Translation, ideology and creativity

Maria Tymoczko
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Early translation studies scholars explored the relationship between translation and literary creation, showing that translation serves innovative purposes in literary systems that are in crisis, or that are weak or relatively young. Translation also acts as an 'alibi' for the introduction of difference. These early explorations leave out the role of ideology in the creative aspects of translation, a role articulated in both discourse theory and postcolonial theory. As a form of linguistic interface, translation introduces discourse shifts, destabilizes received meanings, creates alternate views of reality, establishes new representations, and makes possible new identities. All these changes can produce creative results in a literary system and a culture. These creative dimensions of translation are particularly apparent in postcolonial contexts, illustrated here by the nexus of language interface, translation, and literary creativity in Ireland from the end of the nineteenth century to the present.

1. Literary creativity and translation: early views in translation studies

Almost a quarter century ago, Itamar Even-Zohar observed that at certain periods and in certain circumstances translation and original literary writing are allied: that translated literature maintains a central position in the literary system, participating actively in shaping the center of the system (1978: 23-24, 1990: 47). In such circumstances, he claims, "no clear-cut distinction is maintained between 'original' and 'translated' writings" and, moreover, "often it is the leading writers (or members of the avant-garde who are about to become leading writers) who produce the most conspicuous or appreciated translations" (1990: 46-47). Even-Zohar associates this phenomenon – when major writers or literary practitioners are also translators, and translators themselves write original, creative literary works – with situations in which new literary models are emerging, as well as new poetic languages, new compositional techniques, and new models of reality (1990: 47). Such situations arise, according to Even-Zohar, in three major cases: when a literature is 'young' and in the process of being established; when a literature is 'peripheral' or 'weak' within a large group of correlated literatures; and when a literature faces turning points, crises, or literary vacuums (1978: 23-27, 1990: 47-51). In such cases a literature changes in new and creative directions through the importation and translation of works from other cultural systems, supplementing and expanding – or challenging and contesting – what has gone before.

   Examples of such linkages between translation and literary innovation and creativity are common and have been well explored in translation studies. During the European Middle Ages, for example, nascent vernacular literary movements often began with groundbreaking translation movements. This trajectory can be traced in the translations and adaptations of Latin and biblical material in Old English literature, of Latin and Celtic texts in Old French literature, and of Italian literature in the works of Middle English authors, just to name obvious examples.[1]

   The use of translation in cultural situations where a local literature is perceived as 'young' or 'weak' has its correlate on the level of the individual writer as well. Translation has been a time-honored apprenticeship for young writers in the West, serving for the mastery of both general literary skills and specific literary forms. Early in their careers many famous writers have used translation as a form of iteration and imitation aimed at learning their craft, and some writers have continued to translate intermittently between periods of original writing, often when they have come to an impasse in their own creativity, an analogue on the individual level, perhaps, to a crisis on the cultural level. Gide serves as a good example of the general case, having translated Joseph Conrad's works throughout his career, learning from the process as a young writer and returning to the project when he was in personal crisis, for example during a depression associated with World War I. Such examples and circumstances explain how some great writers of a literary system are also its great literary translators.

   Scholars have taken up these observations of Even-Zohar and extended them. André Lefevere, for example, has expanded on the idea that in certain circumstances translation actually has more freedom from cultural and literary constraints than does original writing, and that in such cases translation can function as a means of innovation. When literary systems become rigid or creativity is blocked for whatever reasons, translation may be permitted more variation than original literary creation, hence offering a sort of 'blind' to evade cultural strictures for a forward-looking writer. Lefevere (1979, 1985: 237-238) argues that at such moments translation becomes an 'alibi' for the importation of new literary genres and forms, new poetics, and new subject matter; it is a major vehicle for challenging the literary center.[2] Since the Renaissance in Western literary history, there have been numerous such episodes. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for example, German writers used translation (of English literature in particular) as a means of developing their own literature and disengaging literary norms from French cultural dominance; under the guise of translating Shakespeare, many literary innovations were pioneered in German, illustrating that the use of translation as an 'alibi' to shift literary standards can be documented for centuries.

   These movements are merely examples of the many ways in which translation and literary creation or creativity are linked in Western literature, and similar movements can be charted throughout world literature.

Translation can serve such innovative purposes in part because translations are perceived (correctly) as 'other' within a given literary system. Translated literature constitutes a distinct element in any literary system, playing a specific role and holding a position different from that of 'original' indigenous literary works (see Even-Zohar 1990: 45-51). As such, translations are subject to somewhat different rules and expectations from indigenous works of the native literature, being potentially exempt from some of the (oppressive) rules and norms that govern most elements of the literary system. The 'deviations' of a foreign literary work in translation are at times tolerated where similar qualities in a native work would be rejected, in part perhaps because such deviations seem less menacing in a work of non-domestic origin, as Gideon Toury has suggested (1995: 42). When constraints within a system become too severe, therefore, writers may attempt literary experimentation within the boundaries of translation, where innovation will be more easily accepted.

