A "Translated" Discipline: English as Intercultural Communication

Ileana Dimitriu

Summary

English Studies is increasingly defined as an "interdiscipline", in which literature is stretched beyond its high-art connotations to encompass cultural and media texts. More latterly, translation has begun to enrich what might be termed a "translated" discipline. English Studies in South Africa, the article argues, has a valuable role in a society in which English as the lingua franca (of state, business and tertiary education) has a responsibility to seek communication across languages and cultures. The article illustrates its case for a flexible and challenging use of translation in an English curriculum.

Opsomming

Anglistiek ("English Studies") word toenemend as 'n "interdissiplinêre" studieveld beskou omdat die letterkunde die betekenis as skryfwerk van hoogstaande gehalte verloor het en deesdae ook kultuur- en mediatekste insluit. Vertaling het in die laaste tyd verrykend ingewerk op wat as 'n "vertaalde" dissipline beskryf kan word. Daar word in hierdie artikel beweer dat Anglistiek in Suid-Afrika 'n belangrike rol in die samelewing te speel het aangesien Engels die lingua franca (in die staatsdiens, die sakewêreld en in tersiêre onderrig) is en kommunikasie tussen verskillende taal- en kultuurgroepe moontlik maak. In hierdie artikel word gronde aangevoer vir 'n soepel en uitdagende aanwending van vertaling binne 'n Engelse kurrikulum.

Teaching at the beginning of the new millennium implies understanding and accepting the major shifts that have taken place within the traditional liberal arts disciplines in relation to the complex needs of today's variegated life in society; this process requires educators to redefine the relevance of specific disciplines for the multilayered world beyond the ivory tower. I have adopted the challenge raised by the International Conference on the Humanities in Southern Africa (June 2008): the challenge of deepening conversations "across academic disciplines ... for the betterment of the multicultural, multilingual world in which we live". Based on such a social and practical mission, we are all faced with major challenges concerning the

UNISA

appropriateness of the curricular design so as to bring skills to the values of a society struggling towards a just order.

As a scholar of English Studies (who for more than two decades has had strong links with its cognate, Media and Cultural Studies), I identified what to me seemed a missing area in both disciplines: an area that could broaden the scope of both disciplines regarding students' responsible participation in a diverse, multilingual and multicultural society such as South Africa. I envisaged a study track that could apply the rhetorical, literary and analytical considerations of both disciplines to students' working-world imperatives. At the same time, and without diminishing the integrity of any disciplinary object of study, I wished to forge links across languages and cultures in the contemporary scene. (I shall comment on the specific study track – as offered at UKZN – in the second part of my article.)

When I arrived in South Africa from Europe in 1991, key issues struck me: in a society of many languages, South Africa at the level of tertiary education was/is not a country of multilingual fluency. Neither was it a country – again, I confine my observations to tertiary-level education – of great intercultural curiosity. The study of English literature and isiZulu literature, for example, had no comparative dimension. In Media Studies, American models of journalism or advertising marginalised the local content and accent. Matters are changing, but slowly: not only because of the history of apartheid, but also – I return to my earlier observation – because of a language situation of "uneasy" communication.

It is a situation that has bedevilled the introduction of "European"-style translation courses that expect students to major in two languages (say, English and French/German). In South Africa, attempts to launch translation on the two-language-majoring-student model (say, English and isiZulu/-isiXhosa/Afrikaans) continue to fail tests of student interest or viability. Sadly, very few students pursue such an option. Why not then begin from a local reality in post-1990 South Africa? This involves the position of English as the language of government, commerce and higher education, whether one is easy with it or not. All students learn at least two languages up to matriculation: in most cases, the languages are English and either Afrikaans or one of the larger African languages, e.g. isiZulu, isiXhosa, seSotho. This linguistic fact constitutes a valuable cultural resource, one that nonetheless tends to be forgotten by universities and students alike. Why not make use of such a linguistic resource at tertiary level? Why not raise students' awareness of their embedded (and, therefore, practically available) linguistic capital by integrating it into our offerings? Why not support students to add value to their degrees by becoming more interculturally versatile?

Further questions proceed from the above: How, given such a reality, may one broaden English Studies and Media Studies to engage with a diverse, language-sensitive context? How to point such a project towards appropriate job-related spheres – the communication industry, indeed communication in

the workplace, journalism, editing? All these fields, in South Africa today, require not only an application and appreciation of language/culture transfer, but – at the level of future leaders – a university context of critical judgement, social alertness, and intellectual reflection.

I am arguing for fostering academic conversations across cognate disciplines: more exactly, in the case of English Studies, beyond the (by now) well-established link with Cultural Studies. What about English and Intercultural Studies? What about rethinking English in relation to needs for translation and shifting identities in post-apartheid South Africa? (See also Dimitriu 2001, 2002)

The Role of English in Intercultural Communication

Furthermore, I argue for the need to adjust the role of English in relation to translation and intercultural communication as a component of larger concerns regarding empowerment through language enhancement, especially since English is still – in spite of the country's language policy – the predominant language in the civil sphere. This situation, paradoxically, is not imposed from above, but arises as a result of pragmatic considerations. Numerous studies have been conducted to analyse the reasons why, since the end of apartheid, the position of English has, ironically, been strengthened – in spite of initiatives such as language policies in higher education and the institution of a watchdog body, The Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB). De Klerk (2000) shows that most parliamentarians' speeches are conducted in English rather than in African languages. Kamwamgamalu (2003) points to the dominance of English in the public broadcaster and shows (2003, 2004) that calls for mother-tongue education are not endorsed by many African parents, especially those who have attained middle-class status. As de Klerk observes, Xhosa parents are actively promoting English over mother tongue: "For political, economical [sic] and educational reasons, they want their children to be assimilated into a single unified national culture" (2002: 11). Other researchers have also focused on English and its hegemonic position in education (Rudwick 2004), including its changing ownership and shifting identity politics (de Klerk & Gough 2002).

