

BENNETT, Karen and QUEIROZ DE BARROS, Rita, eds. (2019):
Hybrid Englishes and the Challenges of and for Translation: Identity, Mobility and Language Change. London/New York: Routledge, 238 p.

Javier Adrada

Volume 65, numéro 2, août 2020

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1075850ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075850ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (imprimé)

1492-1421 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Adrada, J. (2020). Compte rendu de [BENNETT, Karen and QUEIROZ DE BARROS, Rita, eds. (2019): *Hybrid Englishes and the Challenges of and for Translation: Identity, Mobility and Language Change.* London/New York: Routledge, 238 p.] *Meta*, 65(2), 526–529. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075850ar>

entre sourciers et ciblistes pour expliquer, dans son introduction, que Luther était un cibliste avant l'heure (à quelques exceptions près, p. 37), avant d'opter elle-même pour cette même approche dans sa traduction: ton sur ton. Et il faut ici se réjouir de pouvoir disposer de l'original allemand en vis-à-vis de la traduction française. Cette approche se manifeste en particulier dans la traduction de certaines images: ainsi, l'allemand *so steht das arme Volk da wie eine Kuh* est-il traduit par *le pauvre peuple reste là comme une poule qui aurait trouvé un couteau* (développé p. 25), *die feisten, reiche rotte des grossen hansens* devenant *ces tas de gros richards* (p. 126-127), ou tel critique de la traduction de Luther se retrouvant qualifié, assez poétiquement, de *chieur d'encre* et *pisseur de copie* (Sudler et Sudeler, en allemand, p. 78-79). Ce choix, finalement, revient à ressusciter Luther au XXI^e siècle. Est-ce pour autant une traduction totalement cibliste? Oui, par le choix des images. Mais peut-être pas par la conservation de la violence du propos (même si on trouve deux atténuations sans conséquences: p. 66 et 100-101). Martin Luther s'exprimerait-il avec autant de brutalité de nos jours, c'est-à-dire à une époque où la violence est perçue comme infiniment moins acceptable? Et si oui, où cela le situerait-il dans la galaxie de la prédication contemporaine? Conserver cette brutalité est-il une forme de respect historique, ou cela ne revient-il pas à légitimer les théologiens, quelle que soit la religion dont ils se réclament, d'aujourd'hui qui font eux-mêmes preuve d'une violence similaire? Alors, document historiographique, œuvre traductologique ou outil de prédication? Les notes de bas de page ne se privent pas, en tout cas, de rectifier certains non-dits ou certaines exagérations de Luther (p. 127 et 144, notamment), ou de faire ressortir la posture théologique qui l'amène à certains choix (p. 142). Et bien sûr, il aurait été impossible de faire de bonne foi l'impasse sur le caractère abject des écrits antisémites dont s'est par la suite rendu coupable cet auteur (p. 36, notamment). Ce n'est en tout cas pas le moindre des mérites de cet ouvrage que de nous donner les éléments pour réfléchir à l'ensemble de ces questions, textes à l'appui.

Il est une dernière raison de se réjouir de cette publication. Elle pourrait fort bien ouvrir sur un champ de recherche nouveau: est-ce qu'on est mieux traduit par ses partisans ou par ses adversaires? Après tout, la première traduction du Coran en latin fut l'œuvre du théologien catholique Pierre le Vénérable, et commanditée par l'Église, pour mieux connaître et réfuter l'ennemi... À mettre en regard de cette phrase de Luther lui-même:

Ah, l'art de la traduction n'est pas à la portée du premier venu [...]: pour bien traduire, il faut un

cœur juste, pieux, loyal, persévérant, fervent, chrétien, savant, compétent et expérimenté. Je considère par conséquent qu'il est impossible à un mauvais chrétien ou à un esprit sectaire de faire une traduction fidèle. (p. 51)

À débattre, donc...

NICOLAS FROELIGER

Université de Paris/Université Paris-Diderot,
Paris, France

NOTES

1. YOURCENAR, Marguerite (1968): *L'œuvre au noir*. Paris: Gallimard.
2. MACHIAVEL, Nicolas (XV-XVI^e s./1952): *Œuvres complètes*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard.
3. GIONO, Jean (1963/2012): *Le Désastre de Pavie – 24 février 1525*. Folio – Histoire. Paris: Gallimard.