In extreme cases, when translation is relatively free to introduce cultural difference but innovation in original texts has little chance of sympathetic reception, the phenomenon of pseudotranslation may result. When cultures are "reluctant to deviate from sanctioned models and norms", innovations in translations, which are usually a conservative or "secondary" mode of text generation within a literary system, often meet with greater cultural tolerance (Toury 1995: 41), thus opening up the possibility of translation serving as a masquerade for literary creativity and innovation. Sometimes pseudotranslations are used to avoid political reprisals and on occasion they are a gambit to appropriate prestige, say the prestige of the purported source culture when that culture has greater cultural cachet than the author's own (Toury 1995: 42).[3]

2. Creativity in the light of discourse theory

Although these explanations of the alliance between translation and literary creativity and innovation are significant, exemplified by important cases in literary history, they are incomplete, eliding a central reason for the nexus of translation and creativity. What is omitted is the relationship between creativity and ideology, creativity and power. The approaches to creativity and translation of early translation studies scholars – including the systems theorists Even-Zohar, Toury, and Lefevere – are typical of the field at the time: as scholars who started out as literary specialists, these writers emphasized the aesthetics and poetics of systems shifts caused by translation, rather than ideological elements that became the focus in translation studies subsequently.

A clue to the relationship between ideology, creativity, and translation is found in explorations of discourse theory, such as the arguments proposed by Norman Fairclough in *Language and Power* (1989) regarding the relationship between creativity and ideology. Discourse shifts are not merely

alternate ways of speaking; they are associated with shifts in ways of thinking and imaging the world, and they are inevitably correlatives of ideological change as well. Fairclough argues that creativity flourishes when social struggles are in the process of destructuring and restructuring discourses and orders of discourse and, hence, that creativity is one result of shifts in discourse structures and in the order of discourse (1989: 172). Fairclough's observations imply that when they are liberating, shifts in discourse have the potential to release creative impulses throughout a cultural system, not least in the realms of artistic production.

Apart from the salutary affects of liberation itself, a reason for the release of creativity has to do with the interdependence of discourse and identity. Discourse structures shape both personal and social identities; as discourses and orders of discourse shift, so will structures pertaining to identity on personal and collective levels. Unless such shifts are aimed in repressive directions, new identity formations in turn allow for personal and so-cietal growth. They open new possibilities of being and they unlock creati-vity on all levels. Thus, ideology, discourse shifts, identity, and creativity are closely allied. This can be seen in very immediate ways in movements of political and cultural nationalism where there is often an emphasis on opening discourses that will define and valorize new identities for the subjects of liberation movements.

3. Language interface and creativity

Fairclough's arguments bear investigation in relation to language in general and, ultimately, in relation to translation. As in discourse theory, postpositivist approaches to language stress the constructivist dimension of language. Language does not merely provide signs for preexisting structures of reality, as it does in a Platonic view of language. Rather, language creates and establishes 'reality' structures for speakers. This power of language to establish representations of the self, of the other, and of the world has come into focus with the abandonment of the Platonic approaches to language. By extension, what is represented is what is known: language and knowledge are therefore intimately connected within the power structures of a culture.[4]

In intralingual situations shifts in discourse are associated with shifts in language usage: language change is in itself a principal sign of discourse shifts. If one accepts this argument, however, there is an implication for interlingual situations as well. Exposure to a second language and to the ways of speaking that come with a second language in turn offers new ways of imaging and conceptualizing the social and natural worlds. Thus, a second language will de facto provide exposure to new discourses and new orders of discourse. Further, in suggesting alternate discourses, a second language can serve as a vehicle for shifts in ideology and a changed understanding of power relations, even as exposure to a second language can provide new ways of viewing identity, both personal and collective. These salu-

tary effects of learning a foreign language underlie the traditional inclusion of language learning in liberal arts curricula.[5]

Translation participates in these powerful effects of language interface. Unlike language acquisition, translation does not provide direct exposure to a second language, constituting instead a mediated exposure to another linguistic sphere.[6] Nonetheless, translation is positioned to promote shifts in discourse and the order of discourse based on the potentials inherent in exposure to a second language, because translation is a major form of cultural activity that involves language interface, cultural mediation, restructuring of perspective, challenges to existing norms, and importation of difference. Even domesticated translations can import new words or concepts to a receptor language and culture, and they introduce alternate ways of seeing the world and alternate discourses, albeit in an indirect form. For these reasons translation is a prime site for shifting discourses in a receptor culture, as translation theorists who stress difference have indicated.[7] Translation is a culturally 'licensed' activity that implicitly interrogates and alters a society's language on all levels (from phonology and lexis to discourse), with the most conservative manifestations of translation not excluded. For even those translations that obscure the radical challenges of a source text leave open possibilities of cultural change by the very absence or erasure of the sign, ultimately creating a demand for retranslation that introduces the differences that have been suppressed.

Language acquisition and translation are obviously not the only privileged areas of language interface. Whenever a culture encompasses multiple languages, whenever it is polylingual, there will be many forums for the types of linguistic slippage that we are considering. Juxtaposition of and competition between alternate representations of the world and alternate discourses within a polylingual society promote a sense of self-reflexivity about the structures of the social order: the attempt to close off such self-reflexivity and its potential interference with the operations of hegemony may be behind efforts in many states to disempower linguistic minorities or to enforce monolingualism through the civil institutions of the society, including the legal and educational systems. Even when plurilingualism and internal language differences provide continuous opportunity for discourse shifts in a culture, however, translation remains a major vehicle for cognitive and ideological change because it vastly extends challenges to dominant orders of discourse beyond local competing systems, potentially offering material from languages and cultures worldwide throughout human history.