Some of the latest research on the social role of English in a multicultural society has been commissioned by the English Academy of Southern Africa (EASA) which, in 2002, published a special journal issue of *EAR* (*English Academy Review)* on "Language and Empowerment" (Klopper 2002); and, in 2007, a special issue of the same journal on "Language, Identity and English Education in South Africa" (McKinney & Soudien 2007). As the guest editors of the latter point out, "new identities are taking place in the country, which can be read in young people's use of language", as well as in

the ways they are educationally integrated, for, "it is in this new [educational] system that the country's experimentation with difference is now taking place" (McKinney & Soudien 2007: 2).

Owing to the prestigious position of English as symbolic and economic resource, the social integration taking place in both secondary and tertiary education in South Africa inescapably involves *teaching and learning through the medium of English*. The paradigms of the former "Model C schools" – initially white, suburban, whether English or Afrikaans, promoted facility in English, and, since opening to all races – have continued to grant English a prominent role in learning. This has been replicated at tertiary level, where English is the key language of instruction, even in traditionally Afrikaans institutions. As Soudien (2004) and Makubalo (2007) point out, however, racial considerations have not so much disappeared as have been overshadowed by social class – e.g. the emerging black middle class – with a corresponding prestige attached to "white" English, as opposed to English varieties spoken outside a "middle-class" norm. This valorising process is inevitably responsible for "multiple, and at times contradictory, identities [being] continually constructed and reconstructed" (Makubalo 2007: 26) around one's English proficiency. The phenomenon is not surprising given that – as Bourdieu (1992: 105) has indicated – prestige language use is associated with forms of "cultural capital" and of "symbolic power", leading to acts of "inclusion" into, and "exclusion" from, various social groupings and classes. Furthermore, as Finchilescu and Nyawose have shown in a study on Zulu students' views, "English is seen as the language of work and commerce [helping] prevent inter-ethnic clashes between the indigenous language groups" (1998: 58, 56). Generally most people – as distinct from language activists – do not seem to be resentful towards English, which is accepted as a neutrally convenient vehicle of communication. For most translators, therefore, English is being used as either "*source*-language" (e.g. *from* English into isiZulu/Afrikaans, etc.) or "*target*-language" (e.g. from isiZulu/Afrikaans *into* English). An interesting fact related to the ideal direction for translations is that increasingly larger numbers of translations are done by non-mother-tongue speakers of English.

The argument – logical enough – is that proficiency in one's mother tongue is always higher than in another language, which makes mother tongue the desirable target language in translation. But the question remains: how to handle a situation in which translators are needed for target languages that are not their mother tongue? In South Africa, the target language/lingua franca is English. Furthermore, with the racial diversification of educational institutions and increasing numbers of additional language learners (previously disadvantaged students) becoming educated in urban, English-medium schools, the very concept of English-as-first-language is becoming "a misnomer ... and there seems to be little opportunity for real meaning-making [around EL1 and EL2] to take place"

(McKinney & Soudien 2007: 4). One could ask rhetorically: What mother tongue? Whose mother tongue? However, as the majority of African students have not benefited from ex-Model-C schooling, the issue of remedial English teaching is still highly relevant today.

This is why – as Campbell (1998) has noted – it is counterproductive, in English-speaking countries, to separate the need for English language enhancement from the practice of translation. I also believe in the possibility of – what Beeby (1996) terms – "inverse translation", i.e. of translating into one's non-mother-tongue usefully, if not optimally: a process that can be enhanced by integrated teaching. While this is an approach that has been gaining increasing support among translation scholars (e.g. Pokorn 2005), it is also a reflection of larger shifts in teaching and research models worldwide, away from prescriptivist orientations. In her groundbreaking handbook for trainers, Kelly, for example, starts from the premise that "student groups are becoming *increasingly heterogeneous*, essentially due to internationalization and to the *inclusion of groups previously excluded from, or seriously under-represented in, higher education*" (2005: 51; my emphasis). Accordingly, she encourages trainers to adjust their curricular content and teaching methodology to the needs and expectations of diverse sociocultural contexts (2005: 62-78). Kelly's approach is supported by Kearns, who similarly highlights the need for an increased awareness-cum-adjustment to a "variety of *contexts* in which translator training takes place [especially] in certain cultures of Languages of Limited Diffusion" [as, for example, in multilingual South Africa] where the development of a translation training culture is ... relatively young" (2006: 205-207).

While such comments suggest a refreshing departure from dogmatic, usually decontextualised approaches to translation training, they also imply the need for enhancing English competence – a point I shall pursue later in this paper through a focus on intralanguage translation and pretranslation text analysis (see also Rodrigues & Blaauw 2002).

English Studies: Crisis-ridden Discipline or Blossoming Interdiscipline?