RÉFÉRENCES

- BOCQUET, Catherine, A. (2000): *L'Art de la traduction selon Martin Luther, ou lorsque le traducteur se fait missionnaire*. Traductologie. Arras: Artois Presses Université.
- HERMANS, Theo (1985): *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Londres/New York: Routledge.
- LADMIRAL, Jean-René (1997): Les quatre âges de la traductologie — Réflexions sur une diachronie de la théorie de la traduction. In: *L'histoire et les théories de la traduction: les actes*. (Colloque international *L'histoire et les théories de la traduction*, Genève, 3-5 octobre 1996). Berne/Genève: ASTTI/ETI, 11-42.
- MESCHONNIC, Henri (2002): *Au Commencement – Traduction de la Genèse*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- MOUNIN, Goerges (1955): *Les Belles infidèles*. Paris: Cahiers du Sud.

BENNETT, Karen and QUEIROZ DE BARROS, Rita, eds. (2019): *Hybrid Englishes and the Challenges of and for Translation: Identity, Mobility and Language Change*. London/New York: Routledge, 238 p.

Hybrid Englishes and the Challenges of and for Translation, edited by Karen Bennett and Rita Queiroz de Barros, approaches linguistic hybridity in the current context of a paradigm shift that we are witnessing in Translation Studies. Bennett and Queiroz de Barros' volume provides concrete examples of a new trend in translation research that seeks to branch out to new linguistic contexts, on this occasion exploring translational issues with hybrid Englishes.

Until recently, linguistic hybridity was considered a sign of impurity. The traces of a foreign language, often viewed as inferior – as the Other's tongue, were considered to be contaminating the superior status of one's native language. However, as a consequence of large-scale migration, technological progression, and economic globalisation, this understanding of linguistic hybridity is now obsolete. Nowadays, the movement of peoples and communicative scenarios in cities and cyberspaces make daily use of all available languages and semiotic codes in a specific manner that combines them in unprecedented processes of hybridisation.

English and its many variations, both on and offline, are salient examples of such a paradigm shift, as well as of contemporary hybridity. The outdated conception of English as a bounded and uniform system, separate from other languages, has been replaced by other proposals. One such proposal arose from the arrival of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) at the turn of the century. Additionally, the recent success of a multi- or translingual paradigm highlights that English can no longer be considered a self-contained language. The attitude towards hybridity has therefore changed in all cultural spheres. The varieties of English that the official British form tried to silence in the public domain have recently started to demand recognition as standards.

Although this subject has gained a significant scholarly recognition, Bennett and Queiroz de Barros' work addresses it from a rather original perspective. It analyses how the phenomenon of hybridity affects the theory and practice of translation, focusing on the variegated hybrid Englishes that are spoken, written and *translated* over the globe. The volume successfully problematises the question of how it is possible, or even conceivable, to translate from or into English when hybridity is present in the source text, especially taking into account that languages can no longer be considered bounded systems.

The volume seems to assume, and is to some extent based on, a multi- or translingual paradigm. However, we could perhaps detect a slight incoherence. The mentioned paradigm states that languages are not delimited and enclosed apparatuses; instead, they constitute a scattered, ceaseless net of linguistic confluences all over the world. Why, then, does the volume talk about *hybridity* if it is defined as the occasional convergence of tongues, therefore understood as bounded systems? Bennett, who admits in the introduction that the term is to some extent conservative, adduces two reasons for having opted for its use. First, due to its broadness and versatility among a wide range of disciplines, and second, because the present work was born from a special issue on

translation and international English. This special issue received several papers that revolved around hybrid manifestations of English, rather than the lingua franca that Bennett and Queiroz de Barros had at first envisaged.

It is also important to mention a further controversial aspect of the volume, that is, the variety of discourses present in the volume. Each contributing author appears to write their chapter in a different style. Once again, Bennett offers a convincing explanation, that is, that this heterogeneity should not be considered a sign of irregularity or inconsistency, but a smart vindication of hybridity. Bennett and Queiroz de Barros use the term *polyvocality* to define the volume's variety of discourses, which allows multiple "voices to proliferate from different disciplinary worlds" (p. 13). Together with a multi- or translingual paradigm, the polyvocality of the book aims to change "the very construction of knowledge in the Western world."

The volume is made up of three well-structured sections. The first section studies the importance of translation for the constitution of contemporary identities, taking as examples the testimonies of journeyers, migrants and individuals who have grown up in cultural borderlands. In consonance with this, Fiona Doloughan's opening chapter addresses the widely known writings of Xiaolu Guo, whose deeply Chinese-inflected English evolves, in terms of hybridity, as she experiences life on foreign soil and her identity is re-forged and broadened by new cultural environments. Doloughan's reflection leads to the interesting idea that a migrant writer is constantly trying to "construct a version of self that is always already in translation" (p. 24).

The second chapter, by África Vidal, is dedicated to two Chicana authors, namely Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherrie Moraga, who were raised on the boundary between different cultures and languages. They speak and write a mestizo tongue which meshes English, Spanish, and even Nahuatl. Vidal explores both Chicana authors' works in terms of their use of this idiosyncratic linguistic variety, and she does so with a certain purpose: to prove that hybridity is a reflex of cultural and racial asymmetries and therefore a weapon to dissolve them.

