publishers, I had these six published books that I could just give them copies of that and what I'm doing.

However, T09 does mention that in order to pass as a white or almost white British translator he had to "domesticate" his voice. As they put it,

> I went to drama school in the UK and then sort of, I guess, did the linguistic equivalent of domesticating my voice. So, I think all of these things have meant I had a relatively easy move into a publishing scene that might otherwise have discriminated against me.

Here again a type of domesticating strategy, a L1 passing was necessary to fit into the context they were moving into. This is true of many immigrants and racialised subjects, but, T09 has had to domesticate their accent, in a process of "whitening", to be accepted and understood in the field they were entering, namely, theatre and acting. Their switch into the literary scene was helped by this process that had already taken place. In sum, to be accepted, they had to go through a whitening, domesticating process. Some translators,

[113] The emerging field of Raciolinguistics deals exclusively with instances such as these. To read more on it, I recommend Alim, S., Rickford, J.R., and Ball, A., (2016).

arguably younger ones and from different backgrounds, dealt with and used their otherness in different ways. This is to say there is no right way about it, but being a racialised, queer individual (as both T01 and T09 are) meant that in order to achieve certain levels of success in the industry these subjects also had to do more passing in order to balance out their otherness. We will now turn to some examples of other interviewees who perceived blatant/obvious gatekeeping and reacted in different ways to this practice.

T05 pointed out that their proficiency in English was complimented in a slightly patronising way: "in one case, the text was rejected, but the editor said the sample translation is really great considering [T05] is a second language speaker, which is like one of those backhanded compliments". Such backhanded compliments, as they put it, come with a surprise that the non-native speaker is "fluent enough" in the target language, in this case, English. T05 recounts another instance in which "when I tell them I'm Brazilian to say, wow, your English is so good as though English were not like the lingua franca, the language of the empire. Like, of course our English is good.". We can see here, when they put English as a lingua franca, that T05 does not subscribe to the idea that there is a people essentially claiming ownership of English. The frustration T05 feels when confronted with such native-speakerism can also be seen in the case when "there was a press, a UK press that just refused to work with me and told this friend of mine that it was because I am not a native speaker". T03 starts their answer to the question by claiming they had not been rejected officially, but then recalls a situation in which such gatekeeping happened. They were an ALTA (American Literary Translators Association) fellow at the 2016 ALTA conference and were tasked with giving a brief reading before the keynote address. They mention that such an opportunity is geared at emerging translators. Then, T03 recounts the interaction they had with a member of the audience after they did a reading of their Caio Fernandes Abreu translation:

> I did the reading. Afterward, this Portuguese-language translator of some renown came to me and in front of everyone was like, I noticed you have an accent. I'm like, Yes, I do. Yes. Good observation. Wow. If you hadn't said that... And he was like, then, don't you think in that case you need a co-translator, you shouldn't do this on

> your own, because once I was translating Lispector and he said that she mentioned Morro dos Ventos Uivantes (Wuthering Heights), And I translated that as "howling winds" because I'd never heard that. See, had I been a native speaker of Portuguese, I would have known that she was referring to Wuthering Heights by the Bronte sisters, you know, by Charlotte Bronte. But I didn't know that because I'm not a native speaker, so I translated that wrong as "howling winds". You see, I should have had a co-translator, so I told him, well, unlike you, I just happened to have read literature in both languages. How the hell do you not know that is Bronte's novel. And what I mean. So, I had, you know, some comeback, but I was still humiliated. It was terrible.

This public humiliation that they recalled was counteracted by support from renowned translators in attendance like Susan Bernofsky and Esther Allen, who complimented their translation and actively engaged them in their networking and discussions at the conference. Then, T03 recalls a similar incident at an ALTA meeting:

> And then another time also at ALTA, I did another reading and Ellen Doré Watson was there. (…) It was her, me, a couple of other translators. And this translator, who is also well-known but from the Spanish, Italian and Romanian, questioned something from my reading. He was like, did you just say that line? That's a weird line. And I'm like, it is a weird line. That is not an accident. I made a choice there. And he was like. But that's strange. I. You're not a native speaker, are you? that line sounds strange, by the way, to my ears, a native speaker and then Ellen Doré Watson was like, what are you even talking about? Like, that line was perfect. That line sealed the deal with me. And she kind of took over, started arguing with him. And she was like, oh, I edit this journal. No, in fact, you should, I loved what you read. You should publish with me, blah, blah, blah. So as much as, yes. Those things had happened, I also had found people who were very passionate and came, you know, and interceded on my behalf.

It seems that there are an equal number of positive and negative attitudes towards T03's non-native speaker status, with established translators coming to their defence. T03 mentions that they have a niche interest in the texts they choose to translate, stating that "I work with odd writers in

Portuguese. Let me be strange, you know". It is precisely because of the nature of textual experimentation and oddity in the source texts they translate, and the fact that they also do not aim to smooth or domesticate the text, that they are more vulnerable to such criticism, especially considering that they are not a native speaker of the target language. But such non-nativity can come as an advantage, too. On that note, T03 claims:

> I became close with Esther Allen or other translators, even a professor of mine introduced me to Archipelago. And he also, you know, was someone who was passionate about having someone like me translate the book. So, in many ways, there are people there who would think of me as even more qualified, would see my relationship to my languages as an asset.

It is deserving of further investigation that both the translators who questioned T03's abilities were men. T03 identifies as a woman. Qualitative research like this with a limited number of participants cannot aim to reach substantial conclusions about gender distribution and overall discrimination, but it is important to point out that power imbalances and structures could play a role in implicit bias against exophonic translators, and against those who are immigrants, people of colour, women, and queer. Further on, T07 recalls a similar instance. They are particularly passionate about the subject, especially as they point out that their language combination and possible directionalities mean that they often encounter "colonialist" attitudes:

> very often I get, like, this mistrust about my ability to translate into English. And like, I noticed that some editors, you know, they want to find fault in the things that I do, and they want to normalise things as well, you know, when I choose something instead of something. And I have to be very strong. And this is something that I tell my students all the time. Whatever you choose to translate, however you choose to translate, have your strategy in place. (…) especially if you're someone who, you know, like me, translates out of my supposed mother tongue into my supposed, you know, second language, third language, whatever you want to call it. There's always, there's this colonialist, I call it a colonialist attitude that assumes that the only people who can write good English are the people who were born, you know, in a country where English is spoken. And that's a fallacy. That's not true because, you know, I know that I write

> and speak much better English than many people who were born in those countries, you know.

We can see here that T07 has some experience with this type of gatekeeping and has thought more deeply about the topic and has formulated their label for this practice. However, not all the translators interviewed were able to pinpoint an exact moment when gatekeeping happened to them. The majority of them have had negative experiences, but, as T11 said "people are not going to tell you that", or not officially. This is one of the reasons why it can be very difficult to study gatekeeping in these instances because these can be either unconscious, covert, or, in a lot of cases, come from various sides. T06 mentions, for example, that in some situations they were the ones to 'gatekeep themselves' in a way, due to their personal attitude when being corrected, of uncritically accepting every micro-managed correction from someone who is not a speaker of the language they were translating from. Perhaps this self-gatekeeping would work as a Linguistic Stockholm Syndrome, which is not unheard of in language users from former colonies who suffer from a type of linguistic underdog syndrome (Fishman,1991). The definition of Linguistic Stockholm Syndrome is based on Philipson (1992) who, dealing especially with English as the global hegemonic language, states that those that are in the periphery of the English-speaking empire (former colonies) or those that are deemed non-native speakers of English cope with the trauma of colonialism and/or of being subjugated by their less powerful language and thus cultural capital. These speakers then cope with this positionality by siding with the Anglo-monolingual, or the coloniser. Linguistic underdog syndrome, similarly, would describe a coping mechanism to deal with a similar situation, of feeling like the language you speak is weak, inferior, in comparison. When siding with the coloniser and/or the anglo-monolingual speaker, the L2 translator who self-gatekeeps tries to compensate for their inherent sense of unworthiness, sub optimality, and inferiority. In this sense, T10 agrees that in many circumstances they themselves were acting as gatekeepers of their own work and mentions enjoying collaborative translation work to amend their insecurity. But, as T13 puts it, sometimes the gatekeeping comes so early in the process, that the translator does not even have a chance to try translating a

text. T01 mentions it happening all the time, but that it got better the further along they progressed in the consecration scale. The connection between consecration and gatekeeping seems to be a strong undercurrent in some of these responses. However, translators did mention positive experiences with editors. T10, for example, mentions having an English-speaking expert on the author they (T10) were translating and that they gave very positive and constructive feedback. T02 summarises the issue with trying to identify gatekeeping instances:

> Yeah, I think it definitely has. But I say I think because we're dealing with prejudices here, largely with prejudice rather than... I mean, how do you objectively assess a literary translation? It's hard, even if the reviewer or the critic knows both of the languages, which is often not the case with my small exotic languages, even then, how are they going to judge? So, I think a lot of the criticism, a lot of the prejudice that I think I've experienced is about subjective perceptions and it is almost impossible to prove or quantify. So, what I'm saying now, I perhaps do have a bit of an axe to grind after experiencing what I think is prejudice for a number of years, but. I wouldn't be able to document it. (T02)

Therefore, because we are dealing with prejudice, many are not comfortable being openly prejudiced against someone because of their L1, so at times this can be presented in less obvious ways. This is also, in a way, uncovering the many agents involved in translation power structures in the translation milieu as an interactive space, as Prunč (2007:40) puts it, considering the interaction between translators and other agents, like publishers, editors, funding bodies, readers, academics, booksellers, etc. As we have seen here interviewees (eg. T01, T03, T07, T09, T10) mention many interactions with other agents and how they affect their own translation practice and their view of translation.

5.4.3.2 Overcorrection and authoritative language

For question 10, namely '*Have you ever been overcorrected on a linguistic choice or specific form that was consciously made by you? How so?*' the responses followed three visible threads. One of these was the idea of insecurity. As T05 attested:

> it's really hard to account for that when translating into English and I still haven't figured out a way around it. I mean I think I tread particularly carefully because I'm so scared of having people accuse me of like not being a native speaker and telling me to get the hell out of translating into English, even though I've now got, I think, seven books under my belt, it still feels like I'm treading on ice. it's something about the nature of literary translation, we're all... It always feels very precarious, if that makes sense. (T05)

At the same time, T05 has, as they mentioned, seven published translations into English in their portfolio, but this constant doubt and fear, doubt that T05 has mentioned elsewhere as being an essential part of translating, remains. In a slightly different note, T03, when talking about gatekeeping language, provokes: "As if they own the language, right? They are like I'm the one who owns it. And I'm telling you that here are the bounds and you are misbehaving in it. Crossing the bounds as if those are fixed, then I'm like, no, I can't. I can hold the rope too" (T03). We can see here T03 sees their refusal to accept these gatekeepers as a sort of misbehaviour. But perhaps the major trend in the responses to question 10 was that of "being allowed to be awkward". In many of the responses, translators attested to being accused of staying too close to the source text, of sounding awkward, strange, on the assumption that they, as non-native speakers, were unaware of this "awkwardness", when, in fact, theirs was a conscious choice that meant to replicate the awkwardness/strangeness of the source text. T08 mentions being corrected on some of their stylistic choices, and the corrector indicating "that I, as a non-native speaker of English, can't really 'feel' the language. It was a very embarrassing, or even humiliating experience for me. Discouraging, too". (T08). T09 mentions being corrected when they use a Singaporean register, even when translating a Singaporean text. They use an anecdote to illustrate it:

> I was translating a Singaporean book and at one point one of the characters, a small child, is scolded by his mother for being too playful. "Why are you so playful?" And the British editor circled that and went: "but children should be playful, being playful is a good thing". And I was like: "not in Singapore, children should not be playful, children should study hard and do well at school". And I think that's probably more of cultural than a

> linguistic difference. […] there have definitely been edits where I've looked at it and gone "would you have corrected this if I was a, so-called, native speaker? If I was from the UK?" But then, also, would I have used this construction if I was from the UK? (T09)

For consecrated L2 translators these kinds of instances are likely to happen less and less the more respected they are in their profession. However, as T01 puts it, these types of overcorrections based on an assumption of non-nativeness did not happen to them until recently, because, as they put it "I felt a lot of pressure not to foreignise". Some other interesting responses were that of T04, who claimed to be their own worst critic and not feeling like others' criticism were especially problematic in comparison, and T06 mentioning an instance where they got overcorrected by another non-native speaker. These responses paint a fascinating picture of the experiences L2 translators go through in the process of translating, before, during, and even after. These point to a strong connection between gatekeeping, consecration, and the assumptions in place when dealing with the type of target text that is expected of translators in different situations.