English Studies today ranges across literature, language and culture, and can no longer be neatly compartmentalised, which leads to a growing suspicion regarding forms of disciplinarity that are intolerant of cognate intellectual practices. Scholes, for example, is wary of disciplinarity that devalues the academic collaboration necessary for dealing with the rhetorical, cultural or political challenges/innovations of societies in transition: "We need disciplines in order to think productively. We also need to challenge them in order to think creatively." (1998: 108)

16

Mailloux goes so far as to encourage the establishment of "a multi-disciplinary coalition of rhetoricians" (2000: 23) that would find acceptable, and integrate, a broader range of rhetorical practices beyond any single discipline or specialisation. Jay, for his part, suggests that English Studies, in the current climate of transnationalism, expand its boundaries and acknowledge "literature's relation to the historical processes of globalization" (2001: 33). North boldly announces a "fusion" option (2000) that attempts to bridge the subdisciplinary divides in English Studies thus helping "legitimize" interdisciplinary cooperation, while Downing goes one step further still; he suggests one do "more than just expanding the borders of the canon or becoming increasingly interdisciplinary …. There are possibilities for retooling humanities' labour as running *across a spectrum of disciplinary and extra-, non- or post-disciplinary activities that need not be measured according to a single disciplinary yardstick*" (2002: 34-35; my emphasis).

Current debates in English Studies have also been influenced by the pioneering work of Rob Pope, who sees English as a "shifting site", constantly reforming itself under the global influence of the media and the heterogeneity of cultures. He says (2006: 13): "Looking further into the twenty-first century, we see English both embracing and, to some extent, being displaced by Cultural, Communication, Composition and Media Studies". (In this respect, it is interesting to note that, while Media and Cultural Studies wishes to chart its own field, standard requirements in advertisements for jobs in journalism are "an excellent command of English and a sensitivity to cultural diversity".) Pope continues by saying that English is also embracing/being displaced by *a wide range of other, more or less, interdisciplinary studies ... 'English' is thus recognized to be not so much one fixed subject as a shifting combination of many; not a single discipline, but an interdiscipline* (2006: 13; my emphasis). Pope foregrounds the contribution of Translation Studies: "much of the most significant and insightful work on English, whether at school or university, is inevitably produced by those who can see it at a distance, as an object, and who are not simply subject to it as a matter of course" (2006: 33; for more on Pope's insight into English and/in translation, see also pp. 138-155 and 247-250). This view is also shared by other scholars who draw attention to the need of approaching English less complacently: "[W]e have continued to ignore our 'unmarked' linguistic status and fluently claim our subject as English …. "[O]ur subject can no longer be thought of as 'simply English', but 'beyond English' (and, along with other 'mother tongues') as pointing to language and its fundamental presence in every part of society." (Bleich/Downing 2002: XIII; my emphasis)

While the above observations are relevant to the challenges faced by English Studies internationally, in the region – and with South Africa in mind – there are further layers of significance that need to be addressed: past injustices, multicultural settings and lingua francas. With English as the

17

lingua franca of South Africa, it makes sense to attempt a closer institutional link between the academic interests of English Studies and those of Translation/Intercultural Studies. Briefly, there is a strong case for inter/-postdisciplinary dialogues in countries where – in spite of the wider multilingual circumstances – English is, paradoxically, the main official language in institutions. It is my belief that English Studies should consolidate dialogues with Translation/Intercultural Studies by finding meaningful points of entry to ongoing debates around the redefined role of English. This kind of dialogue implies the need to view translation as part of larger social and civic concerns regarding empowerment through language enhancement, which certainly implies a willingness to grant the act of linguistic transformation the status of textual and social intervention.

It is by engaging in debates on the critical dimensions of text con-struction and reconstruction, with a special emphasis on the role of forma-tive rewriting, that a meaningful link has been attempted between the two disciplines. In more general terms – and taking into account dramatic drops of student enrolment for English literature internationally – it is by fostering a new attitude towards writing/communication that one could possibly resuscitate students' interest in taking English as a university subject: a subject that goes beyond literature. Research conducted over the last decade or so (e.g. Goodman 2007, Pope [2002]2006 and [1995]2000; Downing 2002) has focused on curricular transformation along the above lines. Pope's by-now famous concept of "textual intervention" (Pope [1995] 2000) is an important contribution towards overcoming the current impasse; he suggests that one regard texts (literary, as well as nonliterary) not merely as products to be analysed, but also as processes requiring creative inter-vention. The need for training imaginative readers/interpreters of texts (catered for by the traditional approach) has to be linked with the newly re-defined need for "textual intervention" as active rewriting of the texts to be analysed. The new approach requires that – in order to better understand various text types – students should intervene in their construction and reconstruction: instead of viewing texts as fixed products, students should submit them to successive moments of renarration as process. This process is also referred to as "re-centring" or "re-genreing", and is based on the generation of various kinds of "parallel", "alternative" and "counter-texts" (writing with, across and against the grain of the initial text), as well as exercises in paraphrase, imitation, parody, adaptation, hybridisation and collage (Pope [1995]2000: XIV). Such acts could also be referred to as "re-creation ... re-membering and re-familiarisation" (Pope 2005: XVII). This invites one "to see through the existing possibilities to words and worlds beyond, as well as between; and it encourages a view of difference that is genuinely otherwise ... a whole with a hole in the middle" (p. 88). Pope's declared aim of engaging with renarration/recreation is fundamentally hermeneutic: "The best way to understand a text as product is to change it;

to play around with it, to intervene in it in some way (large or small), and then to try to account for the exact effect of what you have done." ([1995]2000: 1) The main message here is that interpretation is (textual) intervention, which clearly brings to mind famous statements by translation scholars, e.g. George Steiner's dictum: "Understanding is translation. Inside or between languages, human communication equals translation" (1975: 47); as well as Hermans's recent call for approaching translation from a hermeneutic perspective (2007).