The intersection of language difference, translation, ideology, and creativity is particularly clear in postcolonial cultures. Postcolonial theory has explored the significant interrelationships between power, discourses, and (personal and collective) identities in postcolonial cultures.[8] Moreover, numerous writers have addressed the importance of language interface and translation in postcolonial situations.[9] Contestations of power, ideologies, discourses, and identities are central to postcolonial histories, and almost all postcolonial people undertake such contestations within a context of mul-

tiple languages and multiple cultural legacies, not least of which are the colonizers' language and culture in interface with native ones. In postcolonial theory the importance of culture and cultural issues is stressed. Culture per se becomes problematized as colonized nations reach for political independence, because the subordination and eradication of native languages, ways of life, and cultural forms under colonization threaten to leave an emergent country politically liberated but still culturally bound to the colonizer after independence.

Postcolonial theorists have emphasized that the postcolonial condition is not simply a matter of loss. It also brings power: power to appropriate the colonizers' culture and invest elements of it with new meanings, as well as power to subvert colonial cultural authority and cultural forms.[10] Many of these changes are operative through shifts in discourse. Homi Bhabha locates this form of power in *hybridity*, and he cautions that hybridity "is not a third term that resolves the tension between two cultures" (1985: 156). Instead, it creates "a crisis for any concept of authority based on a system of recognition," allowing "other 'denied' knowledges [to] enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority – its rules of recognition" (1985: 156).[11] Bhabha's concept of hybridity is one aspect of the radical power of linguistic interface (whether direct or mediated through translation) to shift discourses and ideologies and, in the process, to release creativity.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (1989: 38-77) have analyzed the creative aspects of postcolonial literature, locating the roots of its innovations in aspects of language interface in postcolonial cultures. Postcolonial language dismantles the privileged authority represented by dominant linguistic norms of a colonial power. By appropriating and reconstituting the language of the center, colonial versions of the metropolitan languages grow and become more versatile, leading to hybridized effects (Ashcroft et al. 1989: 41). Lexis, grammar, and syntax all shift, taking on new usages and new vitality. Neologisms, new tropes, and other imaginative effects allow the horizons of the language to expand, offering powerful means of subverting dominant systems of cultural assumptions and facilitating new ways of textually constructing the world (Ashcroft et al. 1989: 44, 48). As a consequence, variation, difference, and code-switching characterize postcolonial writing. Thus, postcolonial creativity resting on language interface enables and supplements discourse shifts and cultural changes that result from overt contestations of power. The result is the release of the "supine energies" of language in hybridized colonial contexts; in effect, postcolonial authors have a cultural fund of defamiliarized language that they can harness for the type of difficulty that Steiner refers to as "tactical difficulties" (Steiner 1978: 40). If defamiliarization is the sine qua non of literary language (see Shklovsky 1965), the presence of a collective fund of defamiliarized language – as is available to postcolonial authors – will certainly facilitate literary creativity. Coupled with a flood of new subjects, new literary forms, and new fields of intertextuality, the defamiliarization and

renewal of language lead to powerful literary results. In favorable circumstances the result is a literary renaissance with creative reverberations in both the indigenous language(s) native to the colony and the dominant language of the colonizers. The literature of Ireland from 1890 to the present in English and Modern Irish is a salient example.

4. Language interface, ideology, and creativity: a case study

A brief examination of conditions in Ireland in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries illustrates the arguments under consideration related to language, ideology, translation, and creativity.[12] Postcolonial theory sets in relief the way that English military and political dominance over Ireland undermined the historical position of Irish-language culture as an autonomous and valued element in Europe. From the end of the seventeenth century, with the ascendancy of English power and the loss of Irish sovereignty, culture in the Irish language increasingly became Ireland's Other, subordinated to the developments and dominant values in English-language culture. Ironically, therefore, from being a major force in the creation of Europe in the early Middle Ages, Irish-language culture assumed roles analogous to those of the native cultures in Europe's colonies. This changed status – as well as the physical and political dominance of Ireland by England – is central to what has made postcolonial theory germane to literary developments in Ireland during the last two centuries.

Inspired by Enlightenment discourses and the ideals of *liberté*, *égalité*, *fraternité*, nationalism in the eighteenth century did not have a fixation on language, nor did it privilege questions of language. Eighteenth-century paradigms of nationalism were relatively tolerant of coalitions across language boundaries and inclusive along cultural lines. In the nineteenth-century paradigm of nationalism, however, a people needed more than a territory to claim nationhood and self-determination: a language, a distinct culture, and a national history were necessary as well. Language – belonging to the social sphere and rooted in the depths of time – became a figure for the imagined community and its history projected into the past (Anderson 1991: 144-45). Ironically, however, the shift from eighteenth-century to nineteenth-century models of nationalism in Ireland coincided with the rapid decline of the Irish language. Having held onto the Irish language throughout the eighteenth century, despite the harsh restrictions of the Penal Laws,[13] the Irish people made a dramatic shift to English in the nineteenth century, and the majority gave up speaking Irish. The reasons for the loss of Irish are many – the required use of English in the national schools was significant, but more pressing were economic compulsions, factors that became inescapable to the citizenry after the terrible losses of the Great Famine in mid century.[14]