5.4.4 Creative Writing, Fluency and Translation

The section on creativity and fluency focused on understanding the subjects' experiences with creative writing and how creativity and fluency relate to both each other and to translation. As we will explore in the analysis of the first question in the section, the responses highlighted eye-opening terminological issues around fluency and creativity that were not expected but made for a more complex and enriching discussion.

5.4.4.1 Fluency and Creativity

The question "How do you view the relationship between fluency and creativity in the languages you use?" elicited astonishingly different responses and were diverse enough to go beyond my expectations. The responses to this question ranged from "fluency is the enemy of creativity" to "you can only be creative when you are fluent". I will go into more detail on the responses and

patterns that emerged, but one aspect that jumped to the eye right away was the polysemic status of the word "fluency" and how this may have heavily influenced the subjects' responses.

5.4.4.1.2 Fluency or Proficiency?

Some of the respondents' answers to this question underscored the many possible meanings of the term and led me to question what I meant by it. I believe it was an interesting resource to leave this question slightly more open, with the possible meanings of fluency coming out through the responses. The extremely varied responses I was able to gather for this question pointed to a confusion in the origin of the question itself. What did I, the interviewer, the researcher, mean by fluency? After much thought, I realised my intended meaning was of fluency in a very broad sense, often used interchangeably as proficiency, or rather as a near-synonym. Whether we call this fluency or proficiency, it is possible to see that both terms escape strict definitions and are highly contextual.

A pattern that emerged in one of the answers given was that of fluency as some sort of translation competence. This relation was not obvious to the interviewee at the time, as I was thinking more of L2 proficiency rather than specifically translation proficiency. However, it can be clearly surmised from their answer to the question:

> if I think of my translation history, the 17 years I've been translating, I am much, much, much freer and more creative now than I was at the beginning because I've developed all these ideas about what language is and what translation is. And they become more and more flexible as time goes by. You know, and I understand more and more that languages permeate each other, that we as translators, we're at the front line of language innovation. (T07)

We can see here that T07 equates fluency with freedom, feeling freer and more creative in the use of a language. At the same time, when they evoke their many years working as a translator and compare their former knowledge with the skillset they have now, it seems that what they think of as fluency is, in a way, translation competence. Translation competence, if understood as "the

system of underlying kinds of knowledge, whether declarative or operative, which are needed for translation" (Presas, 2000:28) would make sense here. Therefore, it seems that fluency as or by itself in a language is not enough to allow for creative freedom when translating or writing into that language, but rather being more fluent in translation competence, almost as if translation were a language, which is what drives language innovation through translation forward.[114]

Further along in their response to this question, T13 summed up their view of fluency as proficiency and how it relates to creativity when they say: "I think creativity... It will come with, with being able to be deep into the language, and be under the skin of that language. But again, you know, it's not about adhering to standards. It's not about adhering to, as you say, the certificate" (T13). This mention of "the certificate", as T13 puts it, points to this idea that fluency as proficiency means adhering to certain standards, following rules, and that is seen as not conducive to creativity. In some of the answers, we can see this pattern, this thinking that to be too rule-abiding when it comes to proficiency can harm the creative process in that language.

5.4.4.1.3 Fluency as conformity

T01 was the first to be interviewed and transcribed, so naturally, their answer was at the back of my mind as I went through the other interviews. They pointed out the opposition between conforming to mastery/official control of a language and being creative in that language. According to them:

> I feel like fluency and creativity aren't really that related. Because there's so many people who are not necessarily what you would call fluent, but they're extremely creative. And there's so many people who are "fluent" but are extremely not creative. And that makes sense because if you think about it, fluency, like we discussed is sometimes a marker of conformism. How well you can conform to some kind of normative ideal of a native speaker or a white person or a white man. So, I feel like people who are conformist are not going to be creative.

[114] Much as translations bring innovation into the literary polysistem (cf. Even-Zohar, 1990), we could think of L2 translators bringing a similar innovation to the target language.

> it seems like, sometimes fluency can be the enemy of creativity, actually. (T01)

This stance was one of the expected outcomes of this question. Often when we focus too much on becoming proficient or attaining a certain socially accepted, consecrated level of fluency in a second language, we may end up focusing so much on a sort of monolingual passing that we become entrapped by a rule-abiding mentality that is counterproductive to creativity. Similarly, when writing or translating literature in a second language, if we strive too hard to sound native, we might lose what we have to offer to that text, our particular exophonic point of view and creativity. If one's definition of fluency involves thinking that the more fluent the closer to passing as a native speaker, then we would have to agree with T01, that criticisms of native-speakerism are, as attested in chapter 2 and in these interviews, valid. Exophonic translators would actively not conform, not pass, they would actively stand out. However, for a linguistic mindset that is obsessed with fitting in, passing, rendering both translations and translators invisible, such a move might prove too revolutionary.

T09, one of the creative writers in the group, put this non-conformity in terms of a type of courage, of boldness, when they claimed:

> There needs to be a certain degree of fluency, I suppose, in order to create freedom, but I wouldn't say... By which I mean, I don't think I could be creative in German because my German just isn't good enough. Like, I would run out of words. But also, some of the most wonderful writing I've seen has been by people like Xiaolu Guo or writer and translator Yan Ge, who is transitioning from writing in Chinese to writing in English. And **often the difference is a kind of boldness**. Trying to write like a native speaker, trying to write "fluently", air quotes, then, um, that does hold you back. But if you are going "this is my version of the language and I'm going to use it boldly", then the results can be astonishingly creative and wonderful and different. (T09)

Non-conformity is here seen as an advantage for producing creative outputs. Being bold is therefore rewarded with new and interesting writing

coming out of that language. This is certainly true of the authors that the interviewee mentions, but also of other exophonic authors such as Yoko Tawada, Emine Özdamar, Jhumpa Lahiri, Ha Jin, among others.

5.4.4.1.4 The Flows of Fluency and Innovation

Another possible meaning for fluency, albeit a more poetic one, is that of something that "flows". It is no surprise that one of the few creative writers in the pool of interviewees, T03, was the one who immediately jumped to that meaning of the word. In their own words:

> Yeah, I think as a translator, I often question this idea of fluency. This idea that if it is fluid, therefore it's superior. Like I mentioned, some of the works I translate don't want to be fluid. It would be an overcorrection if I made them sound, you know, flowy. (...) it doesn't necessarily mean it's against creativity. I'm thinking of writers like Virginia Woolf, like writers who in stream of consciousness, writers whose fluidity has everything to do with them going in unexpected directions. I just think maybe fluidity and creativity are not necessarily related. (T03)

This idea of fluency connected with fluidity is also behind the more traditional meanings of fluency, as someone whose use of language 'flows' more naturally. This naturality is, however, still mostly limited to spoken language. Similarly to T03, T11 mentions "flow" when talking about fluency:

> I kind of understood it in that sense, that kind of... Not even "ease" of using a language, I'm always wary of using the word "ease" in this context, because none of it is easy and none of it should be. But, um, the kind of **flow** of the language, you know? (T11)

This conceptualisation of fluency as flow is also present when subjects mention improvisation. One of the interviewees, T14, made a connection between improvising in music and language, or, more specifically, in translation.[115] This comes from the idea that to improvise, one needs to first

[115] Author and translator Maureen Freely has drawn a metaphor of translators and music when she provided the following, in an interview with Chantal Wright for *The Translator*: 'When I was chair of the Translators Association – this was after years of being in literary land with novelists

have a baseline knowledge or skillset. This is, in a way, connected to the idea of fluency as conformism, as it seems there is a grey area between knowing a language enough so that one feels able to improvise in that language by making use of their skillset, and conforming, alienating, negating one's difference to fit into the mould of a native-level language user. In some way, it means that to break the rules, one needs to first learn the rules. So, is it necessary to be proficient in a language to innovate in it?

Fluency might be seen by some as a necessary toolbox for creativity to work, especially in a foreign language. However, the opposite might not be true. Fluency does not need creativity, even though being able to create in L2 can be considered one of the markers of fluency. More specifically, being fluent in a language does not mean that the person is creative with that language.

5.4.4.2 Creative Writing and Creative Translation

Following the thread of creativity, the last question in this section (Q12) asks: "*Do you also do creative writing outside of your translation practice? If so, is it only in your first language or do you experiment with other languages? How do you feel your creative writing relates to your translation practice?*". This question was devised to understand if exophonic translators also practice exophony in other areas adjacent and complementary to their practice, like creative writing.

From the group of interviewees, a couple of them mentioned having had experiences with writing as a child (T06) or as a teenager (T08). T08 claims

> I don't feel that I have much to say. I do believe, though, that creative writing skills are helpful when it comes to translation, especially, translation of fiction where a translator recreates the original in their language. To do justice to the original and the author behind it, a

---

and poets – translators struck me as being the jazz musicians of the literary world. They are there because they love the music and because they like playing together and improvising, and they don't even notice when they're being brilliant. Translators are very helpful, because jazz doesn't happen unless people are helping each other. These wonderful, brilliant people were just being too modest and I felt that they never should say they're 'just' a translator. I never say that because I'm not just a translator. When I went into translation a lot of my friends told me I was crazy and I should be serving myself but it was a complete gain. It's not just any form of writing, it's a form of writing that any novelist or poet who can should try, because they'd learn from it" (2017:101).

> translator should definitely possess certain creative writing abilities.

Interestingly, T08 says they do not feel they have much to say. This seems to be the case for a few translators interviewed here. T05 claims to only write creatively when writing essays about translation, and T02 says they do not write fiction, but when I mentioned the idea of creative non-fiction, they approved of that term to define their creative practice outside of translation, and concluded by saying that, for them, the practices of translation and creative writing do not link directly, more "at a background or passive level of keeping me mentally agile and interested and curious, playful. So, there is a link. But I think it's more sort of diffuse. And in the background.". T11 claimed to write only in English, their L2, and that "my own original writing has grown enormously and benefits enormously from my literary translation work. The problem is that I rarely have time to do both.". On an opposing end to the responses that claim not to have 'something to say' in creative writing, T10, for example, says that their more recent practice in creative writing in Spanish has been an exercise, "I started writing the story in Spanish to actually reclaim my mother tongue, as it were. […] And I wanted to do that as a kind of an exercise to actually show me that I could still use my language". We can see here that there is an underlining trend of creative writing as an accessory practice to translation, as an exercise. These translators' literary translations inform their creative writing practices and vice-versa. Some may not have publishing aspirations with their own writing, but they have optimistic approaches to their creative practice that accompany their translation work.

T01 claims they wanted to be a writer before they wanted to translate. They also claim that most readers feel the need to respond to their reading by writing something. However, when the creative writer and the translator's voices collapse within a translator, T01 claims one must 'shut up and listen'. T01 has a very essentialist view of writing, as something subconscious produced within the mind, which involves tuning into the language inside and listening. This opinion goes against the idea of language as prosthetics that we have mentioned here repeatedly. However, it is noteworthy that the same T01 who claimed to be Korean through and through also has this incredibly deep

personal connection with English and hears English in their mind when they are writing or translating, proving that a language does not have to be a person's mother tongue for it to be a medium for an 'inner artistic voice'. Similarly, in an essay on the process of translating Geovani Martins, Julia Sanches mentions that:

> When translating, I often feel like I'm crawling into the pages of the text I am working on. The image that comes to me as I visualize this is necessarily eerie, something that takes place in a book I have not read but have heard about. It is the image of a man crawling into the empty, still-warm carcass of a bear to keep himself warm on a winter's night. The image is gory and unsettling. (2019)

On a slightly different tone, T03 claims to only write in English, their L2, and that when they attempted to write in Portuguese, their L1,

> I tried and it sounds ridiculous. I just can't even make it. You know, the aesthetic choices don't quite seem to work. You know, so honestly, the language just **seems unruly**. I have **little control** over it. Whereas in English, I am so trained, so practiced, you know, **I am manipulating it**. So, yeah, I'm only write in my L2, I, I mean, I don't necessarily agree with everyone who's like 'all translators, everyone should translate because it helps, it improves your writing'. Not necessarily. But for me because I am a writer, I, I'm always **reading as a writer**, so I'll be translating and be like, oh, I see what this author did with a sentence structure or I see this image here, so I am constantly, you know, learning or making decisions about my writing based on the relationships I have with other texts. So translation certainly affects my writing a lot.