The parallel between the new orientation in English Studies and the hermeneutic approach to Translation Studies is striking, and definitions of "textual intervention" (Pope) and "rewriting" (Lefevere) are worth pursuing in the teaching of both disciplines. Translators, as well as literary critics, journalists, copywriters or editors, etc., are constantly rewriting texts, for they are "image-makers who have the power of subversion under the guise of objectivity" (Lefevere 1992: 7). Translators have always engaged in acts of "textual intervention" or "re-creation" through which they can exert the power of introducing new concepts, new genres, and various linguistic innovations, whether as image- or decision-makers, cultural mediators or negotiators. This phenomenon begs larger contextualising questions related to who rewrites, for whom, what for, and under what circumstances. As Lefevere aptly comments: "Rewriting manipulates and is effective. [It is] a way to restore to a certain study of literature some of the more immediate social relevance the study of literature as a whole has lost." (1992: 9) Rather than dwell on by-now clichéd perceptions of translation as servile imitation of an "original" [sic!] – I would add that it is helpful to consider translation as a form of "rewriting" or "textual intervention/re-creation"; this would be in keeping with recent debates in Translation Studies, debates that fore-ground translation's intrinsic social relevance, and inevitably apply well beyond the boundaries of literary/cultural studies. It is precisely the often ignored dimension of translation as both textual *and* social intervention that should encourage academic conversations across disciplines, e.g. Translation and English/Media Studies.

Beyond Disciplinarity (in Institutional Contexts): Interdisciplinary Study Tracks

Tendencies to define English Studies – as outlined by Pope and others – are reflected in academic restructuring in various South African universities. I shall use the Faculty of Humanities, more exactly the UKZN (Durban) English Department, as a case in point. This department has pioneered a number of educational initiatives against the backdrop of both voluntary restructuring and an imposed merger. With old disciplinary boundaries under constant renegotiation, new sub-/interdisciplinary study tracks (based

19

on a modular approach) have been integrated into mainstream academic teaching commitments, "in a spirit of challenging dated and codified definitions of our discipline" (Green 2000: 57). This has prompted us to diversify "beyond literature", and – taking our cue from Pope's (2002), [2002]2006 suggested three-track system – to develop courses on language/creative writing and culture. It is against this background that I have gone one step further still, beyond the by-now well-established link with cultural studies, to engage with *intercultural studies*, including the theory and practice of translation. It is against this background, I reiterate, that the translation/intercultural study track I have conceptualised has found a favourable niche, thus adding value to departmental efforts to expand the scope of the discipline. Here I support the modular approach to teaching, both in English and Intercultural Studies. From the point of view of the latter, a modular approach – that normally offers semi-autonomous study units while at the same time, cumulatively, forming a coherent whole – makes it possible to "mainstream" translation and related courses by making them part of existing cognate majors/structures, rather than to continue to ghetto-ise them in rigidly formulated, and notoriously undersubscribed, translation majors, as is mostly the case both locally and globally.

As can be seen in the diagram at the end of this article, the modules that form the Translation/Intercultural Communication study track suggest an attempt at going beyond single disciplinarity by bridging two primary study fields: English and Media Studies. Horizontal arrows on the diagram suggest *horizontal articulation/coherence*: students from each discipline may cross over into the other via the cognate interdisciplinary modules listed in the diagram. The track comprises cognate modules (which are, in the first instance, electives in either the English or the Media major). *Vertical* arrows – indicating the progression from undergraduate to postgraduate studies – suggest that, although the modules can be taken independently of one another, they also offer students the opportunity, should they so wish, to accumulate translation-related skills, which will stand them in good stead in the world of work, whether English- or Media-related. In what follows, I shall offer a brief overview of the modules that form the interdisciplinary study track, and of how they have been interlinked. For ease of reference, see diagram at the end of the article.[1]

Intercultural Communication, both as study field and as 2nd-year/1st-semester module on offer at UKZN, introduces students to the fundamentals of cross-cultural transfer. (This is the reason why this module is placed at

---

1.   The diagram illustrates the above-mentioned study track in relation to two cognate disciplines, i.e. as offered at UKZN in the last few years. Annual adjustments (curricular, staffing/workload, etc.) are, of course, inevitable, but they involve only slight modifications, which do not affect the main principles of interdisciplinary cooperation.

the beginning of the study track.) While the course trains students to deal with intercultural situations – whether in the English- or media-fields – it also seeks to promote (on the vertical axis) an active engagement with language-based translation as social practice: an approach to be pursued in a 2nd-semester course (see below).

The general aim of the introductory module is to provide students with a conceptual framework within which to raise questions such as: In South Africa, one of the most pluralist societies in the world, how can one best establish national consensus and global competitiveness, while at the same time protecting the complex character of its many languages and cultures? How do the local media present diversity, in both the domestic and international arena? How do the English print media or advertising companies reflect multicultural issues, and what can be done to increase the industry's intercultural awareness?