Just when nationalism demanded the possession of a national language, therefore, Irish was on the wane in Ireland, threatening the legitima-

cy of Ireland's demand for sovereignty. All the more reason that from the middle of the nineteenth century, Irish patriots responded vigorously to the nineteenth-century paradigm of nationalism and, like many other European nations, Ireland was seized by the imperative to define itself linguistically. The result was the initiation of various nationalistic projects including editions, translations, and the program to de-Anglicize Ireland. Irish cultural nationalism and its political counterparts were largely English-language operations, but with the founding of the Gaelic League in 1893 and the language movement, Irish nationalism took a stand, refusing to let Irish die or be reduced to a sort of archaeological trace, a political memory of a fossilized past. There was a commitment to retain Ireland's biculturalism and bilingualism.

Ireland provides a good test case of the relationship between creati-vity, translation, ideology, and language interface that is being explored here, because of the manifest creativity demonstrated by Irish literature and Irish writers in the twentieth century. There is scarcely a culture, whatever its size, that produced a larger or more outstanding group of writers than those of Ireland in the twentieth century. The reasons for this outpouring of creative work from such a small country are worth exploring in terms of the issues being tracked here. The literary movement in Ireland is particularly interesting with respect to the concerns at hand because Irish writers are articulate about language, cultural identity, and the role of the artist in a multilingual nation. Language and identity are at the heart of literary discourses in general, but the testimony of Ireland's writers about these issues is unparalleled, as are their self-reflexive formal means of integrating concerns related to language and identity in their literary works. These data are all the richer because of the differences in literary practice and production with relation to language and identity north and south in Ireland.

　　　Let us begin with the question of language interface and translation. The bulk of Irish people in the twentieth century had English as their first language, with Irish a second language at best, seen primarily as the language of ancestors: the language of the nation used to reflect the nation backward in time was, paradoxically, not the language that most people spoke most of the time. Thus, to maintain connection with Irish-language culture, particularly the treasures of Ireland's past, translation was essential.

　　　One of the most significant aspects of Ireland's recommitment to Irish was the practice of cultural translation, a practice that was particularly intense from 1880 onward.[15] Throughout the twentieth century there was broad and deep movement into English-language culture of many aspects of Irish-language literature, culture, and history. The period is marked by the integration of the island's plurilingual heritage in a joint cultural field through translation of texts, adaptations, and rewritings of various sorts, as well as the promotion of these materials in the educational system. Cultural translation and integration are patent in the literature of the Irish Literary Revival and later writing in English: the translation of Irish speech and the

valorization of Hiberno-English by J.M. Synge and others who used the Anglo-Irish idiom; the translations, retellings, and refractions of Irish-language literature by noted writers including Augusta Gregory and Douglas Hyde, as well as by scholars; and the use of Irish mythos by such writers as W.B. Yeats, James Joyce, Austin Clarke, Thomas Kinsella, and Nuala Ní Dhomhnaill.[16] Cultural translation of Irish-language literature and traditions into English became a normative basis for intellectual and artistic life particularly in the Republic of Ireland.

The result was a bicultural literary tradition in the twentieth century in Ireland, biculturalism that Thomas Kinsella (1970, 1995) called first a "divided tradition" and then later a "dual tradition". By the end of the twentieth century, whatever their primary language, most artists in Ireland could draw from all aspects of Ireland's plurilingual culture, crossing freely the lines of language and tradition, claiming as heritage for their artistic identity and creativity materials that had origins in Irish equally with English. The result was a radical expansion of operative models for literary form, linguistic texture, mythic reference, intertextuality, and so forth, feeding the creativity and development of Ireland's outstanding literary production.[17]

The creativity characteristic of postcolonial literatures discussed above is visible in twentieth-century Irish writing. The ability to draw on multiple linguistic and literary traditions is related to the significant creativity of Irish writers seen on every level of their writing, from content to form to linguistic richness.[18] As with Ireland's writers, the habitual world of reference of most readers became bicultural and, thus, implicitly bilingual: the dual tradition has been the foundation of cultural literacy for a century in Ireland, as we have seen. As a result, artists had an initiated and dedicated audience to write for and an informed reception from readers, setting up positive feedback conditions for augmented biculturalism, cultural translation, and hybridity, all of which fostered the sustained creative surge in Irish literature that has characterized literary output in Ireland for more than a century. It is worth emphasizing again that although both residual bilingualism and language acquisition contributed to the literary achievements in Ireland, the major form of access to Irish-language traditions remained textual translation and rewriting throughout the twentieth century.

Yet this does not mean that the Irish language per se can be viewed as an epiphenomenon in Irish cultural and political life or in questions related to creativity in Ireland. It is easy to dismiss or underestimate the ideological importance of the Irish language movement and the literary efforts of cultural translation at the turn of the twentieth century unless we consider the implications of the relationship between language interface and identity. Revivalist discourses about the rationale for using the Irish language at the turn of the twentieth century couched the matter largely in terms of the framework provided by nineteenth-century nationalism, but more recent perspectives, including discourse theory, open up other ways of interpreting the language movement and its program of cultural translation that allow us to see a fuller range of the ideological underpinnings of Irish literary creativi-

ty. These new modes of speaking about language in Ireland are predicated on the central intellectual shift in Western thought during the twentieth century: the abandonment of positivism, followed by a self-reflexive postpositivist insistence on the importance of frameworks and perspectives. Attention to frameworks reveals how language and power are related in Ireland, indicating that language cannot be separated from larger ideological and discursive structures, and suggesting in turn that language can be used creatively to shift those same ideological frameworks.