There are a few points to be drawn out of T03's quote. T03 defines their writing in Portuguese as "unruly", while their L2 writing is more controlled. They claim they are 'manipulating' the language when writing in L2 because they are more trained in writing in that language. Interestingly, however, T03 in other responses throughout the interview had a much more fluid idea of writing and translating than what comes across in this specific answer. At this point, I believe the most interesting part is when they claim to always be 'reading as a writer'. When a translator is also a writer, their reading is influenced by their writing experience. I would argue, however, that a

translation reading is inherently also a writer's reading, or at least contains that within it. Even when the translator claims to not be a creative writer, the writerly aspect is contained when reading as a translator. We can see that in the responses by the other interviewees above. On the relationship between that and writing/translating in a non-mother tongue, it seems as though there is a definitive connection between writing and translating in whatever tongue one is talking about. All of the translators claimed to do at least some writing in their L2, together with translating into it.

Some translators, like T07 mention a clearer connection between their various languages and arts when writing, when they claim:

> Well, you know, for as long as I've been a literary translator, I have written mostly in English, but my texts in the last few years have become increasingly **hybrid**. So, I always bring elements of literary translation, so, I will insert literary translations in my texts. And I also like to insert bits in Basque or Spanish, you know, show that **polyglot aspect** of my brain. So, I like to play with that, I like to play with the presence of other languages, you know, to **disrupt the stability** of the text and to bring into each all of these different things. So, you can say definitely that my practice as a literary translator has influenced enormously my creative writing outlook on the things I perceive are possible, the things that we can do.

Here we can see T07's more radical, disruptive stance on writing and on making their polyglot existence visible in their creative outputs. One could argue this is a stance that stems from a certain level of confidence that also comes from being a consecrated translator. T09, in their own response to this question, claims that their writing used to be more hybrid, but equates this hybridity to a childish approach to writing as exercise, as playful, and then that "it was kind of a phase that evolved into writing mostly in English". Paying attention to the word 'evolve' here, it is interesting to note that for T07 the evolution consists in writing in this deliberately hybrid way, it is not a stepping stone but the finish line. For T07 this practice is tied to a certain maturity in their approach, whereas for T09 such an approach was a part of their process of maturing, or evolving, into only one language.

To conclude this section, I will look at two answers that see creative writing and literary translation as the same practice. T09 is a writer and playwright alongside their translation practice and writes mostly in English but also in Chinese. On the difference between the two practices, they explain thus:

> I see them as all of the same practice. You know, this thing that people say "translation is writing". And I found this formulation recently "translation is a very specialized form of writing", which I like. So, I don't really see them as a gap, um, see a gap between them. I think they feed into each other. They definitely enrich each other. I am not sure about the word experiment, like, I think I just... Do. Yeah. It is not really "tentative" the way that it suggests. I mean, I like playing with, um... With language both in my own writing... In fact, my own writing is often fairly multilingual.

It is important to note here that T09 does not equate translation to writing, but they use the formulation that translation is one of the possible types of writing. This idea is also tied to their linguistic background and their experience as a writer foremost, but a writer who has had to navigate different language backgrounds and statuses and who has used translation as a way to make sense of themselves, as we have seen previously. T14 sees writing and translation in a similar light, using the metaphor of a tree to explain their view:

> I don't see a split between the two. I think that… I suppose if I were to use an image, I'd say that writing is a tree and translation is one of its main branches. So I don't really see a split. (T14)

In this section we could see how, even for those translators who claim to not really write fiction outside of their translation practice, into whatever language they work with, some type of creative writing, or 'creative thinking' as T13 puts it, is always involved.

5.4.5 Training and Professional Status

5.4.5.1 Translation education and Directionality practice

The penultimate question in the interview (Q13) was a cluster question. In it, I asked: "*Did you have formal translation training? If so, did it include different translation directions? If you did receive training in different translation directions, has there been a change in the direction(s) that you practice since completing your training? Do you still translate in both directions, in only one, or in one much more than another?*". This was devised with the purpose of seeing how translation teaching and specifically teaching that involves different directionalities shaped these translators' professional lives. This question was also for statistical purposes, to gauge how many of my interviewees had formal translation training. Since having translation training in a higher education setting is not a *sine qua non* condition for working as a technical or literary translator, the paths which take these people into the profession are also extremely varied. Prompted by my own background, in which I studied a bachelor's degree in English and Portuguese translation which involved a solid base in linguistics, language and literature as well as practical and theoretical training in translation, both technical and literary, and having had training in both directions in my undergraduate studies, I aimed to see how different others' experiences were where training was concerned. That is, based solely on my training, I had no reason to think the L2 direction was a problem, or something out of the ordinary. As T14 puts it, if you translate you should be able to translate everything.

5.4.5.2 Professional Affiliations and Community Belonging

With the last question in the interview (Q14) I aimed at, more for statistical purposes than anything else, understanding the professional affiliations and community belonging of this group of translators. This question, namely "*Are you a member of a professional association? Which one?*", elicited very straightforward responses. Most of the translators interviewed either used to be (T04, T08 and T14) or currently are members of an exclusively literary translator's association (T01, T02, T03, T05, T06, T07, T09, T10, T11). What I mean here as exclusively literary are associations such as ALTA, the Translators Association within the Society of Authors in the UK, and some other national bodies for the support of literary translators such as

the Italian Union for Literary Translators (T06) and the Basque Literary Translators Association (T07). Of the UK-based translators, the majority are part of the UK Society of Authors' Translators Association and one of these (T14) is a member of the Italian Society of Authors but not of the TA or PEN, for example. T14 mentions that they used to belong to both TA and PEN but do not anymore, for political reasons. T14 also mentions being a part of the MLA (Modern Languages Association). Some translators, namely the ones with experience in freelance/technical translations, mention affiliation to broader professional associations such as the ITI, the Chartered Institute of Linguists, the International Association of Professional Translators and Interpreters, and associations that included both literary and technical translators in their terms, such as the AUSIT and the VDU.

Some of these professional affiliations were to country-specific associations, such as the Italian Union for Literary Translators, mentioned by T06 and T11, or the Basque Literary Translators Association, by T07. T12 also mentions language-specific groups, such as the SELTA (Swedish-English Literary Translators Association). The reasons for not joining a particular association might also be financial: T11 mentions being happy that they could pay for a student membership, for example. Of the translators who left a professional association, T14 was the only one who gave a more political-ideological reason for leaving. According to them:

> I think these things are quite useful, although I don't always agree with some of their policies. For instance, when PEN restricts funding precisely on the basis of the translator having to be mother-tongue English. I feel very uncomfortable when the Society of Authors invites Boris Johnson as a journalist to join it. I feel very uncomfortable. (T14)

Here T14 not only points out the linguistic gatekeeping that they were able to perceive in their dealings with associations such as PEN, when funding is restricted to English native speakers, but also the implications of inviting certain political figures to join the society, going against T14's political inclinations. T14 mentions elsewhere in the interview that this is, however, a more recent development. For literary L2 translators who have already broken through, or already achieved a level of consecration, such gatekeeping practices

were not effective, or even noted (however, we must consider the fact that they might have not thought of mentioning this type of information), but for some that are still emerging in the literary translation world even though very experienced in translation in general, like T14, these gatekeeping practices stand out. T10 also mentions these when talking about translation workshops and summer schools.

It is important to mention here that some of these translators belong to Translator Collectives such as Starling Bureau, Cedilla & Co, and Smoking Tigers, among others. The specific case of collectives versus associations and how impactful they are in translators' careers and socialising within the translation community deserves a dedicated study. Now, however, we can already point to the fact that out of these translators the ones who are part of collectives are also those who are exclusively literary translators, working mostly into their L2, and already somewhat consecrated, or not necessarily considered emerging. The UK-based Emerging Translators Network is a valuable example of a group that is neither a collective nor an association but is mentioned by the emerging translators in the group. In order to be considered an emerging literary translator and to be able to join the network:

> prospective members should demonstrate a genuine interest in developing a career in literary translation, through one or more of the following, or by other means:
>
> have published at least one translation (novel, short story collection, poetry collection, non-fiction), whether online or in print;
> have professional experience as a commercial/non-literary translator, whether freelance or in-house;
> have completed, or be close to completing, a postgraduate course in literary translation;
> have a multilingual background (either from birth or acquired) combined with a keen interest in pursuing a career in literary translation.

As we can see here, "emerging" would count as any translator willing to get into the profession but who does not have more than one translation published. An emerging translator would be placed in the consecration scale

somewhere between the investment and the recognition stage (Lindqvist, 2006), not yet fully consecrated and able to influence the market and profession, using the consecration scale proposed by Lindqvist. This "emerging" status is debatable, and not fixed, as there are many members of the network with more than one published translation who would still consider themselves emerging, and these rules do not seem to follow a very strict pattern and are context dependent.

5.5 Conclusions: Demand, Gatekeeping, and relationships with language

When doing research with people, and especially when asking them questions about language identity, ideology, and their translation experience, the resulting data is not going to easily fit into ready-made answers. These interviewees and their answers challenged any expectations I had of forcing them into categories. This work started with the idea of creating a new term with which to label these literary L2 translators and hopefully alongside this, encourage a different respect for this translation practice that defies norms. Whether these translators will be called exophonic translators or not is not for me, the researcher, to decide. There are, however, features of the way they approach the languages they use that I would like to call "exophonic".

There seems to be a struggling relationship between these subjects and the ideas of language loyalty and language identity. From those who have a strained relationship with their L1, through traumatic experiences, and cultural expectations, to those who feel they do have an L1, and a healthy relationship with it, across this spectrum these concepts of language loyalty and identity feature heavily. However, even for those who feel close and attached to their L1, this relationship is never straightforward. Bilingualism, or bilinguality, as Mignolo (2012:231) stated in his criticism of Fornet, must always assume power dynamics, and these are never symmetric, there is therefore always an inherent tension in the lived linguistic experiences of bi- and multilingualism, and even more in the relations between the languages involved in translation directionalities. Yildiz has argued in her analysis of German exophonic authors that a mother tongue can be seen as a site of alienation, identity, exclusion,

inclusion, violence (2012). As we have seen in chapter two, the mother tongue as a metaphor, and the native-speakerism advantage, are strong and still prevalent in the imaginary around language. They are, as stated in page 84 of the present thesis, powerful myths, and (because of it) uncontested myths. However, as Bonfiglio (2010) puts it, these are inventions, heavily tied to Christian concepts and historically bound by the advent of the nation-state and national language ideologies. These invented languages (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006) belonging to imagined communities (Anderson, 1983) still form the basis of how language is understood by a good number of people, not only lay people but also scholars who were able to ignore the many challenges to the survival of such monolithic ideologies. As we have seen with Burke's timeline of language awareness in medieval and Early Modern times, language loyalty is a product of the increasing language anxiety caused by competing European powers and their global imperialist conquests. A person does not owe loyalty to their first language. As put by Petrova in the Chapter 1, this lack of loyalty may be an asset, as it offers a necessary detachment to the target language, a critical eye that is advantageous because it is external. If "language is a necessary and unique collective prosthesis" (Weightman, 2000:55), then having knowledge of that prosthetic nature, as an outsider, helps understand the tensions involved in any act of translation with an externality which can be seen as a positive, not a negative. As T10 put it A translator who goes against the grain and translates into a second language or translates between two foreign languages also does not owe loyalty to any of these. As we have seen with exophony as a theory of literary writing, stepping out of one's mother tongue and adopting another language to write literature also does not imply that the exophonic author owes loyalty to any of the languages used.