To answer such questions, students will be exposed to debates – e.g. Samovar & Porter 2001, Hall 2002 – about the influence of culture on communication, the emphasis being on the impact of vast cultural systems on intercultural dynamics, in terms of – to borrow C.S. Peirce's (1966) terminology – "abduction" (projection into the foreign), "induction" (immersion in the foreign/other) and "deduction" (intercultural awareness). At the end of the module, students should be able to classify/apply established intercultural taxonomies to everyday situations; recognise patterns of verbal processes in intercultural encounters; interpret and contextualise certain nonverbal communicational clues of action, space, time, silence; reduce intercultural misunderstanding and develop strategies of "translating"/ negotiating communication difficulties. Theoretical underpinnings include recent evaluations of well-established taxonomies of cultural patterns – Hofstede's (1984) individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity/femininity; Kluckhohn & Strodt-beck's (1961) value orientations: human nature, person/nature, time, activity, social relationships; E.T. Hall's (1976) high/low context orientation and his (1983) monochronic/polychronic time; B. Hall's (2002) classifications of "fundamental attribution errors" of stereotyping, prejudice and ethnocentrism (pp. 199-231).

Once students have mastered the fundamentals of cultural patterns and stereotyping via established taxonomies, they are asked – in the examinations – to identify and critically reflect on such fundamentals in familiar text types: How did the given media/literary text(s) construct encounters of inter-cultural relevance? What cultural patterns were foregrounded? Can you identify instances of stereotyping or prejudice in reporting? How would you rewrite this text to avoid the "fundamental attribution error" of stereo-typing?

Insights into cultural patterns and the risks of intercultural misunderstandings, therefore, aim to sensitise students culturally, and prepare them to embark on the more language-oriented module, to be described below. Such

21

preparation is advocated by Katan, whose book, tellingly titled *Translating Cultures* (2004), brings the "cultural turn" in Translation Studies to cognate disciplines, by highlighting the role of culture in perceiving, constructing and translating reality across diverse groups. The tendency to make inter-cultural communication skills part of liberal arts (including translation) education is gaining ground, a phenomenon also noted by Kelly, who lists "cultural and intercultural competence" (2005: 32) among the core compe-tences required of graduates; it is an approach that goes beyond simply acquiring encyclopaedic knowledge (cf. the traditional "Civilization" courses). As Kelly puts it, "it is essential to acquire competence [including experiential competence in one's] working cultures' perceptions, myths, values, stereotypes" (2005: 74).

Translation and Intercultural Communication is the next module in the study track (see diagram/Appendix). This is a 2nd-year/2nd-semester module focusing on *interlanguage* translation. Like all the other courses in the study track under discussion, Translation and Intercultural Communi-cation can be taken as a self-contained unit; however, most students come to it via the course described above and, therefore, would already be familiar with the main principles of intercultural communication. While the lectures on generic/transferable theoretical translation principles are conducted in English (which is the one language shared by all), for the practical work students are divided into language-specific groups.

The module is informed by the tenets of the Skopos or Action School of Translation (Nord 1997), which promotes an emphasis on concrete com-municative situations of translation as social activity – e.g. what social forces initiate and control translation as "textual intervention", and what cognitive processes take place when people translate under specific circum-stances. Based on my experience so far, I believe that this approach is suited to the needs of South African students more generally, in that it emphasises practical realism beyond linguistic purism, as well as awareness of translation as social practice. By teaching students the complexities of the social processes involved in translation, we implicitly teach them how to use translation as "social intervention", and how to engage as social mediators in conflictual situations – skills sorely needed in a country still struggling with the legacy of a linguistically divisive past.

In the first part, students are initiated into doing a *"pre-translation text analysis"* (Nord 1991, Kussmaul 1995; my emphasis), which is a welcome "warm-up" phase meant to ease the way into the full integration of applied translation principles and strategies. Current international debates around the role of Discourse Analysis in translator training (e.g. Schäffner 2002) inform this section of the module; the main aim of this type of text analysis is to help students identify potential translation pitfalls and to take appropriate translation decisions (having overcome cross-language inter-

ferences). By alerting students to the complexities of the social processes involved in interlanguage transformations, translation trainers implicitly teach them how to play a responsible role in society. Making active and informed choices about how, as a translator, to engage in "intercultural cooperation" (Nord 1991: 28-29) with the various factors – involved in the translation process – has certainly more than purely linguistic implications: in learning how to invest texts with social meaning, students are also learning how, in real-life communication situations, to engage as cultural mediators and negotiators. In exams, an example of a translation brief might be:

a)   The initiator of this translation is the head of the language services division of the Metro City Council, and s/he requires the given text for a newsletter aimed at an isiZulu-speaking target readership that is largely female, rural, and over the age of sixty.

b)   Once you have adjusted the social function and effect of the target text to the needs of the target readership, briefly reflect on whether your intervention supports Nord's statement that "[t]he function of the target text is not arrived at automatically from an analysis of the source text, but is pragmatically defined by the purpose of the intercultural communication" (1991: 9).

This functional, "profession-based and learner-centred, approach advocated by the Skopos theory admirably combin[es] professional realism with pedagogical progression" (Kelly & Way 2007: 3) and constitutes itself into a unifying concept for all the modules of the study track under discussion. This approach also fits well with debates regarding "rewriting" and "textual intervention" in English Studies (Pope 2000 and 2005, as discussed above). Students of English Studies, for example, find useful the tools of critical intervention of pretranslation text analysis (done in English), while an in-depth pragmatic analysis of text typology strengthens the future media practitioners' competence in operating intralanguage translations (as when they switch from one register to another). Both emphases – on translation-oriented text analysis and on translation as textual-cum-social intervention, as espoused by the functional approach – help form core skills for translating, as well as for editing, revising and rewriting, as I will suggest in the last subsection.