Subject peoples can engage in a process of resignification of received knowledge – both their own and those of dominant cultures – through cultural hybridity, as we have seen. Cultural translation in Ireland contributed to undermining the presence of colonialist authority, creating, in Bhabha's terms, hybrid "objects of epistemological or moral contemplation". By a partializing process – a "metonymy of presence" – such translation disturbed "the construction of discriminary knowledges" (Bhabha 1985: 156-57). Seen in this light, the language movement in Ireland and its attendant cultural translation were fundamental means of engaging in a struggle for power within the movement for independence. New power relations fostered new cultural identities: by undertaking the integration of Irish-language and English-language culture, the Revival established the conditions for the emergence of a decolonized cultural position for Ireland. By creatively drawing together the cultural domains that Ireland had inherited, the writers of the Irish Literary Revival made it possible for Irish literature and Irish culture to resist marginalization within English-language culture, providing a means of decentering the structures of cultural power as well. These are the strengths that the bicultural or dual literary tradition of twentieth-century Ireland could summon, and they are central to the preeminence of Irish literature in the English-speaking world throughout the last century, a preeminence that continues in the twenty-first century.

Let us look at this trajectory in more concrete terms. By turning to the resources of the Irish language, cultural movements in Ireland found a way to break out of the prison-house of language constructed within dominant English-language culture for the Irish. Language revival, cultural translation, and hybridity were strategies of that break-out, forming the basis for the reorganization of particular cultural discourses, as well as the order of discourse. These discourse shifts impacted not only Ireland but England and other English-speaking countries also. Many of the discourses that imprisoned Irish culture have been well canvassed. The stereotyping of the Irish by the English is particularly well known (Curtis 1968, 1971). These stereotypes hardened throughout the nineteenth-century because of contemporary views about race, such that by the second half of the century the Irish had become simianized in dominant English culture.

The language movement and its program of cultural translation were means of supplying alternate discourses and alternate models of Irishness that represented the Irish in new ways – as noble and heroic, for example – and that constructed new identities for both the Irish and the English in the

process.[19] In a sense, through the language movement, Irish nationalism adopted an anti-language, involving conscious oppositions to dominant discourses (see Fairclough 1989: 91). By interrupting ideological assumptions that undergird cultural coherence and support hegemony (see Fairclough 1989: 85), such alternative constructions of language and representations are fundamental to the assertion of decolonized identities, and they are inseparable from demands for justice and liberation.

Constructivist approaches to language and representation indicate the power of the language movement in Ireland and, at the same time, the difficulty in defining people and their identities. The problems associated with definitions of identity go even deeper, however. Pierre Bourdieu has argued that culture – and, hence, personal and social identities – rests on dispositions which are expressed in terms of practices, often of a very particularized sort. Dispositions and practices are integrated in what he calls the *habitus*, "understood as a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a *matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions* and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks" (1977: 82-83, original emphasis). Clearly it is difficult for those outside a system to define its cultural identity, because it is hard to perceive the dispositions and, hence, to understand the meaning of the practices. Bourdieu offers the further insight that it is also difficult for those inside a culture to describe their own habitus – and hence to define their own identity – because of a process of effacement that he describes as "history turned into nature", history "denied as such" (1977: 78).[20]

Language encodes both dispositions and practices. It is a fundamental aspect of any human culture that embodies its deepest perceptions, values, and social structures.[21] Language is also a major vehicle of the process of naturalizing history that Bourdieu delineates, for through language many aspects of life become experienced as 'common sense': the 'obvious' way to talk and, hence, to think. The formation and introjection of discourses are aspects of the process of naturalizing history.[22] The naturalization inherent in the constitution of the habitus and language presents obstacles to innovation and change. Conversely, reconstruction of discourses and representational structures can result from learning a new language or integrating the representations of two languages, whether that integration proceeds on an individual or a collective level. Language shift has the power to interrupt the processes of naturalization, thereby facilitating new perceptions of personal and cultural identities by bringing unconsciously accepted aspects of culture and language to conscious awareness. In part, therefore, the language revival movement in Ireland challenged dominant English-language culture by interrupting the naturalizations operating in language usage and identity formation. These challenges constituted a radical aspect of the language movement that contributed to political and cultural change, as well as artistic innovation in Ireland.

The result was a creative burgeoning of literature that valorized Irish culture, Irish ways of speaking, and Irish subjectivities. Where Oscar Wilde

had been anxious to eradicate his "Hibernicisms", Irish writers of the twen-
tieth century gloried in Hiberno-English and many made it the foundation of
their style. This is true most notably of James Joyce, who even thematizes
the question of language in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1968:
188-89). It is also a hallmark of the style of Augusta Gregory, Douglas Hyde,
J.M. Synge, Sean O'Casey, and innumerable other writers throughout the
twentieth century. Shifted notions of Irish identity also facilitated new re-
presentations of Irish subjects, including Joyce's recasting citizens of Dublin
as principal Homeric characters in *Ulysses*, as well as valorization of Irish
figures in universalized roles. These visions of new identities resonate
throughout twentieth-century Irish literature offering creative possibilities
not merely for Irish readers but for the world.