As stated earlier, the issues of directionality, of education in Translation Studies, and of community belonging, did not yield very substantial responses. It became clear that a choice of specific genre to translate did not depend on directionality, as I presumed, but more on demand, opportunity, and on these subjects' specific language curricula. With regards to education, the translators interviewed had widely varied experiences, the majority of them having translation training within a specific MA program or informal workshops. This

was very different from the expectations suggested by my own background. I have noticed that the intense and comprehensive translation training I had as a student of a Bachelor of Arts in translation is a privilege that many of my interviewees did not have. I was also privileged to have been trained in at least two directions in my translation training, something which these translators have not always had the chance to access. On the issue of community belonging, I noticed a mixture between membership of literary-specific associations, those specific to language pairs, and major professional associations either international or country-specific. This was expected but did not add much to this study.

In the cases where the translation is from the translator's L1 into their L2, and when the L2 is English, there seem to be a few key differences in the translators' confidence and their respective feelings of "freedom" when translating. T03, for example, says that in the rare times they translated into their L1, they would follow their instincts, even when those were wrong, whereas into English, their L2, they were more conscious and deliberate. This conscious aspect of translating into an L2 is also raised by T12. Even though they claim to be equally comfortable in both directions, they mention having some anxieties when translating into English, questioning themselves: "'oh, am I using this word wrong? Is that going to sound like a non-native speaker?' Those things I don't worry about when I translate into Swedish." (T12). At the same time, T12 says they often feel more excited when translating into English, and that this excitement bleeds through and makes their L2 translation a "more inspired craft".

The issue of gatekeeping became central, in the subjects' responses, as it pointed to an overall agreement on how pervasive gatekeeping was for these translators. Even translators such as T14, who claimed not to have experienced this gatekeeping, did mention gatekeeping instances later on, in their answer to other questions. This manifested itself in terms of blocking these translators from trying to translate a text (T13), including outright refusal to hire a translator because of their mother tongue (T05), and sometimes the translator themselves gatekept their own work (T06, T08). I was able to notice in the answers to the interview questions that there is a clear connection between

consecration and gatekeeping. Those L2 translators who have reached a point in their career where they are considered by others (be it the reading public, funders, other translators, the literary establishment in general) to be an authority in their craft feel more comfortable going around these gatekeepers. Such is the case of T01, T05, T09, for example. T09 had to be a published translator and author in the Singaporean context to then start their work in other English-speaking contexts. Still, as we have seen with T05, this does not mean that these translators do not struggle with self-consciousness and doubt over their language abilities. However, as T05 put it, doubt is an important aspect of translation. Overall, it seems that this gatekeeping comes from several different sources, both external and internal. However, the beliefs that translators have about their right to translate into a non-mother tongue are created and/or influenced by these external gatekeeping practices, such as institutional constraints, rules in encyclopaedias, publishing, funding bodies, all sustained by the monolingual myth and the system it supports.

In the second question around gatekeeping, focusing specifically on language choices by the translator that were deemed inadequate on the assumption that such a choice was made because they were not a native speaker, the "awkwardness trend" is strong. Often exophonic authors and translators are not allowed to be dubious, to stray from the rules, to be ambiguous. And in some situations, the exophonic author has it easier when compared to their translator counterpart. When not under the scrutiny of linguistic policing, an exophonic author may play with language, challenge grammar rules, innovate, whereas the translator is less free to do so in their translation. Exophonic translators, for fear of having their work judged, feel a pressure to not foreignise in their translation, as T01 mentions. This disruption of the target text that can be enacted through keeping certain awkward stylistic choices has revealed itself as a major common thread between the translators interviewed. These translators are not allowed, or rather, do not feel allowed to be innovative when writing the target text.

On the issue of creativity and fluency, we can see a connection between language learning and creativity in a second language. Many of these translators also do creative writing or other creative pursuits beyond their

translation practice, and in different languages. This shows that maybe translation is one of the facets of these subjects' multilingual creative outputs. The responses also showed how people have very diverse notions of fluency and proficiency. Some translators claimed that to aim for fluency is to be conformist (T01), others said that it is impossible to be creative without a certain level of fluency (T07), but the most important aspect here is the fact that fluency is not static, and a subject's linguistic skillset changes with time. Being creative is similarly not a static state of being, it is a constant practice. Therefore, a subject does not need to reach a certain point on a fluency scale in order to be creative in that language. These were a few of the main points drawn from the analyses above.

As much as translation brings innovation to a literary system, as previously stated by Even-Zohar (1990), perhaps L2 translators could bring similar innovations to the target language and culture. Exophonic translators, by not caving into the pressure not to foreignise, by being free to be judged on their stylistic choices on an assumption of non-nativeness, could then push these disciplinary boundaries and cross-pollinate their several languages in order to create a richer text-in-translation.

The first research question was to ask if the L1 translation norm could stand up to scrutiny. This covers issues such as current and recent thinking on this topic in Translation Studies but also out there in the real world of translation and publishing, and the relationship between nation, territory, and language. This first question was primarily dealt with in the first four chapters. By looking at the studies dedicated to L2 translation, to how the practice had been regarded in Translation Studies, and to examples of translation into Latin as a second language in medieval and Early Modern times, we were able to attest to the lack of actual evidence against L2 translation, and the long history of conscious and unconscious prejudice against the practice. In chapter 2 we focused on the history of several myths that hold together the L1 translation norm: the monolith national language, the mother tongue, native speaker, fluency, language families and the monolingual bias. English amnesia about its multilingual past, which has been pointed out by Davidson, Galbraith and Butterfield, has resulted in the strength of the L1 translation norm within an

anglo-normative Translation Studies outlook. Chapter 3 was dedicated to examples of how the disciplines evolved in questioning the monolingual paradigm: examples of studies of bilingualism, multilingualism, translingualism, plurilingualism, the postcolonial response through the proposition of languaging practices, and authors dedicated to writing a history of literature that included the many multilingual writings and their meaning to communities throughout history. Finally, we take the different propositions of language drag, language as performance and as prosthesis, propositions that take the fixed, statics ideas about language to task and present possible pathways for theory and criticism that takes the dynamism of language use into account. In chapter 4, I have presented an overview of the area of translation sociology with the aim of demonstrating how it is necessary to look beyond the text and toward the translator and other agents involved in the translation process, including the many movements and tensions in the world system of translation. With this chapter, we could start to unpack research question number 2.

The second research question, namely "What do L2 translators think about L2 translation?" was dealt with in chapter 5, through the interviews conducted with fourteen translators. The responses varied and revealed a complex web of themes including language loyalty and disloyalty, contextual differences between language pairs and market demands, strong gatekeeping practices against L2 translation from various agents in the process, including, sometimes, the translators themselves. We have also concluded that often L2 translators are not allowed to be ambiguous, to make bold stylistic choices, because they are afraid of being judged, gatekept, and when they do make these choices, are corrected either way. It seems that, however, at the point where a translator becomes consecrated by the system, either of the target language/culture or of an international literary translation milieu, they acquire an authority that would enable them to be more secure in their choices and in their exophonic status. There are, however, certain exceptions, like that of T05, who is a highly prolific published literary translator, who mentions still having doubts and being insecure about how they will be received due to their non-native status in English, their target language. In general, these L2 translators

interviewed see L2 translation as a valid practice, a creative pursuit, a language exercise, a chance to act as a literary ambassador of their culture towards the English-speaking literary world.

In the case of the translators interviewed, there seems to be always another language tempting their language loyalty. This other language may be the language of the country they moved into and now inhabit, this can be a language they fell in love with, a language that confers power, a language learned and used solely in education contexts, a language through which they learned their trade, a language they feel freer to be creative in, away from any perceived constraints of the mother tongue. These subjects living in a postmonolingual paradigm are often faced with several tensions, most of all as the exclusion of their practice is largely caused by what Chow calls "the long-standing practices of knowledge production based on the exclusion of discontinuity" (2014:57). Such an exclusion hides a multiplicity of language practices and modes of being that are no longer accepting of being excluded because of language anxieties, language control, gatekeeping. The fourteen people I interviewed for this thesis reflect such complex and varied language backgrounds. This adoption of another language to write in or translate into is, for the majority of these translators, a choice. A choice steeped in context, of course, but ultimately a choice. A result of access, of a lifeline being thrown, at times this choice is not an easy one, nevertheless, it is still a dialogic force in their use of language. As Savin (1994) puts it, in response to Todorov's musings about his dialogic linguistic identity, such a duality or multiplicity is not always a choice, especially for postcolonial subjects. In some cases, like T09's, for example, one's linguistic repertoire is a result of several external forces, governmental policies, geopolitical dynamics, together with a personal, unique story and upbringing, in turn resulting in an incredibly complex and multi-faceted linguistic character. There seems to be, based on these interviews, a central tension between the xenophone and the exophone, between language drag/language passing and standing out as a foreigner. This tension between wanting to sound native and wanting to be seen as non-native, wanting one's non-nativeness to be seen as an advantage, is at the core of many of the interviewees' own linguistic anxieties. And, as Haugen put it in the

1970s, the simplification of the concept of language-as-monolith not only can, but I would argue, begs to be replaced by more sophisticated models. Perhaps models that take into consideration those tensions and discontinuities that are central to dynamic language practices. Translation being a tension and a form of dynamics, could do with a more sophisticated model that does not hold the monolingual and the L1 translation norm to such high, uncontested standards.

A topic which has become more important as the current research progressed, especially in analysing the interviews conducted, was that of queerness, language drag, and the connections between disrupting strict, monolithic and monotopical ideas about language and gender binaries. As Pennycook puts it, "Languages are no more pre given entities that pre-exist our linguistic performances than are gendered or ethnic identities. Rather they are the sedimented products of repeated acts of identity." (2004:15). These repeated acts of identity are what formed these translators' linguistic context and are present in their language activism in doing L2 Translation against the strong binaries and monological thinking that prevails in Translation Studies and language studies. While only a few of the interviewees overtly mention queerness and translation (T01, T09, T12), we can see threads coming together to result in a view of L2 Translation as a disruptive, non-binary translation practice. Perhaps because it is performative and non-binary it should be named Exophonic Translation instead, avoiding terminology that still obeys the binary and monolingual worldviews. With language drag and other concepts that have language as a prosthetic add-on, exophony can be similarly seen as an added layer of performativeness in language practice, especially in literary writing. This, however, will be the result of future research and fruitful discussions. We have learned throughout the last two hundred pages that assigning terms can be a positive way of pinning down certain concepts, but that it can also cement these and keep language, which is a living, social entity, in an epistemic straitjacket.

Possible avenues for future research stemming from this study would include comparing this group with decidedly non-exophonic translators, especially in the anglophone literary translation market, which, I suspect, has a higher degree of anglo-monolingual translators and more gatekeeping than

markets in less widely diffused languages or those that consume more translated literature. A further ramification would include markets such as France, or other major European languages, which might enact a similar type of gatekeeping. This is but an assumption that needs to be tested and questioned further beyond the scope of this work. The initial plan for this thesis was to include a survey of publishers and editors, as well as of students of literary translation. However, time constraints and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on research also impacted on this thesis' chronogram. The survey questions devised will be something to look at in future work, possibly triangulating this new dataset with the interviews conducted in this study. There is also potential for expanding on the relationship between exophony (be it in writing or in translation), the idea of language as performance and queer studies. The latter is a fecund area of research growing within Translation Studies, and the overview present in this thesis as well as the connections drawn could be further expanded into a more robust project. These ideas show the potential of exophonic translation to further extrapolate its confines and become more visible, by increasing an understanding of the unique tensions, relations and experiences that make up our changing ideas about the practice.

With this in mind, what force for change could L2 translation be? To what extent can radical ideologies change prevailing attitudes and practices? I propose that L2 translation, in resisting myths about languages as monoliths and the subsequent restrictions placed on certain language users through gatekeeping, has potential to change the way translation is imagined, and the way multilingualism is understood, and harnessed for good in the field of translation.