Intralanguage Translation and Communication. This is a generic designation: that is, it may be applied to a range of courses that focus on same-language transfers or rewritings between different text types, e.g. literary and journalistic. The current module, "Literature and Journalism", is one possible designation-cum-embodiment of principles at stake in such an approach; it offers models of how practically to cross over, and how to interpret the crossover, from one mode of writing to another: journalistic to

literary, and vice versa. Students are introduced to the techniques of journalistic writing and to ways of transferring meaning across genres, including rewriting/translating between genres, albeit in the same language. Same-language transfer skills of rewriting also form the core business of other modules in English Studies, e.g. "Performance and Text", where the emphasis falls on crossing over from the oral and visual in performance, to the written modes within the same language; or, "Narrative and Popular Forms", which focuses on the translatability of meaning between various narrative conventions, ranging from myths and legends, to romance, bestseller and horror genres.

Whatever the exact focus of such a course, its underlying aim is to foreground (whether implicitly or explicitly) principles of intralanguage translation and help students negotiate meaning across diverse genres and conventions of representability. Students are also alerted to possible misunderstandings based on unfamiliar, culture-specific contextual assumptions, which may inadvertently produce imprecise, incomprehensible or offensive formulations that have the potential of creating intercultural tensions, misunderstandings, and even conflict. As Rodrigues and Blaauw (2002) have shown, through rewriting or "dis-ambiguating" unintentionally incorrect or misleading formulations – in English – students are not only enhancing their English competence, but are also initiated into skills of (intralanguage) translation, becoming "go-betweens for the two active partners in the construction of meaning" (p. 224).

Courses on intralanguage translation are inspired by recent research in the discourse approach to intercultural/genre communication, also referred to as "interdiscourse communication" (Scollon & Scollon 2003: XII), which analyses verbal interactions across diverse cultural, professional and generational groups. The focus can also be on interdiscourse aspects of communications between speakers of English (as lingua franca) and another language – in the case of South Africa, an African language – with a view to demystifying the falsely perceived "universal nature" of certain cultural patterns as embodied in English language usage. Scollon & Scollon draw attention to the fact that "many aspects of Western culture, especially Western patterns of discourse, which ultimately lead to confusion or to misinterpretation in intercultural communication, are carried within English, and are also transmitted through the process of the teaching and learning of English" (2003: 4).

More specifically, students learn how to unpack and rewrite (English to English) the text's communicative function and cultural values; how to adjust changes in context and register; how to "dis-ambiguate" inaccurate formulations based on certain cultural expectations; how to re-encode missing information, etc. The exam requires them to produce intralanguage translations between various text types, or to analyse a news event as constructed by different dailies, and then to rewrite the same news event so

as to make it publishable in, say, a student newspaper. Rewriting headlines or captions is also a useful exercise in learning how to distinguish between who is speaking and who is silenced, whose opinions are omitted and why, how to interpret the distinction between the literal and the metaphoric significance of words. Needless to say, such skills are invaluable for any future translator or editor.

Modules of this type are of particular relevance for South African students today, as translation (not only inter-, but also intralanguage) in this country needs to teach people how to operate in a functionally multicultural world. As anticipated at the beginning of the paper, intralanguage translation may be profitably used to help enhance English language skills; for second-language speakers, in particular, this becomes a linguistically and socially valuable exercise in itself. This type of module emphasises the function of translation (in this instance, via its intralanguage aspect) as a form of social, cultural and critical intervention that plays a crucial role in civil living. Students become increasingly aware that the exercise in intralanguage trans-formation is also a form of intercultural intervention and mediation. The module also helps them refine their general writing skills, as well as their critical thinking and decision-making potential; translation is shown to function as process, the translator as imaginative reader and creative rewriter of texts.

Editing and Communication is a 3rd-year, 2nd-semester course. Like the other modules in the Intercultural Communication study track, it is an optional, semi-autonomous module in the English or Media majors. If taken as part of the interdisciplinary modular track under scrutiny here, Editing and Communication forms the logical end-stage of the translation process; that is, it aims to bring the finishing touches to the translation process, whether interlanguage or intralanguage. At the same time, it prepares students for other, translation-related, professional areas in the world of work, mainly editing and publishing. I believe that a module on editing has a much wider scope than that of ensuring stylistic accuracy; it is also meant to encompass revising and rewriting as a "mind-set", and editing as act of "communication" (as reflected in the course designation). The latter under-standing of rewriting/revising can, of course, be considered to be omni-present throughout the translation process: one constantly repositions one-self by readjusting the text as one goes along, as Lefevere (1992) famously declared when defining translation not as an act of servile imitation, but fundamentally as an act of "creative rewriting".

This notwithstanding, I found it useful in this module to have a distinct *post-translation/post-editing* study unit built in at the end of the Translation track, a stage where students are encouraged to reflect on both the trans-lation/editing problems encountered along the way, and on the choices made to overcome them, and to do so by employing an adequate critical and terminological vocabulary. Students learn how to use TAPs or "think-aloud-

25

protocols": i.e. problem-solving opportunities based on "introspection and conscious observation" (Kussmaul 1995: 6), according to which they critically reflect on their translatorial and/or editorial interventions. At the end-stage of the writing/translation process, students critically contrast their translatorial-cum-editorial interventions with the demands of the given brief. I found Nord's above-mentioned application of functionalism most useful at this stage as well; it is an approach that highlights "function *plus* loyalty" (1997: 123), with the latter emphasising the desired nature of the relationships between the various agents (or participating parties) not only in the translation, but also in the editing/publishing scene. Just as translators are called upon to mediate equitably between two textual actions (at the level of source text and target text), so editors and publishers are called to bring to bear ethical considerations when they perceive too great a discrepancy between, say, the text as originally submitted for revision and the edited end product; and just as translators have to determine the "function-in-culture" of the source text, while at the same time taking into account the commissioner's requirements, so too must editors show loyalty to both horizons of expectation – by "balancing the interests" (Mossop 2001: 5) of clients, publishers, professional associations and other social gatekeepers.