    The creativity that characterizes Irish culture in the twentieth century
is not manifest at the level of original literature alone. Creativity can be seen
in both the products and processes of the Irish translation movement itself,
as I have discussed at length in *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early
Irish Literature in English Translation* (1999a). With cultural nationalism
impinging on the representations in their translations, translators in Ireland
assumed very proactive and visible roles from the beginning of the transla-
tion movement, dating from the end of the eighteenth century. Translation
choices in Ireland frequently have radical ideological implications on all
levels – including choice of texts, content, identity formations, formal repre-
sentations, literary strategies, and defamiliarization and renewal of language.
Some of the translations are themselves monuments of the Irish Literary
Revival, standing as significant literary texts in their own right within the
larger literary movement, for the translations allowed for literary experi-
mentation and innovative textual strategies in a domain that was less con-
strained by the canonized center of English-language literature. The transla-
tions contributed significantly to the emergence of a decolonized cultural
position in Ireland and have been an important part of the creative literary
production of the island (see 1999a: 62-121, 163-190, 222-247).

5. Further implications of the Irish Language Movement

When a people is an imprisoned group and language operates as part of the
enclosure, inevitably the language of the people becomes deformed, subject
to the demands of the dominant group. But strategies of resistance arise as
well, and these, too, have been theorized in critical literature, particularly
with reference to postcolonial peoples, to African Americans, and to women
(see, e.g. Gates 1988). A feature of resistant language is often its doubleness:
the ability to say one thing and signify another, or the ability to say two
things at once. Doubleness is also a characteristic of those who belong
simultaneously to two speech communities, including bilinguals, the condi-
tion of many Irish people in the twentieth century and in the present as well.
Types of resistant language are in part interesting because of the problems of
recognition they pose; like hybridity, double language destabilizes traditio-

nal rules of recognition and communicates a coded message to an initiated community. The result is a density of signification with enormous potential for literary expression, a density that may illuminate the creativity of Irish literary works where the writing is so difficult and charged, for example the works of James Joyce and Flann O'Brien.

Bilingualism and doubleness have been used as effective political tools by many Irish people with a nationalist agenda. Doubleness is a risky way of life, however, for it breeds what has been called a double consciousness, a habitual way of viewing the world and the self from two frameworks simultaneously. In the extreme such doubling moves from resistance to madness, and scholars have discussed the exposure to pathology faced by subjects who continually negotiate a double consciousness as a way of life.[23] The process of becoming an artist is complex in such an environment. The doubleness of Irish culture and its relationship to the challenges and power of Irish writing were articulated overtly in the groundbreaking essays of Thomas Kinsella (1970, 1995), in which he discusses the Irish writer's identity within and awareness of a divided and dual tradition, as we have seen.[24] In a society where double consciousness is widespread, writing about the condition of doubleness becomes an analogue to 'the talking cure' as a means of sorting through social and personal identities in order to find healing for both the community and the individual. This may be an impetus behind some of the great literature that came out of Ireland during the last century, and it may suggest one source of the creative impetus of postcolonial literature as a whole.

It is arguable that the cultural confidence so apparent in Ireland at the beginning of the twenty-first century would not have been possible without the translation of medieval Irish texts, the cultural translation of all sorts of materials between Ireland's two speech communities, the shifts in representation, and the reexaminations of language and power initiated by the Irish Literary Revival and pursued – however inadequately with respect to its stated goals of reviving Irish as the principal language of the nation – in the Irish state after Ireland's partial independence in 1922. The language movement in Ireland which began as an impulse of nineteenth-century nationalism with the goal of language restoration ended the twentieth century with very different objectives, meanings, and significations. Irish cultural assertion that was first articulated in terms of translation undergirds constructions of Irish identity later in the twentieth century expressed in other cultural terms: the popularity worldwide of Irish traditional music, the international recognition of Irish popular music, the entrepreneurial success of the Irish business community in international arenas, and the increasingly high-profile role Ireland plays in the European Union and other international political domains. English has remained the dominant language in Ireland, but Ireland's plurilingualism and language difference have become the lever differentiating Irish culture from the English-speaking cultures of England, the United States, Canada, and Australia, among others. Language difference has become a central thread of Ireland's decolonized culture and one sign

deployed by the Republic of Ireland to secure its independent role in Europe. Thus, the creativity that is so obvious in modern Irish literature can be plausibly connected with other sorts of cultural creativity, expansion, and assertion as well.

Translation, cultural nationalism, the language movement, and the linguistic complexity fostered in modern Ireland have been used to secure for Ireland a strong cultural position within the English-speaking world; to disambiguate it politically, economically, and culturally from dominant English-language nations; to build an autonomous decolonized culture that has been recognized for its excellence within the world community; to claim a distinct place within the multilingual European Union; and to establish a place for itself in the globalized world economy. Cultural creativity associated with language interface and translation in Ireland, thus, go far beyond the realm of the literary.