6 Coda

The present thesis is a work of epistemic disobedience (Mignolo, 2011:88). L2 translation and a theory in defence of this practice are also, in a way, a confrontation of Eurocentric or Anglocentric modes of thinking in Translation Studies, aiming at an epistemic reconstruction. However, we can attest that there is a miscommunication between theories, norms, and actual

practice. Even with many ground-breaking studies going against the monolingual norm, the L1 translation norm and other norms which uphold these Euro and Anglocentric epistemes around translation, there is still a great deal of disobedience needed. I propose that we, in using the theories proposed and considering the interviews that support this thesis, invert lingualist expectations about translation, that we ask for a bi-/multilingual/exophonic turn to Translation Studies, where binaries that thus far upheld outdated norms can be found as something to oppose, as a reactive, interactive basis, but not as the end-all of translation theory.

In conclusion, it seems Translation Studies, with the L1 translation norm, is imprisoned of its own accord in what Walter D. Mignolo terms "monotopic hermeneutics of modernity and nationalism," (1996: 189)[116] with the monological bulwarks and bastions of the discipline still myopic to the realities of translation on the global scale, and blind to the breakthroughs and discussions happening in other disciplines regarding the native speaker, monolingualism and multilingualism.

Nonetheless, in order not to end on a pessimistic note, the fourteen translators interviewed in this thesis, as well as many others I have read, engaged with, and met over these last four years have shown, through their work, that these bulwarks are bound to buckle and fall. Metalinguistic discourse is changing, and alongside come language users breaking through culture maintenance to bring culture change. It is in the tension between what these translators were taught and what they do that the power of exophonic translation might lie. And making this tension visible is what the present thesis has striven to convey. As exophonic poet and scholar Keijiro Suga once said:

> Exophony is not something special for literature. It is rather a basic condition of an innovative literary language that is always trying to implode and break its own vessel from within. Only through self-destruction can a language obtain a new life. [O]ur common destiny in today's translational poetics is to pursue one's own

[116] "Theorizing languages within social structures of domination is dealing with the "natural" plurilingual conditions of the human world "artificially" suppressed by the monolingual ideology and monotopic hermeneutics of modernity and nationalism" (Mignolo, 1996: 189)

> accents, to retain all the memories of linguistic collision that one has gone through. (Suga, 2007: 27)

May exophonic translation offer a way to retain all of these linguistic collisions via translation.

References and Bibliography

Adab, B. (2005) 'Translating into a Second Language: Can We, Should We?', in Anderman, G. and Rogers, M. (eds) *In and Out of English, For Better, For Worse?*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters pp. 227–241.

Aitchison, J. (2001) *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akashi, M. (2018) 'Translator celebrity: investigating Haruki Murakami's visibility as a translator', *Celebrity Studies*, 9(2), pp. 271–278.

Akashi, M. (2021) 'Manifestations of creativity: Murakami Haruki as translator', in Hansen, G. M. and Tsang, M. (eds) *Murakami Haruki and Our Years of Pilgrimage*. Oxford: Routledge, pp. 219–239.

Alarcón, N. (1994) 'Conjugating Subjects: The Heteroglossia of Essence and Resistance', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 125–138.

Aldrete, B. J. (1972) *Del Origen Y Principio De La Lengua Castellana Ò Romance Que Oi [Sic] Se Usa En España (104 facsimile)*. Edited by L. Nieto Jiménez. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Alighieri, D. (1896) *Il Trattato De vulgari eloquentia*. Edited by P. Rajna. Florence: Le Monnier.

Alim, H. S. (2016a) 'Introducing raciolinguistics: Racing language and languaging race in hyperracial times', in Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., and Ball, A. (eds) *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–30.

Alim, H. S. (2016b) 'Who's Afraid of the Transracial Subject? Raciolinguistics and the Political Project of Transracialization.', in Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R.,

and Ball, A. F. (eds) *Raciolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 33–50.

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. 20fifteenth edn. London: Verso.

Aneja, G. A. (2016) 'Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non) native speakering', *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), pp. 351–379.

Angelelli, C. (2012) 'The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies', *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 7(2), pp. 125–128.

Anzaldua, G. (1999) *Borderlands/La Frontera*. 2nd edn. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Arteaga, A. (1994a) *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Arteaga, A. (1994b) 'An Other Tongue', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 9–34.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2004) *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London and New York: Routledge.

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How To Do Things With Words The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Edited by J. O. Urmson and M. Sbisà. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bachleitner, N. and Wolf, M. (eds) (2004) *Soziologie der literarischen Übersetzung*. Special Is. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Baker, C. (1985) *Aspects of Bilingualism in Wales*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2001) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. Third Edition. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 27*. Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. and Hinde, J. (1984) 'Language background classification', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 5(1), pp. 43–56.

Barnard, F. M. (1965) *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2009) 'Gatekeeping: A Critical Review', *Annual Review ofInformation, Science and Technology*, 43(1), pp. 1–79.

Bassetti, B. (2012) 'Bilingualism and writing systems', in Bhatia, T. K. and Ritchie, W. C. (eds) *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 649–670.

Baugh, A. C. (1957) *A History of the English Language*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bauman, R. and Briggs, C. L. (2003) *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*, *Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bear Nicholas, A. (2011) 'Linguicide: Submersion education and the killing of languages in Canada', *Briarpatch Magazine - Unsettling Canada*. https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/linguicide Accessed in 20.05.2022

Beeby Lonsdale, A. (1998) 'Direction of translation (directionality)', *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bell, R. T. (1991) *Translation and Translating*. London; New York: Longman.

Bellos, D. (2016) *Is That a Fish in your Ear? : The Amazing Adventure of Translation*. London: Penguin.

Bickerton, D. (1975) *Dynamics of a Creole System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bjornson, R. (1991) *The African Quest for Freedom and Identity: Cameroonian Writing and the National Experience*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Bloemendal, J. (2017) 'Neo-Latin and Religion', in Hiscock, A. and Wilcox, H. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern English Literature and Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 243–258.

Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*. New York: Holt.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010a) 'Abstracting the secular: Ethnolinguistic nationalism in the eighteenth century', in Bonfiglio, T. P. (ed.) *Mother Tongues and Nations*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 122–141.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010b) 'Chapter 4: From sermo patrius to lingua materna', in *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010c) *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013) 'The Invention of the Native Speaker', *Critical Multilingualism Studies: an interdisciplinary journal*, 1(2), pp. 29–58.

Borowski, A. (1999) 'General Theory of Translation in Old Polish Literary Culture', in Brogi Bercoff, G. and et al (eds) *Traduzione e rielaborazione nelle letterature di Polonia, Ucraina e Russia*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 23–38.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1980) *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: Minuit.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by G. Raymon and M. Adamson. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.

Braine, G. (2012) 'Non-native-speaker English teachers', *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley Online Library, pp. 1–5.

Brisset, A. (1996) *A Sociocritique of Translation: Theatre and Alterity in Quebec, 1968–1988*. Translated by R. Gill and R. Gannon. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Brown, H. (2022) *Women and Early Modern Cultures of Translation: Beyond the Female Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruni, L. (1992) 'Extracts from De interpretatione recta (the right way to translate) published in 1420', in Lefevere, A. (ed.) *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, New York: Routledge. pp 33-35.

Buchweitz, A. and Alves, F. (2006) 'Cognitive Adaptation in Translation: an interface between language direction, time, and recursiveness in target text production', *Letras de Hoje*, 41(2 SE-Artigos). pp 81-90.

Burke, P. (1988) 'William Dell, the Universities, and the Radical Tradition', in Eley, G. and Hunt, W. (eds) *Reviving the English Revolution: Reflections and Elaborations on the Work of Christopher Hill*. London: Verso, pp. 181–9.

Burke, P. (2004) '"Speak, that I may see thee": the discovery of language in early modern Europe', in Burke, P. (ed.) *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (The Wiles Lectures), pp. 15–42.

Burke, P. (2007) 'Translations into Latin in early modern Europe', in Burke, P. and Hsia, R. P.-C. (eds) *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 65–80.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997) 'Gender is burning: Questions of appropriation and subversion', *Cultural Politics*, 11, pp. 381–395.

Butler, J. (2011) *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Buzelin, H. (2005) 'Unexpected Allies: How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies', *The Translator*, 11(2), pp. 193–218.

Buzelin, H. (2007) 'Translations "in the making"', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 135–169.

Bybee, J. L. and Hopper, P. J. (2001) 'Introduction to frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure', in Bybee, J. L. and Hopper, P. J. (eds) *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers, pp. 1–26.

Bynum, C. (1986) *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cameron, D. (2007) 'Language endangerment and verbal hygiene: History, morality and politics', in Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (eds) *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. New York: Bloomsbury, pp. 268–85.

Campbell, S. (1998) *Translation into the Second Language*. London and New York: Longman.

Campbell, E. and Mills, R. (eds) (2012) *Rethinking Medieval Translation: Ethics, Politics, Theory*. Martlesham: Boydell & Brewer.

Canagarajah, S. and Liyanage, I. (2012) 'Lessons from pre-colonial multilingualism', in Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., and Creese, A. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London: Routledge, pp. 49–65.

Cândido, A. (2005) 'Prólogo', in Martins, C. B. (ed.) *Diálogos entre o Brasil e a França. Formação e cooperação acadêmica*. Recife: Fundação Joaquim Nabuco/ Editora Massangana.

Cao, D. (1996) 'Towards a Model of Translation Proficiency', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(2), pp. 325–340.

Caparelli, A. (2016) 'Critical Transfers between Brazil and France and the Nineteenth-Century Press', in Félix, R. R. and Juall, S. D. (eds) *Cultural Exchanges between Brazil and France*. West Lafayette,IN: Purdue University Press, pp. 85–98.

Catford, J. C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, F. (1997) 'What do we mean by fluency?', *System*, 25(4), pp. 535–44.

Chatterjee, P. (1993) *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chesterman, A. (1997) *Memes of Translation - The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. (2004) 'Beyond the Particular', in Mauranen, A. (ed.) *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishers, pp. 33–50.

Chesterman, A. (2007) 'Bridge concepts in translation sociology', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 171–183.

Chesterman, A. (2009) 'The name and nature of Translator Studies', *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, pp. 13–22.

Chesterman, A. (2017) 'The Name and Nature of Translator Studies', *HJLCB HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 22(42), pp. 13–22.

Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chow, R. (2014) *Not Like a Native Speaker: On Languaging as a Postcolonial Experience*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cogo, A. (2012) "English as a lingua franca: concepts, use, and implications", *ELT Journal*, 66(1), pp. 97–105.

Coldiron, A. E. B. (2016) "Beyond Babel: The Translator's Voice in Early Modern Literature and History". *Philological Quarterly* 95.3-4 pp. 311-319.

Collischonn, L. (2022) 'Freed from the monolingual shackles: a mongrel crônica for the mutt translator', in Bhanot, K. and Tiang, J. (eds) *Violent Phenomena: 21 Essays on Translation*. London: Tilted Axis Press, pp. 151-166.

Cook, V. J. (1992) 'Evidence for multicompetence', *Language Learning*, 42(4), pp. 557–591.

Coser, L. (1975) 'Publishers as gatekeepers of ideas', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 421, pp. 14–22.

Coser, L., Kadushin, C. and Powell, W. (1982) *Books: The Culture and Commerce of Publishing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Costa, C. and Murphy, M. (2015) *Bourdieu, Habitus and Social Research: The Art of Application*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coulmas, F. (1988) 'What is a national language good for?', in Coulmas, F. (ed.) *With Forked Tongues: What are National Languages Good For?* Ann Harbor, MI: Karoma Publishers, Inc., pp. 1–24.

Cronin, M. (2006) *Translation and Identity*. London, New York: Routledge.

Cruz Trainor, M. M. de la (2004) 'Traducción inversa: una realidad', *TRANS. Revista de Traductología*, 8, pp. 53–60.