In examinationss, students are requested to rewrite a given text (English to English) for an audience with a different "receiver" profile. A typical examination task-sheet, accordingly, would simulate the real-life expectations of an editing brief:

a) Rewrite the given article from the *Sunday Times* in a register that is appropriate to the imagined publication, Dorling Kindersley's series *Eyewitness Guides* – a large-format, heavily illustrated publication using a style popular with teenagers. You will need to be extremely selective about the amount of information you present to the reader, as well as the register you choose. You may have to delete repetitive information and rearrange the original's structure, as well as pay careful attention to achieving the appropriate balance between relevant content and adequate language use.

b) Critically reflect on the nature of your editorial intervention by justifying your decision to include/exclude information, and the manner in which it is presented, including references to visual aids.

The study track continues at postgraduate level with the modules ***Writing across Worlds*** and ***Intercultural Communication and Translation***. Both courses make use of literary texts as primary sources for the analysis of intercultural tensions and dynamics (on the South/North, East/West and South/South axis). In their intention and design, they build upon the theories, as well as the practices, of the undergraduate study track which I

have discussed. The modules draw on key theoretical methodologies of cultural translation – largely postcolonial in outlook, as promoted by, inter alia, Bassnett/Trivedi 2000, Apter 2006, Baker 2006 – which shifts the focus from translation as linguistic end product trapped in rigid expectations of "linguistic fidelity to an original" (what is an "original", anyway!?) to translation as a multilayered process conducive to, and profoundly influenced by, complex sociocultural relationships.

Recent postgraduate research projects have addressed the following research questions/topics: "Referring to selected sections of Marlene van Niekerk's novel, *Triomf*, discuss the translation strategies employed by Leon de Kock in his English rendition. To what extent, if at all, have the translation norms operating in English affected the original's meaning, intention and form?" Or, "Several English translations have been produced of James Stuart's isiZulu recording of the 'Praises of King Dingaan'. By contrasting the English versions of Daniel Malcolm and Princess Magogo kaDinuzulu, respectively, reflect on the transfer of culturally specific concepts, their underlying ideological assumptions, and the extent to which the choice of translation strategies has influenced the impact of this isiZulu praise poem on the English-speaking receiving culture".

The "cultural turn" in Translation Studies – recently revisited by Wolf (2006), who goes so far as to call for a "social turn": an emphasis on the social and historical differences embedded in linguistic differences – is underscored by a healthy scepticism of "universal" linguistic essences. It is an emphasis on the cultural needs of the target/receiving culture (rather than the "sacrosanct" nature of the source text) that informs recent approaches. Such theories highlight the identity-forming power of language transfer in translation and the active consequences of translation-related decision-making in a multicultural context. The approach helps restore a sense of balance between source text and target text, by shifting from a subject/object division to a subject/subject equivalence. To put it another way, the goal is to seek intercultural communication, or its social equivalent of mutual respect.

APPENDIX – STUDY TRACK
(Translation/Intercultural Communication, UKZN)

UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

MEDIA STUDIES "major"	INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION STUDY TRACK	ENGLISH STUDIES "major"
(x) 2nd YEAR	(z) 2nd YEAR	(y) 2nd YEAR
First Semester		
Media 2A modules	Intercultural Communication	English 2A modules
Second Semester		
Media 2B modules	Translation and Intercultural Communication	English 2B modules
(x) 3rd YEAR	(z) 3rd YEAR	(y) 3rd YEAR
First Semester		
Media 3A modules	Literature and Journalism	English 3A modules
Second Semester		
Media 3B modules	Editing & Communication	English 3B modules
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES		
Media Postgrad. Modules	Intercult. Comm/Translation Writing Across Worlds Supervision (Transl./English/Media)	English Postgrad. Modules

References

Apter, E.
2006   *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature.* Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Baker, M.
2006   *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account.* London & New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. & Trivedi, H. (eds)
2000   *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice.* London & New York: Routledge.

Beeby, A.
1996   *Teaching Translation from Spanish to English.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

Bleich, D., Hurlbert, C.M. & Mathieu, P.
2002   Foreword: It's About Time We Go "Beyond English". In: Downing, D.B. et al. (eds) *Beyond English: Curricular Reform in a Global Economy.* Portsmouth: Heinemann. (Boynton/Cook), pp. IX-XIII.

Bourdieu, P.
1992   *Language and Symbolic Power.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Campbell, S.
1998   *Translation into Second Language.* New York: Longman.

de Klerk, V.
2000   Language Shift in Grahamstown: A Case Study of Selected Xhosa-Speakers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 146: 87-110.

2002   Language Issues in Our Schools: Whose Voice Counts? *Perspectives in Education* 20(1): 1-14.

de Klerk, V. & Gough, D.
2002   Black South African English. In: Mesthrie, R. (ed.) *Language in South Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 356-378.