6. Conclusions

Translation in a postcolonial context is interesting in part because it illustrates the importance and implications of the interface of radically different languages; of differences in culture, representations of the world, and discourses; and of issues pertaining to contestations of identity and power. Ideological factors of translation are, thus, writ large. In such contexts it is easier to discern the relationship between translation and creativity.

If we accept Fairclough's contention that creativity flourishes when social struggles are in the process of destructuring and restructuring discourses and orders of discourse (1989: 172), then clearly postcoloniality will entail cultural creativity, for the entire process of colonizing a nation and decolonizing it involves attempts to destructure and restructure discourses and orders of discourse. The colonizing powers attempt to break down and undermine indigenous discourses, even as contact with the people who are colonized brings into question the colonizers' assumptions about the world and their own ways of speaking about it. Similarly, the process of decolonization involves challenging and contesting the discourses of the colonizers, even as those colonized absorb and deploy cultural modes introduced by the colonizing powers. At any of these stages creativity can be released. Thus, the special creativity associated with many postcolonial cultures is not simply a function of power struggles and contestations. Rather, creativity turns on more fundamental aspects of the interface of languages and cultures that are a hallmark of postcolonial experience and that are also essential factors in translation.

A constructivist analysis indicates that views of reality are shaped by language, and shifts in such views are also central to the creativity of postcolonial literature. The multilingual cultures of postcolonial nations entail linguistic interface and interference which result in shifts in discourse and which challenge established formulations for construing and defining the

world. Linguistic interference is also at the root of the power of hybridity and double language, which facilitate struggles for cultural power by postcolonial peoples. Finally, linguistic interface leads to the development of defamiliarized language, perhaps the hallmark of literary language, central to the creative literary force of postcolonial literature.

All these features figure in the force of translation in postcolonial cultures as well. In these respects the creativity associated with postcolonial translation is merely a limiting case of the potential for creativity in all translation. It stands as a figure for the creative aspects of linguistic and cultural interfacings in other translation contexts where the destructuring and restructuring of experience, and the renewal of language are more difficult to perceive, more subtle in their implications. These creative potentials are present in any interface of language and, thus, are immanent in all translation.

In *Imagined Communities* Benedict Anderson writes "It is always a mistake to treat languages in the way that certain nationalist ideologues treat them – as *emblems* of nation-ness, like flags, costumes, folk-dances, and the rest" (1989: 133). Some scholars make this mistake, discounting the importance of language in studies of history, culture, and ideology, as well as in processes of identity formation. This constitutes a failure to come to grips with views of language and critical frameworks that have emerged since positivism has receded. In turn, failure to acknowledge the radical potential of language interface and its inescapable ideological nature contributes to misprizal of the power of translation, as well as the potential relationship between translation and creativity.

One correlate of the arguments advanced here is that scholars should be alert to the role of translation within postcolonial resistance movements and cultural nationalism. They should be sensitive to ways that postcolonial literature is engaged with the project of cultural translation even when literary works are written in the language of the colonizers. This sort of translation occurs in the work of writers such as Amos Tutuola, Chinua Achebe, and Ngugi wa Thiong'o, all of whom engage in cultural translation and linguistic mediation, deploying defamiliarized language that instantiates discourse shifts as well.[25] There are translational elements associated as well with language revival movements, movements to define a national literature, and the like, where at least part of the focus is on language explicitly. All these connections between translation and other aspects of cultural renaissance will relate to creativity and innovation in postcolonial contexts.

Creativity is also inherent in postcolonial translation movements per se. The possibilities offered by a hybridized cultural environment facilitate the production of translations that differ significantly from dominant expectations and theorizations about translation.[26] In such postcolonial contexts translations emerge as significant literary monuments, as centers of literary innovation, as sources of linguistic expansion and renewal, or as celebrated means of challenging dominant power structures. Again these innovative and creative aspects of postcolonial translation products and processes are merely limiting cases, and they have implications for translation as a whole.

Finally, the correlation between ideology and creativity outlined here suggests the importance of promoting self-reflexivity on the part of translators. The more translators recognize the ideological implications of language interface in their work and the ideological foundation of translation in general, the more innovative they potentially become. As we have seen, the ideological component of translation is seen in its ability to promote discourse shifts and to suggest new identity formations, both of which constitute significant cultural movement, as well as in more particular effects such as double writing, defamiliarization, and hybridity. Translators can develop self-reflexivity as a result of actual immersion in a charged political context, but they can also learn it in their formal training, the promotion of which is in the hands of translation scholars. Whatever the source, awareness of ideology moves translators and translations beyond transposition toward innovation and creation.

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso.

Ashcroft, Bill et al. (1989). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literature*. London: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan & Harish Trivedi (eds) (1999). *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1985). "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12, 144-65.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. (tr. Richard Nice). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curtis, L. Perry, Jr. (1968). *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-irish Prejudice in Victorian England*. Bridgeport, CT: University of Bridgeport.

Curtis, L. Perry, Jr. (1971). *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1989 [1903]). *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Bantam Books

Edwards, Ruth Dudley (1973). *An Atlas of Irish History*. London: Methuen.

