

ATTR Fall Seminar 2020

Translation and Reception



Speakers, Abstracts, and Readings

BRENNAN BREED, Columbia Theological Seminary:
“Aerosol Transmission: Theorizing Reception History during a Global Pandemic with Ecclesiastes 1:2”

Abstract:

Since the emergence of the airborne pathogen COVID-19, many non-specialists have had to learn the basics of epidemiology in order to navigate the ensuing pandemic. For scholars of authoritative texts, epidemiology offers new perspectives on concepts such as transmission, reproduction, communication, and translation. As a test case, I explore the reception history of Ecclesiastes 1:2 (“vanity of vanities, all is vanity,” or “all is vapor/breath”), tracing its various trajectories of transmission from its ancient context of production to the present day.

Required reading:

Brennan Breed, “What Can a Text Do?: Reception History as an Ethology of the Biblical Text.” Pages 95-106 in *Reception History and Biblical Studies: Theory and Practice. Scriptural Traces*. Edited by Emma England and William John Lyons. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Brennan Breed, “Biblical Scholarship’s Ethos of Respect: Original Meanings, Original Texts, and the Reception History of Ecclesiastes.” Pages 212-236 in *Reading Other Peoples’ Texts: Identity Formation and the Reception of Authoritative Traditions*. Edited by K. Brown, B. Breed, A. Joseph. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020.

Recommended reading:

Deborah Goldgaber, “Derrida and Translation.” Pages 141-156 in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Philosophy*. Edited by J. Piers Rowling and Philip Wilson. London: Routledge, 2018.

Richard Gameson, “Conceiving the Life of Texts.” Pages 1-27 in *The Life of Texts: Evidence in Textual Production, Transmission, and Reception*. Edited by Carlo Caruso. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.

The Book of Ecclesiastes, chapters 1-3, 9, 12.

MIRIAM L. HJÄLM, Stockholm School of Theology: “The Bible in Arabic”

Abstract:

The complex and heterogeneous reception of the bible in Arabic is increasingly gaining attention by scholars in various fields. The numerous biblical references in the Qur’ān attest to

its earliest stage and to the importance of biblical texts in the struggle to own divine revelation that took place among Jews, Christians, and Muslims at this time. When Arabic bible translations appear in physical form approximately two centuries later, they seem to serve a variety of functions in the Christian communities. They were used in liturgy, for studying the bible, and perhaps also for apologetic and missionary purposes. A number of them exhibit a remarkable interest in textual criticism. Although we have almost no paratextual information in these renditions, we may assume that the function of the translations effected the translation techniques used to compose them. During this lecture, we will look at such differences and try to understand what purpose the various translations might have served in these communities.

Required reading:

Hjälml, Miriam L. "1.2.12 Arabic Texts [Overview Article > The Textual History of the Deutero-canonical Texts]," in *The Textual History of the Bible*, vol. 2a. Edited by Frank Feder and Matthias Henze. Leiden: Brill. Forthcoming 2020.

Hjälml, Miriam L. "Scriptures beyond Words: 'Islamic' Vocabulary in Early Christian Arabic Bible Translations," *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 15 (2018), pp. 49–69. ONLINE: <https://www.uco.es/revistas/index.php/cco/article/view/1071>

Recommended reading:

Overviews and contextual studies:

Griffith, Sidney H. "When Did the Bible Become an Arabic Scripture?," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*, 2013b, 1, 7–23.

Vollandt, Ronny. *Arabic versions of the Pentateuch : a comparative study of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim sources*. Leiden: Brill, 2015. [chapter 3], pp. 40–89.

Studies on translation techniques:

Hjälml, Miriam L. *Christian Arabic versions of Daniel : A comparative study of early MSS and translation techniques in MSS Sinai Ar. 1 and 2*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

For future studies also:

Polliack, M. *The Karaite Tradition of Arabic Bible Translation: A Linguistic and Exegetical Study of Karaite Translations of the Pentateuch from the tenth and Eleventh Centuries CE*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

NORA EGGEN, University of Oslo: "Translation of the Qur' ān"**Abstract:**

This lecture will be organized around the following topics:

- Translation of the Qur' ān as a contested concept in historical and theological terms.

- Translations of the Qur'ān as an empirical field.
- Interdisciplinary and methodological challenges and possibilities in the study of translations of the Qur'ān.
- Analytical issues like the diverse functions and roles of translation; cross-historical relations between text and reception; interactions between the local, regional and global; agency and authority.

Required reading:

- Eggen, N.S. 2019. On the Periphery: Translations of the Qur'ān in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. In *Routledge Handbook of Arabic Translation*, eds. Sameh Hanna, Hanem El-Farahaty, Abdel-Wahab Khalifa, 68-80. London: Routledge.
- pink, J. 2015. "Editor's preface." Thematic issue: Translations of the Qur'an in Muslim-Majority Contexts. *Journal of Qur'anic Studies*, 17/3, 1-9.

