



DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Narrative Section of a Successful Application

The attached document contains the grant narrative and selected portions of a previously funded grant application. It is not intended to serve as a model, but to give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants should consult the Summer Seminars and Institutes application guidelines at

<http://www.neh.gov/grants/education/summer-seminars-and-institutes>

for instructions. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with the NEH Division of Education Programs staff well before a grant deadline.

Note: The attachment only contains the grant narrative and selected portions, not the entire funded application. In addition, certain portions may have been redacted to protect the privacy interests of an individual and/or to protect confidential commercial and financial information and/or to protect copyrighted materials. The page limit for the narrative description is now **fifteen** double-spaced pages.

Project Title: What is Gained in Translation: Learning How to Read Translated Texts
Institution: Kent State University
Project Director: Francoise Massardier-Kenney
Grant Program: Summer Seminars and Institutes

Table of Contents
Summer Institute for College Teachers:
What is *Gained* in Translation: Learning How to Read Translated Texts
Kent State University

Introduction	2
a. Intellectual Rationale	3
The Translator’s Voice	4
Cultural Difference	6
b. Program of Study	8
c. Project Faculty and Staff	10
d. Participant Selection	13
e. Publicity and Project Website	14
f. Institutional Context	14
Housing	15
Budget Form.....	17
Appendices	21
1. Syllabus and Reading List	21
2. Directors’ Résumés	26
Brian Baer	26
Françoise Massardier-Kenney	31
3. Guest Lecturer Letters and CVs	36
Rosemary Arrojo	36
Peter Bush	38
M. R. Ghanoonparvar	40
Carol Maier	42
Christi Merrill	44
Michelle Yeh	46
4. Kent State University Provost Letter of Institutional Commitment	48
Evaluations	49

What is *Gained* in Translation:

Learning How to Read Translated Texts

Introduction

This proposal seeks funding for a three-week summer institute to be held at Kent State University in June of 2017. This institute, like the one we offered in 2015, is dedicated to the study of literature in translation as a way to develop cross-cultural literacy. The institute will focus on features of translated literary texts that distinguish them from texts that are written and read in the same language in order to explore the complexities involved in cross-cultural communication. Specifically, the institute will investigate the deep cultural beliefs and assumptions, related to time, space, and agency, that shape the production and reception of the original text, and, through a series of case studies, explore the role played by translators in presenting that culture to a new audience. Informed by discussions of contemporary translation scholarship, participants will consider translated texts not as mere copies of an original, but as versions that, while providing points of access to the source culture, are shaped both by the translator's individual voice and by the receiving culture's beliefs and practices. The institute's mission is to provide participants with the resources necessary to engage with the specific set of issues posed by translated texts, allowing them to use those texts more knowledgeably in their classrooms and their research. Encouraged by the success of our 2015 institute, as documented in the extremely positive participant evaluations and projects, and by the demand for such an institute, as evident in the large number of applications submitted in 2015—over twice the number we could accept—we would like to offer this opportunity to another cohort of college and university instructors.

a. Intellectual Rationale

As American colleges and universities seek to globalize their curricula, instructors have come to rely more and more on translated texts. In addition, an increasing number of these texts are from less-commonly taught languages, leaving most students and instructors unable to compare the translations with the originals. And so, while the inclusion of foreign works on reading lists suggests a laudable desire on the part of educators to expose students to different worldviews and to encourage cross-cultural understanding, many instructors do not know how to address “the problematics of translation” (Damrosch 2009, 8), that is, the fact that these works written in one language have been selected and re-presented in another language for an audience often very different from that of the original. Moreover, there are few materials available to assist instructors in doing so. The failure to treat the specificity of translated texts in a pedagogically sound way increases the likelihood that these texts will be made to align with the reader’s previously held cultural beliefs and perspectives, and that their “difference” will be lost. Therefore, addressing the question of translation should be considered an essential component in developing true cross-cultural literacy and in reading translated texts responsibly, that is, “without either sacrificing or appropriating difference” (Dingwaney and Maier 1995, 304).