In the third chapter, Stefania Taviano studies diasporic Arab Hip Hop. Taviano argues that Arab and English coexist in this musical genre as a reciprocal translation in a multimodal code. Similar to the Chicana writers in the previous chapter, Taviano explores these hip-hop artists in terms of their display of a contentious attitude, inasmuch as they intend to denounce instances of cultural oppression all over the world, such as the plight of the Palestinians.

The first section closes with the volume's fourth chapter, written by Sohomyjit Ray. Ray looks back in time to the Opium Wars through Amitav Ghosh's *Sea of Poppies*.¹ Ghosh's novel is set on board a ship, in which his characters are travelling from Calcutta to Mauritius in an extremely multilingual bedlam. Ray reflects on the (un)translatability of this literary, purposeful infringement of anglonormativity, and at the same time considers Gosh's work a manifestation of a multi- or translingual paradigm.

The second section faces one of the crucial questions of the volume, that is, what possible procedures or strategies might a translator employ in order to recreate the hybrid discourse of translingual authors in the target language? In the first instance, this question is explored by Isabel Oliveira Martins, Margarida Vale de Gato and Conceição Castel-Branco. They offer a discussion of the practical and technical difficulties tackled by the *PEPAL in Trans - Portuguese-English Platform for Anthologies of Literary Translation* project,² which is an attempt to recreate the hybrid English of North Americans of Portuguese descent for a target audience in Portugal.

The next three chapters dwell on the ethical aspects of translating hybridity, in view of the power dynamics of which the translator needs to be aware in certain cultural circumstances. In line with this underlying aim, Elena Rodríguez Murphy, in chapter six, analyses Spanish translations of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's works. Adichie's works are written in a translingual variety of English, naturally combined with Igbo, Nigerian Pidgin and influenced by other tongues and creoles. With little respect to hybridity, the Spanish translations, as Rodríguez Murphy notes, exoticize Adichie's African-influenced words or expressions by using italics. The use of italics, Rodríguez Murphy argues, imposes a hierarchy when hybrid English is translated into standard Spanish: standard English acquires a normative status, whereas the African influenced elements are set apart as Other.

Contrary to the Spanish translations of Adichie's works, Robert Dickson's translation³ of Tomson Highway's *Kiss of the Fur Queen*,⁴ as studied by Franck Miroux in chapter seven, is argued as having been intentionally undertaken in order to diminish the sovereignty of official English. Miroux's study suggests that Dickson's translation intentionally reproduces the disjunctive nature of the source text. Following Miroux's analysis, Cristina Carrasco's chapter delves into the Spanish translation⁵ of Najat El Hachmi's *L'Últim Patriarca*.⁶ Similarly to Adichie's works, the novel of this Moroccan-born Catalan author, Carrasco affirms, was translated into a

conventional, natural-looking Spanish, erasing all traces of hybridity. The last chapter of section two, by Remy Attig, examines the dubbing of the 2017 Disney/Pixar film *Coco*⁷ into what he calls *Spanglish*. Attig examines examples of code-switching, lexical borrowing and varying grammatical structures that create a hybrid English that is unique to Chicano culture.

The third section adopts a systemic perspective to explore the extent to which translation can be considered a motor of language change, and hybridity, accordingly, a tumultuous stage in a tongue's development. Rita Queiroz de Barros' chapter reflects on the evolution of English over the centuries thanks to phenomena like translation, textual code-switching and vernacular bilingualism. In particular, Queiroz de Barros focuses on the example of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and the lexical change that is perceivable in every epoch's translations of the masterwork.

The last chapter of the book, by Karen Bennett, is conceived as a conclusion of the whole volume. Based on the comparison between the use of the Islamic veil in European countries and the presence of foreign linguistic features in a language in the process of hybridisation, Bennett's contribution addresses two key concepts. First, the *limits of assimilation*, which can be understood as a culture's degree of tolerance and absorption of alien practices without losing its own identity, and second, *transparency*, which is the desire to always have the truth in sight, without strange elements obscuring the essence of one's own culture. These two concepts, Bennett argues, could be applied to linguistic debates, which would lead to some critical questions, such as whether English preserves its identity despite hybridity? Does a language by the name of English even exist? In an attempt to find an answer to these inquiries, Bennett offers a list of six varieties of hybridity: postcolonial, diasporic, traveller or language learner's, translational, *ad hoc*, and institutional. Although it is somehow bewildering that the reader has to wait until the last chapter for such a relevant classification to be revealed, it serves the purpose of a conclusion, since it sums up all of the issues raised in the previous chapters, and to which each variety of hybridity corresponds.