Recommended reading:

- Abdel Haleem, M.A.S. 2018. The Role of Context in Interpreting and Translating the Qur'an. *Journal of Qur'anic Studies*, 20, 47-66.
- Bevilacqua, A. 2013. The Qur'an Translations of Marracci and Sale. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76, 93-130.
- Elmarsafy, Z. 2009. *The Enlightenment Qur'ān: The Politics of Translation and the Construction of Islam*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Lawrence, B.B. 2017. *The Koran in English: A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- fisje, J. 2015. 'Literal Meaning' or 'Correct 'aqīda'? The Reflection of Theological Controversy in Indonesian Qur'an Translations. *Journal of Qur'anic Studies*, 17, 100-120.
- Zadeh, T. 2015. The Fātiḥa of Salmān al-Fārisī and the Modern Controversy over Translating the Qur'ān. In *The Meaning of the Word: Lexicology and Qur'anic Exegesis*, ed. Stephen Burge, 375–420. Oxford: Institute of Ismaili Studies/Oxford University Press.

MORTEN BECKMANN, University of Agder: "Translating the Bible: Tradition, Authority and Reception"

Abstract:

Translation is no neutral enterprise. In the last three decades, Translation Studies have focused on how translations are affected by the cultural context in which they are produced. This shift has led the attention away from assessing translations solely with regard to how «accurate» they render the source text to the multiple socio-cultural (contextual) factors that influence the choice of translation. No translation is made in a vacuum, and every translation is made for a reason.

This lecture will focus on how the Churches' traditions and other variables affect how the Bible is translated. Bible translations can strengthen the authority of a religious tradition by reaffirming the institutionalized interpretation of a canonical text. At the same time, they can

also challenge that interpretation in an effort to change the institution or found a new one (Venuti 2004).

Required reading:

Lawrence Venuti. “Retranslations: The Creation of Value“, *Bucknell Review* 47, no. 1 (2004): 25-38.

Morten Beckmann. “Negotiating Christology: The Translation of Colossians 1:15 as a Case Study“. Pages 75-102 in *Nordic Interpretations of the New Testament: Challenging Texts and Perspectives*. Edited by Bylund et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020.

Recommended reading:

Lawrence Venuti. *Translation Changes Everything : Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Leung, Matthew Wing-Kwong. “The Ideological Turn in Translation Studies“. Pages 129– 44 in *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. Edited by João Ferreira Duarte, Alexandra Assis Rosa og Teresa Seruya. *Benjamins Translation Library* 68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006.

Munday, Jeremy. “Translation and Ideology“. *The Translator* 13, no. 2 (2007): 195–217.

Porter, Stanley E. “Translating the New Testament: An Introduction to Issues of Text, Translation, and Theology“. Pages 1–12 in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*. *McMaster New Testament Studies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

STEFKA G. ERIKSEN, NIKU: “Translations into Medieval Norway and Iceland: Texts, Practices, and Contexts”

Abstract:

Old Norse literature comprises of highly original indigenous prose and poetry, as well as translations from Latin, French, and German. In this lecture, I will focus on Old Norse translations, seen as linguistic, textual, material and cultural *translatio* from one context to another, a process which entails a dynamic interplay between separate, but related sub-cultures.

The lecture will include:

- An overview of Old Norse translations in the Middle Ages: texts, languages, background, translators, and cultural contexts
- A historiography of how Old Norse translations have been studied in scholarship, including theoretical starting points and main research questions
- New approaches in translation studies: cognitive theory and multimodal communication

Required reading:

Copeland, Rita. 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge. Pp. 1-8 (8 p.)

Stefka G. Eriksen and Sif Rikhardsdottir, 2013, 'Etat present of Research on Old Norse Arthurian Literature', *The Journal of the International Arthurian Society* 1:3–28.

or

Sif Rikhardsdottir, 2012, *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia*, Boydell and Brewer, see Introduction

Recommended reading:

On the Nordic context

Fidjestøl, Bjarne. 1997. *Romantic Reading at the Court of Håkon Håkonsson*. In Selected Papers, edited by Odd Einar Haugen and Else Mundal, translated by Peter Foote, pp. 351-365. Odense.

Johansson, Karl G. 2007. Texter i rörelse. Översättning, original textproduktion och tradering på Norra Island 1150-1400. In *Übersetzen im skandinavischen Mittelalter*, edited by Vera Johanterwage and Stefanie Würth, pp. 83-106. Wien. (23 p.)

On translation theory:

Gideon, Toury. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam. Part two: Ch.1 (pp. 23-39), ch. 2 (53-69); Part four (pp.259-279) (52 p.)