Therefore, we are proposing a three-week institute for college and university teachers dedicated to exploring what can be *gained* by addressing issues of translation in the classroom. This institute will provide instructors in the Humanities and Social Sciences who work with translated texts with theoretical models and applications developed in the field of Translation Studies to allow them to more fully exploit translation as a teachable moment. These strategies are designed to sensitize students and teachers to the worldviews embedded in other languages, or to what Anthony Appiah refers to as “the rich differences of human life in culture” (2000,

427), and in so doing to become aware of the culture-specificity of their own modes of thinking and perception, and of the ways in which those modes of thinking are embedded in language.

We propose to structure the institute using a dual focus. Part one is organized around discussions of contemporary translation scholarship and the implications it has for the study of translated texts. Specifically, this part of the institute will focus on the role of the translator as cultural mediator and on the status of translated texts as versions rather than copies of an original. Part two of the institute will be dedicated to what Edward Hall famously referred to as “the silent language of culture” (1973), that is, the deep cultural differences that shape literary texts and complicate their translation and reception. During this part of the institute, instructors will lead discussions involving comparative analysis of translations of key cultural texts from Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, and Spanish into English. The overall goal of the institute is to develop systematic approaches to teaching translated literary texts that will allow readers to perceive the worldview shaping the source text while acknowledging the important mediating role of the translator in fashioning the target text, as proposed by Carol Maier and Françoise Massardier-Kenney in *Literature in Translation: Teaching Issues and Reading Practices* (2010).

The Translator’s Voice

Contemporary views on translation question the fundamentally Platonic model of representation that presents translation as a pale reflection of an original, and the translator as a neutral conduit of source text content. This traditional model, which is still evident in book reviews, scholarly criticism and in the discourse of practitioners, is based on a mimetic notion of representation, according to which words “reflect” the source text with as much fidelity as possible, positing perfect equivalence as the elusive ideal, and imperfect equivalence—reflected

in mistakes, losses, and distortions—as the unavoidable reality. Contemporary critics of this mimesis-based model of translation, such as Lawrence Venuti, author of *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995) and the *Translation Studies Reader* (2000, 2003), Mona Baker, editor of *The Translator* and of the collection *Critical Readings in Translation Studies* (2010), and Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karen Littau, editors of *A Companion to Translation Studies* (2007), insist that the meaning of the source text can no longer be posited as a given but should be seen as constructed in the act of interpretation, in this case, the translation. No longer viewed as a linguistic matching game, translation has been re-defined, in the words of the Czech translation theorist Jiří Levý, as a complex decision-making process. This reformulation lends new agency to translators as co-creators of meaning, or “writers” (Bush and Bassnett 2006), and new autonomy to translated texts as versions and re-creations (Littau 1997), or even “tellings” (Ricci 2011). By invoking the oral tradition, Ricci goes so far as to challenge the very existence of “an original, invariant Ur-text” (Ricci 2011, 21). Jorge Luis Borges makes a similar point in “The Homeric Versions,” where he questions the notion of a definitive original, arguing that, while literary texts endeavor to hide the process by which they are written, translation does the opposite: it forces us to see the changes that texts undergo.

While this theoretical position is often described as postmodern, it is in fact very old. When, for example, in 395 St. Jerome made his now famous distinction between translating word for word and sense for sense, he acknowledged a gap between words and their meaning, that is, that words do not give up their meaning in a direct and transparent way, as evidenced by the fact that a lexically and syntactically “close” or “exact” translation might make no sense at all. This recognition of the “fuzzy” relationship between signs and referents led Roman Jakobson to greatly expand the definition of translation in his seminal 1959 essay “On Linguistic Aspects

of Translation,” in which he redefines as translation all commentary, explication, and explanation, whether in the same language as the source text (intralingual translation) or in a different language (interlingual translation)—or even medium (intersemiotic translation). This notion was further expanded upon by George Steiner in his classic text *After Babel*, where he, too, equates translation with interpretation by defining interpretation “as that which gives language life beyond the moment and place of immediate utterance or transcription” (1992, 28), echoing Walter Benjamin’s notion of translation as the afterlife of a text.

This re-conceptualization of translation has led, in turn, to a reformulation of the translator’s role. Now seen as a co-creator of meaning rather than a more or less faithful scribe, the translator is granted new agency, although an agency that is mediated by the receiving culture in general and by the publishing industry in particular. Nevertheless, acknowledging the translator’s voice should have major implications for the way we read and teach literature in translation. Understanding the translated text as a mediated rewriting of the source text raises a number of questions related to the position or status of translators and translated texts both within the target culture (What gets translated and by whom?) and between the source and target cultures (How does the relationship between the source and target cultures shape the selection, translation, and reception of texts?).