The volume ends with a decisive and challenging interrogative: "*The end of English?*" This calls for us to remember the dissolution of Vulgar Latin in the past: is English destined to follow the same route as Vulgar Latin? Will it eventually grow into multiple linguistic branches and even in new tongues? Bennett predicts, "as for the postcolonial and diasporic hybrids, [...] these will draw steadily apart until they become mutually unintelligible, eventually producing a new generation of creoles"

(p. 209). Whether this prognosis will be fulfilled or not remains uncertain for now, but there is no doubt that this volume brings forward reasons to believe in such a future scenario.

JAVIER ADRADA

Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

NOTES

1. GHOSH, Amitav (2008): *Sea of Poppies*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
2. VALE DE GATO, Margarida (Last update: 30 June 2019): *PEñPAL in Trans - Portuguese-English Platform for Anthologies of Literary Translation*. Centro de Estudos Anglisticos da Universidade de Lisboa. Consulted on 15 May 2020, <www.penpalintranslation.com>.
3. HIGHWAY, Tomson (1998/2004): *Champion et Ooneemeetoo*. (Translated from English by Robert DICKSON) Sudbury: Prise de parole.
4. HIGHWAY, Tomson (1998/2008): *Kiss of the Fur Queen*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
5. EL HACHMI, Najat (2008/2016): *El Último Patriarca*. (Translated from Catalan by Rosa María PRATS) Barcelona: Planeta.
6. EL HACHMI, Najat (2008): *L'Últim Patriarca* [The last patriarch]. Barcelona: Planeta.
7. *Coco* (2017): Directed by UNKRICH, Lee. Walt Disney Pictures/Pixar Animation Studios. United States of America.

DAM, Helle Vrønning, BRØGGER, Matilde Nisbeth, and ZETHSEN, Karen Korning, eds. (2019): *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 237 p.

Recent decades have witnessed a myriad of new approaches and concepts in translation studies. Some burgeoning activities like crowdsourcing, transediting and translanguaging, to name just a few, have gained momentum in translation studies. Concepts, like intralingual and intersemiotic translation, which are considered peripheral to translation studies have gained renewed focus. Translation studies is embracing ever-expanding boundaries. It is against this backdrop that this current volume is published. To recapitulate briefly, this book touches on the following two major trends in translation studies: the internal boundaries are blurring and the external boundaries are expanding.

Due to the upsurge of various translation activities, the internal boundaries of translation have blurred and have become fuzzy. Consequently, conceptual innovation should be prioritized. Chesterman (Chapter 1) suggests four ways for the creation of new categories and names. Platypus concepts are for the kind of new concept

that is proposed when a new empirical phenomenon is confronted. Examples include *fansubbing* and *translanguaging*. Splitter concepts refer to focusing on differences and dividing related concepts into different entries. Professional vs. non-professional and literary vs. non-literary translation are typical splitter concepts in translation studies. Lumper concepts focus on similarities and tend to lump different concepts under a single entry. A case in point is the concept of *translation* itself. Rebranding concepts pertain to endowing an existing concept with a new term. A typical example is *localization* which illustrates how the notion of translation has been downgraded to a small corner of a rebranded larger practice, to highlight something presented as radically new. Chapter 3 focuses on the conceptual boundaries of interpreting. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of using any single criterion as a basis to define interpreting is well noted by the author. Thus, the author adopts the concentric-circle model of the conceptual territory of interpreting, with an *inner circle* representing established practices and *outer circle* phenomena that differ in some criteria and are therefore regarded as being less prototypical. Additionally, the *expanding circle* incorporates novel forms that have been driven by technology, such as *transpeaking*. Chapter 7 explores the fuzzy boundaries between professional and non-professional translation and interpreting. Traditionally, professional and non-professional translators and interpreters were regarded as disparate categories. However, incremental studies have been accounting for a range of mediation activities required in multifarious communicative contexts, irrespective of the question of professionalism. By looking beyond professional activities and approaching the miscellaneous phenomenon of translation and interpreting, translation studies is embracing new conceptual tools and new definitions for established frameworks. What's more, scholars can take cognizance of translation and interpreting activities in contemporary society by looking at the broader practice rather than through the narrow prism of professional practice all alone. Chapter 9 argues that the borders between literary and non-literary translation should be fuzzy and moveable. First, the binary distinction is detrimental because it presupposes an exclusive non-reciprocal relationship. Second, a negative suffix suggests lower status and less complexity. Thirdly, the disciplines on which literary and non-literary translation draw are themselves constantly changing. Fourthly, technological and professional developments have overtaken such a simplified view of the world of translation. Concepts such as adaptation, localization, and transcreation have been much discussed in recent years. Divergent opinions of these con-