Crystal, D. (2000) *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1984) 'Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students', in Rivera, C. (ed.) *Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp 2-19

Cummins, J. (2000) 'Putting language proficiency in its place: responding to critiques of the conversational/academic language distinction', in Cenoz, J. and Jessner, U. (eds) *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Davidson, M. C. (2009) *Medievalism, Multilingualism, and Chaucer*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US (The New Middle Ages).

Davies, A. (2003) *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dewaele, J. (2018) "Why the Dichotomy 'L1 Versus LX User' is Better than 'Native Versus Non-native Speaker', *Applied Linguistics*, 39/2, pp. 236–240

Derrida, J. (1998) *Monolingualism of the other, or, the prosthesis of origin*. Translated by P. Mensah. Stanford, CA.: Stanford Univ. Press.

Diebold, A. R. (1964) 'Incipient bilingualism', *Language*, 37, pp. 97–112.

Dirkx, P. (1995) 'Paris and Amsterdam as Translational Go-Betweens: The Evolution of Literary Translation in Belgium after World War II', in Jansen, P. and Robyns, C. (eds) *Selected Papers of the CERA Research Seminars in Translation Studies*. Leuven: CETRA. pp.9-24.

Doloughan, F. (2015) 'Translation as a Motor of Critique and Invention in Contemporary Literature: The Case of Xiaolu Guo', in Gilmour, R. and Steinitz, T. (eds) *Multilingual Currents in Literature, Translation and Culture*. New York: Routledge, pp. 150–167.

Donohue, G. A., Tichenor, P. J. and Olien, C. N. (1972) *Gatekeeping: mass media systems and information control*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.

Dryden, J. (1992) 'Extracts from his preface to his translation of Ovid's Epistles published in 1680', in *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, New York: Routledge.

Drysdale, H. (2001) *Mother Tongues: Travels through Tribal Europe*. London: Macmillan.

Duff, A. (1989) *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dziurosz, M. (2017) 'On L2 ("non-native") Translation', *The Linguist.*, 1(56) pp.26-27.

Emerson, R. (1960) 'The West and Non-Western Nationalism', in Emerson, R. (ed.) *From Empire to Nation*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, pp. 188–210.

Erasmus, D. (1992) 'Extracts from the "Letter to William Warham," dated 1506', in Lefevere, A. (ed.) *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 25-31.

Esparza Torres, M. A. (1995) *Las ideas linguísticas de Antonio de Nebrija*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Espósito, A. P. (1995) 'Bilingualism, Philology and the Cultural Nation: The Medieval Monolingual Imaginary', *Catalan Review*, IX(2), pp. 125–139.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990) 'The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem', *Polysystem Studies - Poetics Today*, 11(1), pp. 45–51.

Falk, D. (2004) 'Prelinguistic evolution in early hominins: Whence motherese?', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27, pp. 491–583.

Febvre, L. and Martin, H. J. (1997) *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800*, *A Verso Modern Classic*. London and New York: Verso.

Ferreira, A. (2014) 'Analyzing recursiveness patterns and retrospective protocols of professional translators in L1 and L2 translation tasks', *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. John Benjamins, 9(1), pp. 109–127.

Ferreira, A. A. (2013) *Direcionalidade em tradução: o papel da subcompetência bilíngue em tarefas de tradução L1 e L2*. Doctoral Thesis. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, MG, Brazil.

Ferreira, A. and Schwieter, J. W. (2017) 'Directionality in Translation', in *The Handbook of Translation and Cognition*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 90–105.

Fichte, J. G. (1808) *Reden an die deutsche Nation*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.

Fillmore, C. J. (1979) 'On Fluency', in Fillmore, C. J., Kempler, D., and Wang, W. S.-Y. B. T. (eds) *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 85–101.

Fishman, J. A. (1965) 'Who speaks what language to whom and when?', *La Linguistique*, pp. 67–68.

Fishman, J. A. (1971) 'An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society', in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) *Advances in the Sociology of Language, Volume 1*. The Hague: Mouton.pp.217-404.

Fishman, J. A. (1972) *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fleischman, S. (1996) 'Medieval Vernaculars and the Myth of Monoglossia: A Conspiracy of Linguistics and Philology', in Lerer, S. (ed.) *Literary History and the Challenge of Philology*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, pp. 92–104.

von Flotow, L. (2000) 'Women, bibles, ideologies', *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 13(1), pp. 9–20.

von Flotow, L. (2009) 'Contested gender in translation: Intersectionality and metramorphics', *Palimpsestes. Revue de traduction*, 22, pp. 245–256.

Foley, J. A. (1988) *New Englishes. The Case of Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Foley, J. A. (2001) 'Is English a first or second language in Singapore?', in Ooi, V. B. Y. (ed.) *Evolving Identities: The English Language in Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp. 12–32.

Forster, L. (1970) *The poet's tongues. Multilingualism in literature*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Fransen, S. and Cook, H. J. (eds.) (2017) *Translating Early Modern Science*. Leiden: Brill.

Gal, S. (1993) 'Diversity and Contestation in Linguistic Ideologies: German Speakers in Hungary', *Language in Society*,, 22(3), pp. 337–359.

Galbraith, V. H. (1941) 'Nationality and Language in Medieval England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 23, pp. 113–28.

Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gilmour, R. (2020) *Bad English: Literature, Multilingualism, and the Politics of Language in Contemporary Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ginzburg, C. (1992) *The Cheese and the Worms*. Translated by J. Tedeschi and A. C. Tedeschi. Charles Village, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Di Giovanni, E. and Chelati Dirar, U. (2015) 'Reviewing directionality in writing and translation: Notes for a history of translation in the Horn of Africa', *Translation Studies*, 8(2), pp. 175–190.

Gouanvic, J.-M. (1999) *Sociologie de la traduction. La science-fiction américaine dans l'espace culturel français des années 1950*. Arras: Artois Presses Université.

Gouanvic, J.-M. (2002) 'The Stakes of Translation in Literary Fields', *Across Languages and Cultures*, 3(2), pp. 159–168.

Gouanvic, J.-M. (2005) 'A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances - Field, "Habitus", Capital and "Illusio"', *The Translator*, 11(2), pp. 147–166.

Gramling, D. (2016) *The Invention of Monolingualism*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Gramling, D. (2021) *The Invention of Multilingualism*, *Key Topics in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greco, A. N. (2013) *The Book Publishing Industry*. New York: Routledge.

Grosjean, F. (1985) 'The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(6), pp. 467–77.

Grosjean, F. (1994) 'Individual bilingualism', in Asher, R. E. and Simpson, J. M. (eds) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (Volume 3)*. Oxford: Pergamon. pp.163-187.

Grosman, M., Kadric; M., Kovaĉiĉ, I and Snell-Hornby, M. (eds.) (2000) *Translation into Non-mother Tongues in Professional Practice and Training*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Guillén, C. (1993) *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*. Translated by C. Franzen. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Guimarães, E. (2005) 'Apresentação Brasil: país multilíngüe ', *Ciência e Cultura* São Paulo, v. 57, n. 2, pp. 22–23.

Gutt, E.-A. (1990) 'A Theoretical Account of Translation – Without a Translation Theory', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 2(2), pp. 135–164.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hadley, J. and Akashi, M. (2015) 'Translation and celebrity: The translation strategies of Haruki Murakami and their implications for the visibility paradigm', *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 23(3), pp. 458–474.

Hamers, J. F. and Blanc, M. H. A. (2000) *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hansegård, N. E. (1975) *Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet?*, *Series 253*. Stockholm: Aldus.

Harries, P. (1987) 'The Roots of Ethnicity: Discourse and the Politics of Language Construction in South-East Africa', *African Affairs*, 87, pp. 25–52.

Haugen, E. (1966) Language conflict and language planning. The American Behavioral Scientist, 10(8), 13-18.

Haugen, E. (1973) 'The Curse of Babel', *Daedalus*, 102(3), pp. 47–57.

Heilbron, J. (1999) 'Towards a Sociology of Translation', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(4), pp. 429–444.

Heilbron, J. (2000) 'Translation as a Cultural World System', *Perspectives*, 8(1), pp. 9–26.

Heilbron, J. and Sapiro, G. (2002) 'La circulation internationale des idées', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, (Special Issue), 145(1), pp. 3-11.

Heinich, N. (1984) 'Les traducteurs littéraires: l'art et la profession', *Revue française de sociologie*, 25, pp. 264–80.

Herder, J. G. (1985) 'Über die neuere deutsche Literatur', in Gaier, U. (ed.) *Johann Gottfried Herder frühe Schriften 1764-1772*. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, pp. 161–694.

Herder, J. G. (1992) 'Extracts from the Fragmente (Fragments) published in 1766 and 1767', in Lefevere, A. (ed.) *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, New York: Routledge, pp 20-26.

Hermans, T. (1999) *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Hermans, T. (2007) 'Translation, irritation and resonance', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 57–75.

Hernández-Chávez, E., Burt, M. and Dulay, H. (1978) 'Language dominance and proficiency testing: Some general considerations', *NABE Journal*, 3(1), pp. 41–54.

Heryanto, A. (1995) *Language of Development and Development of Language: The Case of Indonesia*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australia National University.

Hickey, R. (2005) 'Englishes in Asia and Africa: origin and structure', in Hickey, R. (ed.) *Legacies of Colonial English: Studies in Transported Dialects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Studies in English Language), pp. 503–535.

Hill, C. (1958) *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Hill, C. (1972) *The World Turned Upside Down*. London: Penguin Books.

Hogan-Brun, G. (2020) *Linguanomics: What is the Market Potential of Multilingualism?* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Holliday, A. (2006a) 'Native-speakerism', *ELT Journal*, 60(4), pp. 385–387.

Holliday, A. (2006b) 'What Happens between People: Who We Are and What We Do', in Gieve, S. and Miller, I. K. (eds) *Understanding the Language Classroom*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 47–63.

Holmes, J. S. (1988) 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies', in Holmes, J.S. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 67-80.

Hopper, P. (1998) 'Emergent grammar', in Tomasello, M. (ed.) *The New Psychology of Language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 155–175.

Houghton, S. A. and Hashimoto, K. (eds) (2018) *Towards Post-Native-Speakerism Dynamics and Shifts*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Housen, A., Kuiken, F. and Vedder, I. (2012) *Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency : complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hüllen, W. (1992) 'Identifikationssprachen und Kommunikationssprachen', *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, 20(3), pp. 298–317.

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H. and Seidlhofer, B. (2008) 'Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication', *Synergies Europe*, 3, pp. 25–36.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2015) *Language Proficiency in Native and Non-native Speakers Theory and research*. Amsterdam, New York, NY: John Benjamins Publishers.

Humboldt, W. von (1999) *On language: on the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species*. Edited by M. Losonsky translated by P. H. Losonsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hur, A. (2018) 'How to Write Queer Korean Lit: a Manual', *Litro Magazine*, May, Link: https://www.litromagazine.com/every-saturday-litro-magazine-publishes-essays-that-reach-far-beneath-the-surface/write-queer-korean-lit-manual/ Accessed on 11th January 2022.

Hutton, C. (1999) *Linguistics and the Third Reich*. New York: Routledge.

Ivanovic, C. and Matsunaga, M. (2011) 'Tawada von Zwei Seiten: Eine Dialektüre in Stichworten ['Tawada-Glosar]', in *Text + Kritik*. Munich, pp. 108–156.

Jamoussi, R. (2015) 'Exporting cultural goods through the medium of translation in the Arab world: the (not so) strange case of L2 translation', *The Translator*, 21(2), pp. 173–188.

Janse, M. and Sijmen, T. (eds) (2003) *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jefferson, J. A., Putter, A. and Hopkins, A. (eds) (2013) *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066-1520) Sources and Analysis*. Turnhout: Brepols n.v

Jones, E. (2022) *Literature in motion : translating multilingualism across the Americas*. New York: Columbia University Press

Kachru, B. (1992) *The Other Tongue: English across cultures*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kahng, J. (2014) 'Exploring Utterance and Cognitive Fluency of L1 and L2 English Speakers: Temporal Measures and Stimulated Recall', *Language Learning*., 64(4), pp. 809–854.