Cultural Difference

As Rachel May argues in *The Translator in the Text*, literature in translation should be understood not as being *about* the source culture—a simple and “true” reflection—but rather as being *of* that culture, that is, a complicated product of a complex, contested, and evolving culture, or configuration of cultures. In order to understand the relationship of the text to the

culture in which it was produced, it is crucial, therefore, to explore what the influential cultural anthropologist Edward Hall calls the “cultural unconscious.” Translated texts offer a unique opportunity to bring this cultural unconscious to the fore. Many students and instructors who are fluent in another language are often unaware of the powerful yet unacknowledged culture-specific forces that shape the way speakers and writers experience and interpret their world. When culture is included in language programs, the focus is often on the visible markers of culture (art, architecture, food, clothing, institutions), and sometimes on cultural norms (traditions, style, etiquette); rarely are students introduced to the cultural unconscious, or the principles that underlie different systems of representation, perception, and belief. For example, an awareness that some cultures value relations and networks more than the rule of law will impact the way we interpret the actions of characters and the twists of a plot. Similarly, reading texts written in what are called “high context” cultures (in which communication and signification is achieved through non-verbal, indirect means) requires training to hear what is expressed through these channels of communication and make sense of these texts. Although translated texts may seem “transparent” because they are accessible in the reader’s mother tongue, an awareness of these invisible yet potent culturally-determined ways of seeing the world and others is crucial to reading translated texts, as Maier and Massardier-Kenney argue in *Literature in Translation*. Therefore, the challenge posed by teaching translated texts is to help their students not only to hear the voice of the translator but also to evaluate the strategies used by these translators to render these deep cultural differences. Instilling awareness of this “invisible language” is a crucial first step in developing true cultural literacy.¹

b. Program of Study

The institute will be divided into two parts, with part one dedicated to a discussion of the translator's role, or agency, in the selection, translation, and promotion of authors and texts, and part two, to the deep cultural beliefs and practices that shape the production of texts in one language and culture and their reception in another. The first part of the institute will be devoted to a discussion of several key concepts developed in Translation Studies to describe the specific qualities of translated texts, focusing in particular on the translator's voice and its role in shaping the text for a target audience. Some of the questions addressed in part one of the institute include: Who Speaks in Translated Texts? How Do We Find the Translator in the Text? How Do Cultural Politics Shape the Translator's Role? and How Do Translators Describe What They Do? During part two of the institute, the early morning sessions will be devoted to theoretical readings on the five cultural themes (relationships, time, space, authority and individuality) from a variety of disciplines (literature, philosophy, intercultural communication, history, etc.), followed by late morning sessions devoted to case studies during which we examine how these theoretical readings enable us to read translations of specific short texts productively, i.e., with an awareness of their status as translations and of the cultural beliefs and practices that shape the reading of these texts.

Our approach is collaborative and constructivist. That is, the daily sessions will be structured around a discussion of the readings and group work in which participants bring in texts from their particular discipline that they want to discuss using the approach developed during the theoretical sessions. If a certain text provokes particular interest and participants want to spend more time discussing these texts, the content of the sessions will be altered accordingly. Based on the success of our 2015 Institute format, we plan to facilitate discussion by dividing the

participants into five tables of six; when participants arrive each day, they select a color-coded card and sit at the table with that color. One of the cards will be marked with an M to indicate who will serve as a group moderator for the day, in charge of reporting the highlights of the small group discussions to the whole group. This allows us to vary the grouping in a natural way and to create a dynamic atmosphere in the classroom (switching from small group to large group discussion to lectures), maximizing participation in discussions while decreasing social anxiety. We found this to be a very effective way to invigorate daily discussions, promote collegiality, and encourage collaboration.

Our guest speakers include prominent translators who are also translation scholars working in a range of languages and cultures. As these experts both “do” translation and reflect systematically on their practice, participants will have an opportunity not only to familiarize themselves with the scholarship on translation and issues in cross-cultural communication but also to be guided by seasoned translators on how to incorporate approaches to reading in translation into their own research and teaching. For instance, the prominent Persian scholar, M. R. Ghanoonparvar (see pp.40-41) has published widely on Persian literature and culture and identity in Middle Eastern societies on topics ranging from drama, film, cooking, and space. One of his presentations will use the translation of Shahrokh Meskub’s *Dialogue in the Garden* to reflect on Persian perceptions of art, nature, and identity, raising pertinent questions in regard to texts translated from other (often less-commonly taught) languages.