Venuti, Lawrence (ed). 2002. *The Translation Studies Reader*. (2 ed.) New York. Ch. 17: Itamar Even-Zohar The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem (pp.199-204) (5 p.)

Munday Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and applications*. London. Ch. 1. Main Issues of Translation Studies (pp.4-17); chapter 7. System theories (pp. 108-125) (30 p.)

IRIS MUÑIS, University of Oslo: “Gender and Feminism in Translation Studies”

Abstract:

The interest on the relationship between a cultural, non-grammatical or merely biological understanding of gender and its impact on the practice and theory of translation has steadily grown in the last decades. Stemming from the pioneering theorisation on feminist translation by Canadian scholars during the 80-90s, the field, in tune with its mother feminist movement, has branched out to include broader gender and sexuality concerns that permeate 21st-Century society. Those three subfields (feminist, gender and sexuality studies) have been very productive in their interaction with translation theory, as shown by the growing numbers of academic research. During this session, we will go over the development and main ideas of the field, based on the mandatory and suggested reading materials. In addition, practical examples from my own recent research on two major feminist-claimed Norwegian literary works translated into both English and Spanish, will be presented on the light of the aforementioned theoretical perspectives.

Discussion with students on how this theoretical perspective may affect their own research projects or possible future research within the language combination they work with will be

encouraged on the later part of the session. To enliven discussion, students are asked to do some background reading and bring examples from the current political perspectives on gender issues in language in their own culture/language they are familiar with (Issues such as: Does your language have grammatical gender, if so is it based on biological associations? / Has there been any interest in developing a cultural connection to that linguistic gender in the last decade? / What is your experience/opinion with gender-neutral language uses? / Can this affect/Has this affected your work as a translation researcher or practitioner?)

Required reading:

- Ergun, Emek and Olga Castro (2017): “Pedagogies of Feminist Translation: Rethinking Difference and Commonality across Borders”. In *Feminist Translation Studies, Local and Transnational Perspectives*, ed. Olga Castro and Emek Ergun. Routledge. 93-108. [.pdf available]
- Flotow, Luise von (1991): “Feminist translation: contexts, practices and theories”. *TTR* 4(2): 69-84. <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/037094ar>
- Simon, Sherry (1996): “Taking Gendered Positions in Translation”. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identities and the Politics of Transmission*. Routledge. 1-36. [.pdf available]

Recommended reading:

- AtGender (2012): *Translating Gender: The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction*. <https://atgender.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/207/2015/12/Translating-Gender-2012.pdf>
- Federici, Eleanora (2011): “The visibility of the woman translator”. In *Translating Gender*, ed. Eleanora Federici. Peter Lang. 79-91.
- Flotow, Luise von (1997): *Translation and Gender: Translation in the Era of Feminism*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Flotow, Luise von and Farzaneh Farahzad (2016), eds, *Translating Women. Different Voices and New Horizons*. Routledge.
- Flotow, Luise von (2006): “Women, bible, ideologies”. *TTR*, 13 (1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037390ar>
- Flotow, Luise von and Hala Kamal (2020), eds, *The Routledge Handbook of Translation, Feminism and Gender*. Routledge.
- Larkosh, Christopher (2014), ed: *Re-engendering Translation. Transcultural practice, Gender/Sexuality and the Politics of Alterity*. Routledge.
- Leonardi, Vanessa and Annarita Ferrara (2011): “Translators vs. Translatresses’ strategies: ethical and ideological challenges”. *MonTI* 3: 377-402. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2651/265119725014.pdf>
- Olga Castro, Olga and Emek Ergun. *Feminist Translation Studies, Local and Transnational Perspectives*, Routledge. 80-92.
- Santamília, José (2005), ed: *Gender, Sex and Translation. The manipulation of identities*. Routledge.
- Santamília, José (2017): “Sexuality and Translation as Intimate Partners? Toward a Queer Turn in Rewriting Identities and Desires”. In *Queering Translation, Translating the Queer*, ed. Brian James Baer and Klaus Kaindl Routledge. 11-25

Wallmach, Kim (2006): (2006): "Feminist translation strategies? Different or derived". *Journal of Literary Studies* 22: 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02564710608530388>

Uri, Helene (2018): *Hvem sa hva? Kvinner, menn og språk*. Gyldendal

KJETIL BERG HENJUM, University of Bergen: "Literary style and translation from a linguistic point of view"

Abstract:

In my talk I will discuss and illustrate different types of equivalence with examples from German and Norwegian (and maybe English) prose fiction and show how differently problems "of the same type" are treated by translators and how this affects the potential of meaning conveyed by the texts.

Required reading:

Koller, W. (1995): The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies. In: *Target* 7, 191-222.