Kaindl, K. (2021) '(Literary) Translator Studies: Shaping the field', in Kaindl, K., Kolb, W., and Schlager, D. (eds) *Literary Translator Studies*, pp. 1–38.

Kaindl, K., Kolb, W. and Schlager, D. (eds) (2021) *Literary Translator Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kaza, M. H. (ed.) (2017) *Aster(ix) 2017 Summer: Kitchen Table Translation*. Pittsburgh, PA: Blue Sketch Press.

Kelly, D.; Nobs, M., Sánchez, D. and Way, C. (eds.) (2003) *La direccionalidad en Traducción e Interpretacion: perspectivas teóricas, profesionales y didácticas*, *2002 Forum on Directionality in Translating and Interpreting in Granada* Granada: Editorial Atrio.

Kellman, S. G. (2000) *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press.

Kiraly, D. C. (1995): *Pathways to Translation. Pedagogy and Process*, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Kitsou, S. (2016) 'English as a Lingua Franca: a weapon or a tool?', in Tsantila, N., Mandalios, J., and Ilkos, M. (eds) *ELF: Pedagogical and interdisciplinary perspectives*. Athens: Deree: The American College of Greece, pp. 129–135.

Klopstock, F. G. (2013) *Die Deutsche Gelehrtenrepublik*. Edited by R. M. Hurlebusch. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Koponen, M. and Riggenbach, H. (2000) 'Overview: Varying perspectives on fluency', in *Perspectives on Fluency*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 5–24.

Kramsch, C. (2003) 'The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker', *PMLA*, 112, pp. 359–369.

Kramsch, C. (2015) 'Applied Linguistics: A Theory of the Practice', *Applied Linguistics Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), pp. 454–465.

Kramsch, C. (2020) *Language as Symbolic Power*, *Key Topics in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2000) 'Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives', in Kroskrity, P. V. (ed.) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, pp. 1–34.

Kubota, R. and Lin, A. (2009) 'Race, culture, and identities in second language education', *Race, culture and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. Routledge New York, pp. 1–23.

Kuzar, R. (2001) *Hebrew and Zionism: A Discourse Analytic Cultural Study*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lamb, S. (1992) 'The sources of linguistic patterning', *LACUS*, XIX, pp. 23–44.

Lefevere, A. (1992) 'Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame', *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(2), pp. 171-180.

Lefèvre, P. (1986) *De selekterende stripuitgevers. Een onderzoek naar de gatekeeping bij de grote stripuitgeverijen Lombard en Dupuis*. uupublished Master's dissertation. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven.

Lefèvre, P. (2016) 'Gatekeeping in Comics Publishing. A Practical Guide to Gatekeeping Research', in Brienza, C. and Johnston, P. (eds) *Cultures of Comics Work, Palgrave Studies in Comics and Graphic Novels*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 205–217.

Léglu, C. E. (2010) *Multilingualism and Mother Tongue in Medieval French, Occitan, and Catalan Narratives*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Leibniz, G. W. (1983) 'Ermahnung an die Deutschen ihren Verstand und ihre Sprache besser zu üben, samt beigefügtem Vorschlag einer deutschgesinnten Gesellschaft [um 1682/83]', in Pörksen, U. (ed.) *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache: zwei Aufsätze. Kommentiert von Uwe Pörksen und Jürgen Schiewe*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, pp. 47–78.

Lennon, B. (2015) 'Challenges to Monolingual National Literatures', in Kramsch, C. J. and Jessner-Schmid, U. (eds) *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 143–160.

Lennon, P. (1990) 'Investigating Fluency in EFL: A Quantitative Approach.', *Language learning*, 40(3), pp. 387–417.

Lennon, P. (2000) 'The lexical element in spoken second language fluency', in Riggenbach, H. (ed.) *Perspectives on Fluency*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 25–42.

Li, W. (2018) 'Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language', *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), pp. 9–30.

Li, W., Milroy, L. and Ching, P. S. (1992) 'A two-step sociolinguistic analysis of codeswitching and language choice: The example of a bilingual Chinese community in Britain', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), pp. 63–86.

Lim, L. (2005) *Singapore English: A Grammatical Description*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lindqvist, Y. (2006) 'Consecration mechanisms: The reconstruction of the Swedish Field of High Prestige Literary Translation during the 1980s and 1990s', in Wolf, M. (ed.) *Übersetzen – Translating – Traduire: towards a 'social turn'*. Vienna: LIT Verlag, pp. 65–75.

Lintunen, P., Mutta, M. and Peltonen, P. (eds) (2019) *Fluency in L2 Learning and Use*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lintunen, P. and Peltonen, P. (2019) 'What is Fluency? Learner Perceptions of the Concept', in Lintunen, P., Mutta, M., and Peltonen, P. (eds) *Fluency in L2 Learning and Use*. Bristol; Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, pp. 16–33.

Lörscher, W. (1992) 'Form- and Sense-oriented Approaches to Translation', in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and Thielen, M. (eds) *Translation and Meaning, Part 2: Proceedings of the Lódz Session of the 1990 Maastricht-Lódz Colloquium on 'Translation and Meaning', held in Lódz, Poland, 20-22 September 1990*. Maastricht: Rijkshogeschool Maastricht, Faculty of Translation and Interpreting, pp. 403–414.

Love, N. L. (2009) 'Science, language, and linguistic culture', *Language & Communication*, 29, pp. 26–46.

Lucy, J. A. (2001) 'Sapir–Whorf Hypothesis', in Smelser, N. J. and Baltes, P. B. B. T. (eds) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 13486–13490.

Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2006) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mannheim, B. (1991) *The Language of the Inkha since the European Invasion*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Marmaridou, A. S. S. (1996) 'Directionality in translation. Processes and practices', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(1), pp. 49–73.

Marton, F. (1981) 'Phenomenography — Describing conceptions of the world around us', *Instructional Science*, 10(2), pp. 177–200.

Matter-Seibel, S. (2006) 'Margaret Fullers Übersetzungen deutscher Werke: Soziale Entstehungsbedingungen und genderspezifische Aspekte', in Wolf, M. (ed.) *Übersetzen – Translating – Traduiere: Towards a 'Social Turn'?* Vienna: LIT Verlag, pp. 23–34.

McAlester, G. (1992) 'Teaching Translation into a Foreign Language: Status, Scope and Aims', in Dollerup, C. and Loddegaard, A. (eds) *Teaching Translation*

and Inter- preting: Training, Talent and Experience. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 291–297.

McAlester, G. (2005) 'The Evaluation of Translation into a Foreign Language', in Schäffner, C. and Adab, B. (eds) *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 229–241.

McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender, and sexuality in the colonial contest*. London and New York: Routledge.

McCrum, R., Cran, W. and MacNeil, R. (1986) *The Story of English*. New York: Viking.

Mignolo, W. (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking* (Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (1996) 'Linguistic Maps, Literary Geographies, and Cultural Landscapes: Languages, Languaging, and (Trans)nationalism', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 57(2), pp. 181–196.

Mignolo, W. D. (2012) *Local histories/global designs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2021) 'Decolonizing the Nation-State', in *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 154–180.

Minogue, K. R. (1967) *Nationalism*. New York: Basic Books.

Modiano, M. (2001) 'Ideology and the ELT practitioner', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), pp. 159–173.

Modiano, M. (2005) 'Cultural studies, foreign language teaching and learning practices, and the NNS practitioner', in Braine, G. (ed.) *Non-native language teachers*. New York: Springer, pp. 25–43.

Mufwene, S. S. (2001) *The Ecology of Language Evolution*, *Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nairn, T. (1977) *The break-up of Britain: crisis and neo-nationalism*. London: NLB.

Nama, C. A. (1995) 'Translators and the development of national languages', in Delisle, J. and Woodsworth, J. (eds) *Translators through History: Revised edition (Vol. 101)*. Twelfth edn. John Benjamins Publishers, pp. 61–92.

Nancy, J.-L. (1994) 'Cut Throat Sun', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 113–124.

Neubert, A. and Shreve, G. M. (1992) *Translation as Text*. Kent, OH, and London: The Kent State University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988) *Textbook of Translation*. New York, London, Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986). Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. Nairobi, Kenya: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.

Niranjana, T. (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Poststructuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Niranjana, T. (1994) 'Colonialism and the Politics of Translation', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 35–52.

Noorani, Y. (2013) 'Hard and Soft Multilingualism', *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), pp. 7–28.

Nord, C. (2011) 'Making the source text grow: a plea against the idea of loss in translation', in Buffagni, Claudia; Garzelli, Beatrice; Zanotti, S. (ed.) *The Translator as Author: Perspectives on Literary Translation : Proceedings of the International Conference, Universita Per Stranieri of Siena, 28-29 May 2009*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, pp. 21–30.

Nunes de Leão, D. (1983) 'Origem de língua portuguesa (1606)', in Carvalhão Buescu, M. L. (ed.) *Ortografia e Origem da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Imprensa nacional - Casa da moeda, pp. 189–329.

Oller, J. W. and Perkins, K. (1980) *Research in Language Testing*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ortega, L. (2013) 'SLA for the twenty first Century: Disciplinary Progress, Transdisciplinary Relevance, and the Bi/multilingual Turn', *Language Learning*, 63(s1), pp. 1–24.

Oz-Salzberger, F. (1995) *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press/Clarendon Press.

Parks, G. (1998) 'Towards a Sociology of Translation', *Rivista internazionale di tecnica della traduzione*, 3, pp. 25–35.

Parks, T. (2010) 'The Dull New Global Novel', *The New York Review*, February. Link: https://www.nybooks.com/online/2010/02/09/the-dull-new-global-novel/ Accessed in 20th May 2022.

Pavlović, N. (2007) *Directionality in Collaborative Translation Processes: A Study of Novice Translators*. (PhD Thesis). Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Pearson, B. Z. (2010) 'We can no longer afford a monolingual norm', *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 31(2), pp. 339–343.

Peltonen, P. and Lintunen, P. (2016) 'Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in L2 fluency analysis: A study of Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners of English at two school levels', *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), pp. 209–238.

Pennycook, A. (2004) 'Performativity and Language Studies', *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(1), pp. 1–19.

Pennycook, A. and Makoni, S. (2012) 'Disinventing Multilingualism: From Monological Multilingualism to Multilingua Francas', in Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., and Creese, A. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London: Routledge, pp. 439–453.

Perteghella, M. and Loffredo, E. (eds) (2006) *Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*. London: Continuum.

Petrova, E. (2020) 'Neither Here And There: The Misery And Splendor Of (Reverse) Translation*', *Reading in Translation*, July, p. online. Accessed on 3rd August 2020: https://readingintranslation.com/2020/07/28/neither-here-and-there-the-misery-and-splendor-of-reverse-translation/

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2013) 'Linguistic Imperialism', in Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester: Wiley, pp. 3470–3476.

Phipps, A. (2013) 'Unmoored: language pain, porosity, and poisonwood', *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), pp. 96–118.

Pokorn, N. (2005) *Challenging the Traditional Axioms Translation into a non-mother tongue*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pratt, M. L. (1987) 'Linguistic Utopias', in Fabb, N. and Al, E. (eds) *The Linguistics of Writing*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 48–66.

Préfontaine, Y. (2013) 'Perceptions of French Fluency in Second Language Speech Production', *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(3), pp. 324–348.

Préfontaine, Y. and Kormos, J. (2016) 'A qualitative analysis of perceptions of fluency in second language French', *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 54(2), pp. 151–169.

Presas, M. (2000) 'Bilingual Competence and Translation Competence', in Schäffner, C. and Adab, B. (eds) *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 19–31.

Prunč, E. (2007) 'Priests, princes and pariahs: Constructing the professional field of translation', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 39–56.

Pym, A. (1996) 'Ideologies of the expert in discourses on translator training', In *Problems and Trends in the Teaching of Interpreting and Translation* , (= Koinè Anno IV), in Snell-Hornby, M and Gambier, Y (ed.) Misano: Istituto San Pellegrino pp. 139–149.

Pym, A. (1998) 'Method in translation history '. Manchester: St. Jerome

Pym, A. (2013) 'Translation as an Instrument for Multilingual Democracy', *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), pp. 78–95.