Similarly, Professor Christi Merrill (see pp. 44-45), a translator and a scholar of South Asian Literature will discuss her work with Kausalya Baisantriy’s *Dohara Abhishap* [Doubly Cursed], a non-fictional text written by a feminist and Dalit activist to question patriarchy and oppose untouchability. It is the first autobiographical narrative written in Hindi by a Dalit

(formerly untouchable) woman. Merrill will discuss the ethical issues involved in translating historically-significant texts that interrogate the source culture's own conscious and unconscious forms of discrimination. Professor Michelle Yeh (pp. 46-47), a translator and scholar of modern Chinese poetry, will address the challenges presented by reading Chinese literature in translation. Focusing on the interconnection between literature and cultural identity, Dr. Yeh will discuss the aesthetic and philosophical contexts and cultural values that shape the production and reception of Chinese poetry.

Peter Bush, a world renowned translation scholar and translator from Catalan, French, Portuguese and Spanish, will focus on the role of translation and translators in bringing to life the Catalan literary tradition and culture undermined by political repression and lack of translation. He will explore the autobiographical fictions by Josep Pla, Mercè Rodoreda, Joan Sales and Emili Teixidor and the challenges of translating a literature and language that re-emerged in the nineteenth century in written form, only to flower for fifty years and then be suppressed for forty. Can translation help re-configure a fractured tradition by finding new readerships? How does such a process challenge translators' and readers' assumptions?

For a complete list of seminar topics and readings, see Appendix I, pp. 21-25

c. Project Faculty and Staff

The Institute will be directed by Brian James Baer and Françoise Massardier-Kenney, professors of Translation Studies at Kent State University, and leading scholars in the field, active as teachers, authors, and editors. The directors will be primarily responsible for the theoretical readings while the visiting scholars will present on translation between specific language pairs.

Brian James Baer (see pp. 26-30) is Professor of Russian and Translation Studies at Kent State University. He received an MA degree in Slavic Languages and Literatures from New York University and a PhD in Comparative Literature from Yale. He has trained translators at the undergraduate and graduate levels since 1996, and advised doctoral students in translation studies since 2007. His research interests include the theory and practice of translation and cross-cultural communication. He is founding editor of the journal *Translation and Interpreting Studies* (TIS), general editor of the Kent State Scholarly Monograph Series in Translation Studies, and co-editor of the Bloomsbury series *Literatures, Cultures, Translation*. He is author of the monograph *Other Russias: Homosexuality and the Crisis of Post-Soviet Identity* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), which was selected as a Choice Outstanding Academic Title by the American Library Association in 2011. His most recent publications include the edited volumes *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Re-thinking Translation Pedagogy*, with Geoffrey Koby (ATA, 2003), *Contexts, Subtexts, Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Benjamins, 2011), *No Good without Reward: The Selected Writings of Liubov Krichevskaya* (University of Toronto, 2011), *Russian Writers on Translation. An Anthology*, with Natalia Olshanskaya (St. Jerome, 2013), and *Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies*, with Claudia Angelelli (Routledge, 2015), and the translation of Juri Lotman's final book-length work, *The Unpredictable Workings of Culture* (University of Tallinn, 2013). His recent monograph *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature* Bloomsbury (2015) argues for the full integration of translated texts in Literary Studies.

Françoise Massardier-Kenney (see pp. 31-35) is Professor of French and Translation Studies at Kent State University and is the Director of the Institute for Applied Linguistics, an internationally known research and training translation center. She has trained translators at the

graduate level since 1989 and advised Ph.D. students in Translation Studies since 2007. Her research interests include the theory and practice of literary translation, and cross-cultural communication. She is the general editor of the American Translators Association (ATA) Scholarly Series. Her publications include the monograph *Gender in the Fiction of George Sand* (2001), *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing* (with Doris Kadish) (2000, 2010), *Translating Slavery: Ourika and its Progeny* (2010), a translation of Madame de Duras's *Ourika* (2000), George Sand's novel *Valvèdre* (2007), of Antoine Berman's *Toward a Translation Criticism* (2009), and numerous articles on Sand, nineteenth-century women's writers, and translation. She is also the co-editor with Carol Maier of *Literature in Translation* (2010). Her recent publications include chapters and articles on the translations of George Sand into English, the pedagogy of translation, gender and translation, and retranslation, and the co-edited volume *Translators Writing, Writing Translators* (2016). She is currently working on issues in translation and cross-cultural competency.