Recommended reading:

Pisarska, A. (2004): Metaphor and other tropes as translation problems: A linguistic perspective. In: H. Kittel et al. (Hrsg.) (2004): *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Band 1, Artikel 55.* Berlin/New York (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 26:1), 520-527.

Delabastita, D. (2004): Wordplay as a translation problem: A linguistic perspective. In: H. Kittel et al. (Hrsg.) (2004): *Übersetzung– Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Band 1, Artikel 66.* Berlin/New York (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 26:1), 600-606.

Steiner, E. (2004): The heterogeneity of individual languages as a translation problem. In: H. Kittel et al. (Hrsg.) (2004): *Übersetzung– Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Band 1, Artikel 47.* Berlin/New York (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 26:1), 519-527.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2004): Lexical problems of translation. In: H. Kittel et al. (Hrsg.) (2004): *Übersetzung– Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Band 1, Artikel 48.* Berlin/New York (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 26:1), 528-538.

House, J. (2004): Culture-specific elements in translation. In: H. Kittel et al. (Hrsg.) (2004): *Übersetzung– Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Band 1, Artikel 52.* Berlin/New York (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 26:1), 567-577.

Ronald Kibirige- NTNU/MUK; “From Oral to Written Incriptions: Reflections on Textual and Notated Translations as Processes of Interpretation in Interdisciplinary Communal Music and Dance Events of Practice”

Abstract:

Translation as a process of interpretation has always been a key feature in interdisciplinary music and dance research. Although they are regarded as culturally established systems of knowing, especially within local communities, processes of musicking and dance-musicking as translation and interpretation processes, are still heavily underestimated. Their transfer from oral to written forms in the present music and dance research does not only present them as exclusively authoritative, but also adds another layer of complexity in as far as their re/presentation, translation, interpretation, and transmission are concerned. While the process of their “re/presentation” in the present is a process of their re-contextualisation, it is also a process of knowledge (re)production itself. Music and dance practitioners, and local community elders point to interdisciplinary processes of “doing” (musicking, dancing, and dance-musicking) as vital communal forms of knowledge, as well as interpretation processes of life events present in local artistic events of practice. The material aspects of these artistically interactive processes are key in their emic and etic sense-making processes. The knowledge they embed exists collaboratively in the material (written texts and traditional regalia) and non-material forms (lived or spoken) today (Kibirige, 2020). However, processes of their interpretation are still limited to rather trivialised performer-audience, as well as textual and noted representations in “formal” academia today. Notational translations in the field of music and dance, for instance, have been regarded with reservations because of their complex syntax, strict conceptualisation, and imagery of the material and non-material aspects of sound and movement at a conscious level (Also see Bakka & Karoblis 2010; Fügédi, 2003; Watt, 2014). An interdisciplinary approach to understanding the material and non-material aspects initiates translation as a process of interpretation that goes beyond what is accessible through performative and formal written representation. To use Timothy Rice’s perspective, “understanding a world of meanings and experiences is not only a matter of observing and arranging words into taxonomies and contrasting pairs” (1997, p.88). It is also in the interactively live “doing” (dancing, musicking, and dance-musicking). The “doing” draws on an interdisciplinary understanding of, and active engagement with a music/dance practitioner’s actions and surroundings on a given event of practice (Also see Nannyonga-Tamusuza 2015; Karoblis, 2012; Bakka & Erling, 2017). Their reception in scholarly or community contexts today notwithstanding, could the genuine interpretation and understanding of this oral and written knowledge lie in an interdisciplinary as well as an interactive approach to their studies/research, enaction/performance, and transmission? Could it lie in its emic and etic interpretive translation of the audible sound and body movements? How does an interdisciplinary understanding sustain the authority interdisciplinary music and dance texts from studies/research and performative contexts command to both the immediate audiences and the wider community? This lecture will reflect on the above aspects from an applied perspective. I will draw on processes of musicking and dance-musicking with in the Lamokowang music and dance-music tradition and events of practice of the Acholi peoples of Northern Uganda. Supplementary to dance and music notation examples, I will use my most

recent research, and communal cultural and artistic engagements to explore the inescapable impact of interdisciplinary music/dance texts from studies and research on, and enaction/performance in a day-today life activities of the Acholi people of Northern Uganda and beyond.

Required reading:

Bakka, E., & Karoblis, G. (2010). Writing “a dance”: Epistemology for Dance Research. *Yearbook for Traditional Music*, 42(2010),167-193.

Fügedi, J. (2003). Movement Cognition and Dance Notation. *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 44(3-4), 393-410, Budapest: Akadémiai.

Watts, V. (2014). The Perpetual ‘Present’ of Dance Notation. In *Bodies in Between. Ekphrasis* (2) 180-199. University of South Australia

Recommended reading:

Karoblis, G. (2012). Triple Disembodiment of Dance: *Nordic Theatre Studies* 24