Dimitriu, I.
2001   Academic Restructuring and Modularity in the Humanities: The Role and Meaning of Translation Training in the South African Context. In: Thelen, M. (ed.) *Translation and Meaning.* Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht, pp. 207-216.

2002   Translation, Diversity and Power: An Introduction. *Current Writing* 14(2). Special issue: *Translation, Diversity and Power*, pp. I-XIV.

Downing, D.B., Hurlbert, C.M. & Mathieu, P.
2002   Beyond Disciplinary English: Integrating Reading and Writing by Reforming Academic Labour. In: Downing, D.B. et al. (eds) *Beyond English: Curricular Reform in a Global Economy.* Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, pp. 23-38.

Finchilescu, G. & G. Nyawose, G.
1998   Talking about Language: Zulu Students' Views on Language in the New South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology* 28(2): 53-61.

Goodman, S. et al. (eds)
2007   *Redesigning English.* London & New York: Routledge.

Green, M.
2000   Nouns for the Adjective: New Directions in English Studies. *English Academy Review* 17: 55-63.
Hall, B.
2002   *Among Cultures: The Challenge of Communication.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
Hall, E.T.
1976   *Beyond Culture.* Garden City NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
1983   *The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time.* Garden City NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
Hermans, T.
2007   *The Conference of the Tongues.* Manchester: St Jerome.
Hofstede, G.
1984   *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values.* Beverly Hills: Sage.
1991   *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* London: McGraw Hill.
Jay, P.
2001   Beyond Discipline? Globalization and the Future of English. *PMLA* 116(1): 32-47.
Kamwamgamalu, N.
2003   Social Change and Language Shift: South Africa. *Review of Applied Linguistics* 23: 225-242.
2004   The Language Policy/Language Economics Interface and Mother-tongue Education in Post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 28(2): 134-146.
Katan, D.
[1999]2004   *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators.* Manchester: St Jerome.
Kearns, J.
2006   In the Broader Context: Reflections on Curricular Design Principles for Training Translators. In: Kearns, J. (ed.) *New Vistas in Translator and Interpreter Training.* Special issue of *Translation Ireland* 17(1): 205-218.
Kelly, D.
2005   *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice.* Manchester: St Jerome.
Kelly, D. & Way, C.
2007   Editorial. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 1(1): 1-13.
Klopper, D. (ed.)
2002   *Language and Empowerment.* Special issue of *English Academy Review* 19.
Kluckhohn, F.R. & Strodtbeck, F.L.
1961   *Variations in Value Orientations.* Evanston: IL: Row & Peterson.
Kussmaul, P.
1995   *Training the Translator.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
Lefevere, A.
1992   *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London & New York: Routledge.

McKinney, C. & Soudien. C.
　2007　　　　Editorial. *Language, Identity and English Education in South Africa.* Special issue of *English Academy Review* 24(2): 1-5.

Mailloux, S.
　2000　　　　Disciplinary Identities: On the Rhetorical Paths between English and Communication Studies. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30(2): 5-29.

Makubalo, G.
　2007　　　　"I Don't Know ... It Contradicts": Identity Construction and the Use of English by High School Learners in a Desegregated School Space. *English Academy Review* 24(2): 25-41.

Mossop, B.
　1997　　　　*Translating as Purposeful Activity.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.
　2001　　　　*Revising and Editing for Translators.* London: St Jerome. *Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

North, S.
　2000　　　　*Refiguring the PhD in English Studies.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Peirce, C.S.
　1966　　　　*Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce,* edited by C. Hartshorne, P. Weiss & A.W. Burks. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pokorn, N.
　2005　　　　*Challenging the Traditional Axioms: Translation into a Non-Mother Tongue.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pope, R.
　[1995]2000　*Textual Intervention: Critical and Creative Strategies for Literary Studies.* London & New York: Routledge.
　2005　　　　*Creativity: Theory, History, Practice.* London & New York: Routledge.
　[2002]2006　*The English Studies Book.* 2nd edition. London & New York: Routledge.

Rodrigues, R. & Blaauw, J.
　2002　　　　Negotiating the Communication Process: A Partnership Approach to Translation. *Current Writing* 14(2): Special issue: *Translation, Diversity and Power*, pp. 213-228.

Rudwick, S.
　2004　　　　"Zulu, We Need it For Our Culture": Umlazi Adolescents in the Post-Apartheid State. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Languages Studies* 22(3/4): 159-172.

Samovar, L.A. &. Porter, R.E.
　2001　　　　*Communication between Cultures.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schäffner, C.
　2002　　　　Discourse Analysis for Translation and Translator Training: Status, Needs, Methods. In: Schäffner, C. (ed.) *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translation Training.* Clevedon, Buffolo, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters.

Scholes, R.
　1998　　　　*The Rise and Fall of English.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

31

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S.W.
[1995]2003   *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach.* Oxford: Black-
              well.
Soudien, C.
2004   Constituting the Class: An Analysis of the Process of "Integration" in
              South African Schools. In: Chisholm, L. *Changing Class: Education
              and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa.* Cape Town:
              HSRC Press, pp. 89-113.
Steiner, G.
1975   *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation.* New York &
              London: Oxford University Press.
Wolf, M.
2006   *Übersetzen, Translating, Traduire: Towards a "Social Turn"?* Wien:
              Lit Verlag.

Ileana Dimitriu
University of KwaZulu-Natal
dimitriu@ukzn.ac.za