Visiting Scholars will include several prominent translation scholars and translators who can facilitate case studies discussions and guide participants. Michelle Yeh (University of California, Davis; see pp. 46-47) will address issues in Chinese translation; Rosemary Arrojo (Binghamton University; see pp. 36-37) will speak about the translator's voice and translators in fiction; Carol Maier (Kent State University; see pp. 42-43) will consider the discourse of translators; Peter Bush (see pp. 38-39) will consider the role of translation and translator in shaping Catalan literature...M.R. Ghanoonparvar (University of Texas at Austin; see pp. 40-41) will address cultural issues related to Persian Translation; and Christi Merrill (University of Michigan; see pp. 44-45) will discuss issues pertaining to the translation of Hindi texts.

The **staff** supporting the Institute will be two advanced Ph.D. student in Translation Studies who have administrative experience. They will be responsible for practical issues such as arranging for library privileges, parking passes, lodging, coffee breaks, room scheduling, overseeing packet preparation, and assisting with paperwork related to participants or visiting scholars.

d. Participant Selection

As we did in 2015, we hope to attract participants who teach courses in which translated texts are used and who are generally interested in translation and in developing intercultural competence in themselves and their students. Ideally they will come from a variety of institutions and be at all stages of their careers. We hope that participants will come from a variety of disciplines in the humanities and humanistic social sciences (ranging from literature, and applied linguistics to history, religious studies, communication, cultural studies, anthropology, and philosophy) and from a variety of languages and cultures (European, Asian, African, and Middle Eastern). Our participants will have an interest in cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural issues. While there is no requirement to know the source language of the texts we will discuss, we welcome participants who have some experience of a second language (formal or informal) or whose mother-tongue is not English to participate in the institute to enrich the collaborative and interdisciplinary conversations that the institute will promote. Participants will be selected by the two project directors and two colleagues from the Kent State Institute of Applied Linguistics who have expertise in Translation Studies and an interest in cross-cultural communication. Prior to the institute, participants will be asked to select as a case study a translated text they have taught or with which they have worked. Then, during the institute, they will develop an analysis

of the translated text based on the readings and discussions. They will also be encouraged to bring their own projects pertinent to issues of translation and cross-cultural competency.

e. Publicity and Project Website

Because we hope to attract a wide range of applicants and we aim to disseminate widely the intellectual content of the institute, we paid particular attention to the development of the project website and hired a website consultant who was in charge of designing an attractive, user friendly, easily updateable site that can be a resource to both faculty members and students. Besides the required information regarding the institute, the resources available in the website include participants' projects. (See sample projects from 2015 at <http://www.kent.edu/neh-grant/participants>)

f. Institutional Context

Kent State University is especially well suited for an NEH Summer Institute in Translation Studies. Kent State University's Institute for Applied Linguistics, founded in 1988, has the largest U.S. graduate (M.A. and Ph.D.) Translation Studies program in the U.S. and is recognized internationally as a leading Translation Studies research and instructional center with ten tenured/tenure-track Translation Studies faculty members. It is home to *Translation and Interpreting Studies* (TIS), a leading U.S. journal devoted to Translation and Interpreting Studies (edited by Baer), and the American Translation Association Scholarly Series (edited by Massardier-Kenney). The University Library has an outstanding collection in Translation Studies both in print and electronically and provides excellent facilities for individual research. Its staff is very supportive and the Dean of Libraries provides participants with full access to all library

services, including individual and group study space. In addition, participants have access to Ohio Link, an extremely efficient interlibrary loan service linking all major libraries in Ohio. Our Translation Studies library liaison will be available to provide individualized training sessions using specialized Translation Studies data bases. The Department of Modern and Classical Languages and Cultures and the College of Arts and Sciences with which the Institute for Applied Linguistics is affiliated fully support this NEH institute proposal and will co-host both professional and social activities for participants, including an initial reception and orientation and various social activities during the Institute. The department will provide office space for participants, as well as copying privileges. Seminar meetings will be held in a fully equipped, comfortable, air-conditioned room and we will have access to the Institute's 36 stations computer laboratory, which is equipped to handle multiple scripts. Participants in our 2015 Institute commented on the outstanding institutional support Kent State provided and were impressed that the Provost of the University made a point of welcoming them at the beginning of the Institute and has given us a letter of support for this new proposal (see p. 48). In addition, they appreciated the fact that the Director of the Wick Poetry Center made his lovely space available to us for receptions.