Records of the General Conference, nineteenth session, Nairobi, 26 October to 30 November 1976, v. 1: Resolutions (no date). UNESCO. Nairobi, Kenya.

Rico, F. (1978) *Nebrija frente a los barbaros: El canon de gramáticos nefastos en las polémicas del humanismo*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Riggenbach, H. (1991) 'Toward an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversations', *Discourse Processes*, 14(4), pp. 423–41.

Riggenbach, H. (2000) *Perspectives on Fluency*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Risku, H. (2000) 'Situated Translation and Situated Cognition: Ungleiche Schwestern', in Kaindl, K., Pöchhacker, F., and Kadric, M. (eds) *Translationswissenschaft. Festschrift für Mary Snell-Hornby zum 60. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, pp. 81-91.

Risku, H. (2004) *Translationsmanagement. Interkulturelle Fachkommunikation im Informationszeitalter*. Tübingen: Narr.

Rivers, D. J. (2018) 'The Idea of the Native Speaker', in Houghton, S. A., Rivers, D.J., and Hashimoto, K. (eds) *Beyond Native-Speakerism: Current Explorations and Future Visions*. New York: Routledge, pp. 15–35.

Robyns, C. (1992) 'Towards a Sociosemiotics of Translation', *Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte. Cahiers d'Histoire des Littératures Romanes*, 16, pp. 211–226.

Rosa, J. and Flores, N. (2017) 'Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective', *Language in Society*. 2017/09/11. Cambridge University Press, 46(5), pp. 621–647.

Samuelsson-brown, G. (1995) *A Practical Guide for Translators*. Clevedon; Philadelphia, PA; Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Sanches, J. (2019) 'Sun and Slang: On Translating Geovani Martins's "The Sun on My Head"', *Words Without Borders*, June, p. online. Accessed on 4th March 2020.

Santiago, S. (1978) *Uma literatura nos trópicos: ensaios sobre dependência cultural*. São Paulo: Perspectiva: Secretaria da Cultura, Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de São Paulo.

Sapiro, G. (2002) 'L'importation de la littérature hébraïque en France: Entre universalisme et communautarisme', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 144, pp. 80–98.

Sapiro, G. (2010) 'Globalization and Cultural Diversity in the Book Market: The Case of Literary Translations in the US and in France', *Poetics*, 38(4), pp. 419–439.

Savin, A. (1994) 'Bilingualism and Dialogism: Another Reading of Lorna Dee Cervantes's Poetry', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 215–224.

Schleiermacher, F. (1963) 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersezens (1813)', in Störig, H. (ed.) *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Stuttgart: Henry Goverts, pp. 38–70.

Schmidt-Rohr, G. (1932) *Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker: Eine Wesens und Lebenskunde der Volkstümer*. Jena: Diederichs.

Schögler, R. (2017) 'Sociology of Translation', in Odell Korgen, K. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociology, Volume 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 399–407.

Schoneveld, W. (1983) *Intertraffic of the Mind, Studies in Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Dutch Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Scott, C. (2012) *Literary translation and the rediscovery of reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sela-Sheffy, R. (2014) 'Translators' Identity Work: Introducing Micro-Sociological Theory of Identity to the Discussion of Translators' Habitus', in Vorderobermeier, G. M. (ed.) *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam, New York, NY: Rodopi, pp. 43–55.

Sela-Sheffy, R. (2016) 'Elite and non-elite translator manpower: The non-professionalised culture in the translation field in Israel', *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 25, pp. 54–73.

Será, G. (1998) 'Francfort: la foire d'empoigne', *Liber*, 34, pp. 2–3.

Seton-Watson, H. (1977) *Nations and States: An Enquiry Into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. New York: Routledge.

Shoemaker, P. J. and Vos, T. P. (2009) *Gatekeeping Theory*. New York: Routledge.

Sieg, K. (2002) *Ethnic Drag: Performing Race, Nation, Sexuality in West Germany*. Ann Harbor: University of Michigan Press.

Simeoni, D. (1998) 'The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus', *Target*, 10(1), pp. 1–39.

Simeoni, D. (2007) 'Between sociology and history. Method in context and in practice', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 187–204.

Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation - Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge.

Sin, S. (2010) 'Considerations of quality in phenomenographic research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 9(4), pp. 305–319.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981) *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2013) 'Linguistic Human Rights', in Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Toukomaa, P. (1976) *Teaching Migrant Children Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Socio-Cultural Situation of the Migrant Family*. Tampere, Finland: Tukimuksia Research Reports.

Smith, A. D. (1981) *The Ethnic Revival*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1992) 'The Professional Translator of Tomorrow: Language Specialist or All-round Expert?', in Dollerup, C. and Loddegaard, A. (eds) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 9–22.

Spitzer, L. (1968) *Essays in historical semantics*. New York: Russell & Russell.

Spivak, G. C. (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in Nelson, C. and Grossberg, L. (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 271–313.

Spivak, G. C. (1994) 'Bonding in Difference', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 273–286.

Spivak, G. C. (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present*. London: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (2012) 'The Politics of Translation', in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London, New York: Routledge.

Stern, H. H. (1992) *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, W. A. (1968) 'A Sociolinguistic Typology For Describing National Multilingualism', in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 531–545.

Stewart, D. (2001) 'Poor Relations and Black Sheep in Translation Studies', *Target*, 12(2), pp. 205–228

Stiernhielm, G. (1671) *Evangelia Ab Ulfila (Udgiver)*. Stockholm: Wankif.

Stoklosinski, E. (2014) *Another View Tracing the Foreign in Literary Translation*. Champaign IL: Dalkey Archive Press.

Suga, K. (2007) 'Translation, Exophony, Omniphony', in Slaymaker, D. (ed.) *Yoko Tawada: Voices from Everywhere*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. p.21-34.

De Swaan, A. (1993) 'The Emergent World Language System: An Introduction', *International Political Science Review*. SAGE Publications Ltd, 14(3), pp. 219–226.

Swain, M. (2006) 'Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning', in Byrnes, H. (ed.) *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky*. London: Continuum, pp. 95–108.

Tavakoli, P. and Hunter, A.-M. (2018) 'Is fluency being "neglected" in the classroom? Teacher understanding of fluency and related classroom practices', *Language Teaching Research*, 22(3), pp. 330–349.

Tawada, Y. (2003) *Ekusofonii: bogo no soto e deru tabi (エクソフォニー――母語の外へ出る旅)*. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Tight, M. (2016) 'Phenomenography: The development and application of an innovative research design in higher education research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19(3), pp. 319-338

Todorov, T. (1994) 'Dialogism and Schizophrenia', in Arteaga, A. (ed.) *An Other Tongue Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 203–214.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Treffers-Daller, J. (2018) 'The Measurement of Bilingual Abilities', in De Houwer, A. and Ortega, L. (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), pp. 289–306.

Tsao, T. and McIntosh, W. (2020) 'Interview #154 - Tiffany Tsao', *Liminal Mag*, November, p. online. Accessed on 11th November 2021: https://www.liminalmag.com/interviews/tiffany-tsao

Valdes, G. and Figueroa, R. A. (1994) *Bilingualism and Testing: A Special Case of Bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Venuti, L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London, NY: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2008) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Second edn. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (ed.) (2012) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London; New York: Routledge.

Veríssimo, L. F. (1982) *O gigolô das palavras: crônicas selecionadas e comentadas por Maria da Glória Bordini*. Porto Alegre: L&PM editores.

Vermeer, H. J. (1978) 'Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie', *Lebende Sprachen*, 23(3), pp. 99–102.

Viotti da Costa, E. (2000) 'Alguns Aspectos Da Influência Francesa Em São Paulo Na Segunda Metade Do século XIX', *Revista De História*, 142–143(dezembro), pp. 277–308.

Vorderobermeier, G. M. (ed.) (2014) *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.

Wacquant, L. (2018) 'A Concise Genealogy and Anatomy of Habitus', in Medvetz, T. and Sallaz, J. J. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 529–536.

Wagner, R. (1894) *Richard Wagner's Prose Works: The Theatre*. Translated by William Ashton Ellis. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

Wang, B. (2009) 'The Issue of Direction of Translation in China: A Historical Overview', *Translation Journal*, 13(3). Accessed on 05th March 2022: http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/49direction.htm

Wang, B. (2011) 'Translation Practices and the Issue of Directionality in China', *Meta*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 56(4), pp. 896–914.

Wang, L. (Evelyn) and Fang, F. (Gabriel) (2020) 'Native-speakerism policy in English language teaching revisited: Chinese university teachers' and students' attitudes towards native and non-native English-speaking teachers', *Cogent Education*. Edited by Y. Khajavi. Cogent OA, 7(1), p. 1778374.

Warwick Research Collective (2015) *Combined and Uneven Development: Towards a New Theory of World-Literature*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Weightman, J. (2000) 'Language as Prosthesis', *The Hudson Review*, 53(1), pp. 53–62.

Weisberger, L. (1929) *Muttersprache und Geistesbildung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

White, D. M. (1950) 'The "Gate Keeper": A Case Study in the Selection of News', *Journalism Quarterly*. SAGE Publications, 27(4), pp. 383–390.

Whyatt, B. (2019) 'In search of directionality effects in the translation process and in the end product', *Translation, Cognition & Behavior*. John Benjamins, 2(1), pp. 79–100.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994) 'The Ownership of English', *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), p. 377.

Williams, C. (1994) *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor, UK.

Wolf, M. (1999) 'Zum "sozialen Sinn" in der Translation. Translationssoziologische Implikationen von Pierre Bourdieus Kultursoziologie', *Arcadia*, 34(2), pp. 262–275.

Wolf, M. (2002a) 'Censorship as Cultural Blockage: Banned Literature in the Late Habsburg Monarchy', *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction TTR*, XV(2), pp. 45–61.

Wolf, M. (2002b) 'Culture as Translation – and Beyond. Ethnographic Models of Representation in Translation Studies', in Hermans, T. (ed.) *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 180–192.

Wolf, M. (2003) 'Translating – a Social Event. Towards a Sociological Approach of Translation', in Bonito Couto Pereira, H. and Guarnieri Atik, M. L. (eds) *Língua, Literatura e Cultura em Diálogo*. São Paulo: Editora Mackenzie, pp. 47–67.

Wolf, M. (2007a) 'The emergence of a sociology of translation', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 1–36.

Wolf, M. (2007b) 'The location of the "translation field": Negotiating borderlines between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds). Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 109–119.

Wolf, M. (2013) '"Prompt, at any time of the day...". The emerging translatorial habitus in the late Habsburg Monarchy', *Meta*, 58(3), pp. 504–521.

Wolf, M. (2015) *The Habsburg Monarchy's Many-Languaged Soul. Translating and Interpreting 1848-1918*. Translated by K. Sturge. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Woodard, R. D. (ed.) (2004) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolard, K. A. (2002) 'Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 44(3), pp. 446–480.

Wright, C. (2008) 'Writing in the "Grey Zone": Exophonic Literature in Contemporary Germany', *gfl- journal*, 3, pp. 25–41.

Wright, C. (2010) 'Exophony and literary translation: What it means for the translator when a writer adopts a new language', *Target*, 22(1), pp. 22–39.

Wright, C. (2013) *Yoko Tawada's Portrait of a Tongue*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Wright, C. (2016) *Literary Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wright, C. and Freely, M. (2017) '"Translators are the jazz musicians of the literary world": translating Pamuk, literary translation networks and the changing face of the profession'. *The Translator* 23(1), pp. 95–105.

Yildiz, Y. (2012) *Beyond the Mother Tongue - The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Zahedi, S. (2013) 'L2 Translation at the Periphery: A Meta-Analysis of Current Views on Translation Directionality', *TranscUlturAl*, 5(1–2), pp. 43–60.

Zaliwska-Okrutna, U. (2008) 'Translator-centred view on translation', in Thielen, M. and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (eds) *Translation and Meaning, Part 8 - Proceedings of the Łódź Session of the 4th International Maastricht - Łódź Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning", Held in Łódź, Poland, 23 – 25 September 2005*. Maastricht: UPM, Universitaire Pers Maastricht, pp. 107–114.