Housing

Housing is available in Kent State's newest dormitories, Johnson and Stopher Hall, which, during the academic year, house students in the KSU Honors College. The spacious double and single rooms are equipped with a bathroom and shower, a refrigerator and microwave. Every floor has comfortable lounge space and state-of-the-art classrooms. In addition, our doctoral students and colleagues make available summer sub-lets that are very attractive. Kent State is within walking distance of Kent, a thriving town and both have been

recognized as a model of collaboration between town and gown. It offers a wide range of good (and moderately priced) restaurants, a well-attended farmer's market, excellent parks and trails for walking and biking, summer musical events, a summer repertory theatre as well as several movie screens which show independent films. Kent is within an hour's drive of Cleveland, which boasts one of the top five art museums in the U.S., the renowned Cinematheque, which shows foreign films rarely seen elsewhere, a famous orchestra, which has an outdoor summer program (within 30 minutes of Kent), the well-known "West Side Market," many ethnic restaurants, and several independent bookstores.

¹ As bibliometric studies show, the humanities are not among the disciplines that have become informed by research in cross-cultural competency. "Psychology, communication, and sociology are found to be highly influential disciplines. ... The analysis also shows that the top six influential disciplines are psychology, business, the biomedical sciences, sociology, communication and anthropology." Bibliometric study in *IJIR* Volume 37.2 (March 2013): 133.

Appendix 1. Syllabus (Seminar Topics) and List of Readings

PART I: THEORIZING AND MAKING VISIBLE THE TRANSLATOR'S VOICE

Day 1 (Monday, June 6): Translation and Language

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse and the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist, 262-275 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 113-118 (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Massardier-Kenney, Françoise. "Translation Theory and Its Usefulness" in *Literature in Translation. Teaching Issues and Reading Practices*, eds. Carol Maier and Françoise Massardier, 22-30 (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2010).
- Apter, Emily. "Keywords 3: 'Fado' and 'Saudade'" in *Against World Literature. On the Politics of Untranslatability*. (New York: Verso, 2013).

Day 2 (Tuesday, June 7): Theorizing Translation and/as Authorship: Who Speaks in Translated

Texts?

- Maier, Carol. "The Translator as Theoros: Thoughts on Cogitation, Figuration and Current Creative Writing," in *Translating Others*, Vol 1, ed. Theo Hermans, 163-180 (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2006).
- Arrojo, Rosemary. "The 'Death' of the Author and the Limits of the Translator's Invisibility" in *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, ed. Mary Snell-Hornby et. al., 21-32 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997).
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. "Invisibility" in *The Translator's Invisibility*, 1-42 (London: Routledge, 1995).
- Paz, Octavio. "Translation, Literature and Letters" in *Theories of Translation*, eds. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, 152-162 (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1992).

Day 3 (Wednesday, June 8): Uncovering the Translator's Voice: How Do We Find the

Translator in the Text?

- May, Rachel. Chapters One and Two, in *The Translator in the Text*, 2-55 (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1994).
- Avstad, Cecilia. "Voices in Translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol 4, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 207-10 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2013).
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "The Translators of the Thousand and One Nights" in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. L. Venuti, 34-49 (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Mason, Ian. "Discourse, Ideology and Translation" in *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*, eds. R. de Beaugrande et al., 23-34 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994).

- Berman, Antoine. *Toward a Criticism of Translation*, trans. F. Massardier-Kenney, 23-80 (Kent: Kent State UP, 2009).

Day 4 (Thursday, June 9): Situating the Translator’s Voice: How Do Cultural Politics Shape the Translator’s Role?

- Casanova, Pascale. “Consecration and Accumulation of Literary Capital: Translation as Unequal Exchange” in *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker, trans. Siobhan Brownlee, 285-303 (London: Routledge, 2002-2010).
- Jaffe, Alexandra. “Locating Power: Corsican Translators and Their Critics” in *Language Ideological Debates*, ed. Jan Blommaert, 39-67 (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1999).
- Van Leeuwen, Richard. “The Cultural Context of Translating Arabic Literature” in *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*, ed. Said Faiq, 14-25 (Clevedon, U.K.; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2004).
- Appiah, Anthony. “Thick Translation,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 417-429 (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Selim, Samah. “Pharaoh’s Revenge: Translation, Literary History and Colonial Ambivalence” in *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker, 319-336 (London: Routledge, 1999-2009).

Day 5 (Friday, June 10): Figuring the Translator’s Voice I: How Do Translators Describe What They Do? Guest Speaker: Carol Maier

- Heaney, Seamus. “Earning a Rhyme: Notes on Translating *Buile Suibhne*” in *The Art of Translation: Voices from the Field*, ed. Rosanna Warren, 13-19 (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1989).
- Howard, Richard. “The Translator’s Voice” (An interview by Paul de Mann), *Translation Review* 9 (1982): 5-15.
- Weber Nicholson, Shierry and Samuel Weber. “Translating the Untranslatable” in *Prisms* by Theodor W. Adorno, 10-15 (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1990).
- Lane, Helen. “Helen Lane.” *On Translation: Translators*, ed. Ronald Christ, 1-15 (Atlanta: Atlanta College of Art Library, 1996).

Day 6 (Monday, June 13): Figuring the Translator’s Voice II: How Do Translators Describe What They Do? Guest Speaker: Peter Bush

- Cavanagh, Clare. “The Art of Losing: Polish Poetry and Translation” in *Translation. Translators on Their Work and What It Means*, eds. Esther Allen and Susan Bernofsky, 234-245 (New York: Columbia UP, 2003-2012).

- Bush, Peter. “Memory, War and Translation: Mercè Rodereda’s *In Diamond Square*” in *Perspectives on Literature and Translation: Creation, Circulation, Reception*, eds. Brian Nelson and Brigid Maher, 31-46 (London: Routledge, 2013).
- Hejinian, Lyn. “Forms in Alterity: On Translation” in *The Language of Inquiry*, 296-318 (Berkeley: U California P, 2000).
- Nabokov, Vladimir. “The Art of Translation.” *New Republic* (4 August 1941): 160-162.

Day 7 (Tuesday, June 14): Fictional Translators on Translation: Why Are Writers So Fascinated

with Translators? Guest Speaker: Rosemary Arrojo

- Arrojo, Rosemary. “Writing, Interpreting, and the Power Struggle for Control of Meaning: Scenes from Kafka, Borges, Kosztolany” in *Translation and Power*, eds. Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler, 63-79 (Amherst: U Massachusetts Press, 2002).
- Delabastida, Dirk and Ranier Grutman, Introduction, *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, Vol. 4, Special Issue on Fictional Translators (2005): 11-34.
- Klaus Kaindl, Introduction, in *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translated Fiction*, eds. K. Kaindl and K. Spitzl, 1-18 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014).
- Barbara Wilson, “Mi Novelista” in *Death of a Well-Travelled Woman*, 9-13; 195-215 (Chicago: Third Side Press, 1998).
- Borges, Jorge Luis. “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote,” trans. Andrew Hurley. 88-95. <http://hispanlit.qwriting.qc.cuny.edu/files/2011/06/Borges-Pierre-Menard.pdf>
- Davis, Lydia. “The Walk” in *Varieties of Disturbance*, 72-82 (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007).
- Salter, James. “Last Night.” *The New Yorker*: <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2002/11/18/last-night-2>

Day 8 (Wednesday, June 15): The Translator’s Voice and the Study of Literature: Why Should

Translated Literature Be Included in Literary Studies? Guest Speakers: Carol Maier, Peter Bush

- Cook-Sather, Alison. *Education Is Translation: A Metaphor for Change in Learning and Teaching*, 29-54 (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2006).
- Coldiron, A. E. B. “Translation’s Challenge to Critical Categories: Verses from French in the Early English Renaissance,” *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16(2): 315-344.
- Johan Heilbron, “Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World System,” *European Journal of Social Thought* 2(4): 429-444.
- Carol Maier, “Choosing and Introducing a Translation,” in *Literature in Translation: Teaching Issues and Reading Practices*, eds. Carol Maier and Françoise Massardier-Kenney, 11-21 (Kent: Kent UP, 2011).
- Baer, Brian James. “Introduction: Born in Translation” in *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature*, 1-20 (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015).

PART II. THEORIZING AND MAKING VISIBLE CULTURAL DIFFERENCE.

Day 9 (Thursday, June 16): Translated texts and Cross-cultural Competency: How Do We

Conceptualize Cultural Difference?

- Hall, Edward T. *Beyond Culture*, Introduction, Chapters 1, 2, and 7 (New York: Doubleday, 1976).
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas” in *Bourdieu, A Critical Reader*, ed. R. Shusterman, 220-228 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).
- Hofstede, Geert. “Values and Culture” in *Culture's Consequences*, 1-40 (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2001).
- Javorksi, Adam, Kari Sajavaara and Jaakko Lehtonen, “The Silent Finn Revisited” in *Silence. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Adam Jaworski, 263-284 (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1997).
- Nisbett, Richard. *The Geography of Thought*, xiv-xxiii;1-44 (New York: Free Press, 2004).
- Rapport, Nigel and Joanna Overing. *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*, entries on Bakhtin and Benjamin (New York: Routledge, 2000).

Day 10 (Friday, June 17): Authority/Agency: How Do Different Cultures Regard Structures of

Authority or Ascribe Status? Guest Speaker: Christi Merrill

- Aoyama, Tomoko and Judy Wakabayashi, “Identity and Relationships in Translated Japanese Literature” in *Literature in Translation. Teaching Issues and Reading Practices*, eds. Carol Maier and Françoise Massardier, 101-116 (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2010).
- Faiq, Said. “The Cultural Encounter in Translating from Arabic” in *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*, ed. Said Faiq, 1-13 (Clevedon, U.K.; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2004).
- Hofstede, Geert. “Power Distance” in *Culture's Consequences*, 79-121 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001).
- Merrill, Christi. “Memoir as Translation, Memory in Translation” in *Translators Writing, Writing Translators*, eds. Françoise Massardier-Kenney, Brian James Baer, and Maria Tymoczko, 55-68 (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2016).

Day 11 (Monday, June 20): Space and Time: How do different cultural groups perceive space

and time, and how does it affect specific beliefs and practices? Guest Speaker: M. R.

Ghanoonparvar

- Ghanoonparvar, M. R. *Translating the Garden*, 1-78 (Austin: U Texas P, 2001).
- Ricci, Ronit. “The Book of Samud: A Javanese Literary Tradition” in *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia*, 66-97 (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 2011).

- Hall, Edward. “Space Speaks” in *The Silent Language*, 158-180 (New York: Anchor Books, 1990).
- Carbonell, Ovidi. “Exoticism, Identity and Representation in Western Translation from Arabic” in *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*, ed. Said Faiq, 26-39 (Clevedon, U.K.; Buffalo : Multilingual Matters, 2004).

Day 12 (Tuesday, June 21): Individuality and Community: How Do Different Cultures Perceive the Relationship of the Individual and the Community? Guest Speaker: Michelle Yeh.

- Underhill, James. “Love,” in *Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts. Truth, Love, Hate and War*, 65-108 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012).
- Yeh, Michelle. “Literature as Identity Formation: Reading Chinese Literature in Translation” in *Literature in Translation: Teaching Issues and Reading Practices*, eds. Carol Maier and Françoise Massardier Kenney, 117-135 (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2010).
- Eifring, Alvor. “Introduction: Emotions and the Conceptual History of Quíng” in *Love and Emotions in Traditional Chinese Literature*, 1-36. (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Stewart, Frank (ed.). *The Poem Behind the Poem: Translating Asian Poetry*, Introduction and Gladstone essay (Port Townsend, WA: Copper Canyon Press, 2004).
- Robinson, Doug. *Exorcising Translation*, Chapter 3 “East and West: Toward a Civilizational Turn.” (Bloomsbury, 2016).

Day 13 (Wednesday June 22): Group Presentations

Day 14 (Thursday June 23): Group Presentations

Day 15 (Friday June 24): Group Presentations and Conclusion