Eoyang, Eugene Chen (1993). *The Transparent Eye: Reflections on Translation, Chinese Literature, and Comparative Poetics*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978). *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990). *Polysystem Studies*. Special issue. *Poetics Today* 11(1).

Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.

Fanon, Frantz (1966 [1961]). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (tr. Constance Farrington). New York: Grove Press.

Foucault, Michel (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*. (tr. A.M. Sheridan Smith). Pantheon: New York.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. (1988). *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Graham, Joseph F. (ed.) (1985) *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hermans, Theo (ed.) (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation.* London: Croom Helm.

Joyce, James (1968). *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: Text, Criticism, and Notes*. Chester G. Anderson (ed.). New York: Viking.

Kinsella, Thomas (1970). "The Irish Writer." W. B. Yeats and Thomas Kinsella. *Davis, Mangan, Ferguson? Tradition and the Irish Writer*. Dublin: Dolmen Press, 57-70.

Kinsella, Thomas (1995). *The Dual Tradition: An Essay on Poetry and Politics in Ireland*. Manchester: Carcanet.

Lefevere, André (1979). "Slauerhoff and `Po Tsju I': Three Paradigms for the Study of Influence." *Tamkang Review* 10, 67-77.

Lefevere, André (1985). "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites?" The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm." Th. Hermans (ed.) (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation.* London: Croom Helm, 215-243.

Lewis, Philip E. 1985. "The Measure of Translation Effects." J. F. Graham (ed.) (1985) *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 31-62.

Moody, T. W., and F. X. Martin (eds) (1987). *The Course of Irish History*. Revised and enlarged edition. Cork: Mercier Press.

Mutran, Munira H. & Laura P. Z. Izarra (eds) (2003). *Kaleidoscopic Views of Ireland*. São Paolo: Universidade de São Paolo.

Ní Dhomhnaill, Nuala (2003). "Seal sa Domhan Thoir: Sojourn in the Eastern World." M.Tymoczko & C. Ireland (eds) (2003). Special Issue. *Language and Identity in Twentieth-Century Irish Culture. Éire-Ireland* 38 (1-2), 181-97.

O'Leary, Philip (1994). *The Prose Literature of the Gaelic Revival, 1881-1921: Ideology and Innovation.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shklovsky, Victor (1965). "Art as Technique." *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Translated by Lee T. Jemon & Marion J. Reis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 3-24.

Simon, Sherry & Paul St-Pierre (eds) (2000). *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Steiner, George (1978). "On Difficulty." G. Steiner (1978). *On Difficulty and Other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University press, 18-47.

Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tymoczko, Maria (1986-87). "Translation as a Force for Literary Revolution in the Twelfth-Century Shift from Epic to Romance." *New Comparison* 1, 1-16.

Tymoczko, Maria (1994). *The Irish "Ulysses"*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Tymoczko, Maria (1999a). *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Tymoczko, Maria (1999b). "Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation." S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (eds) (1999). *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 19-40.

Tymoczko, Maria (2000). "Translations of Themselves: The Contours of Postcolonial Fiction." S. Simon & P. St-Pierre (eds) (2000). *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 147-63.

Tymoczko, Maria (2003). "Cultural Translation in Twentieth-Century Irish Literature." M. H. Mutran & L. P. Z. Izarra (eds) (2003). *Kaleidoscopic Views of Ireland*. São Paolo: Universidade de São Paolo, 189-223.

Tymoczko, Maria & Colin Ireland (eds) (2003). Special Issue. *Language and Identity in Twentieth-Century Irish Culture*. *Éire-Ireland* 38(1-2).

Tymoczko, Maria & Colin Ireland (2003). "Language and Identity in Twentieth-Century Ireland." M. Tymoczko & C. Ireland (eds) (2003). Special Issue. *Language and Identity in Twentieth-Century Irish Culture*. *Éire-Ireland* 38 (1-2), 4-22.

Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) (1992). *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge.

Williams, Patrick & Laura Chrisman (eds) (1994). *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Yeats, William Butler & Thomas Kinsella (1970) *Davis, Mangan, and Ferguson? Tradition and the Irish Writer*. Dublin: Dolmen Press.

---

[1] A detailed examination of the case of Old French literature is found in Tymoczko (1986-87).

[2] See also Even-Zohar (1978: 21-27, 1990: 45-51) on translation and its relationship to center/periphery.

[3] Other reasons for pseudotranslations are discussed in Toury (1995: 42-44).

[4] The constructivist analysis within discourse theory obviously follows from a weak version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. On the constructivist implications of language, see also Foucault (1972).

[5] And, of course, the 'controls' societies exert over the hierarchy of foreign languages their students are encouraged to learn.

[6] One caution should be added here. Some translations, such as facing translations in scholarly editions, serve primarily as a means to access the source text and, thus, facilitate direct exposure to the second language. Eoyang calls such translations "contingent translations". See his full discussion of the topic (1993: 160, 192-94).

[7] Arguments are found, for example, in Lewis (1985); Venuti (1992, 1995, 1998).

[8] See Fanon ([1961] 1966) and essays in Williams and Chrisman (1994) for examples.

[9] Essays by Ngugi wa Thiong'o and Chinua Achebe in Williams and Chrisman (1994: 428-55) are well known statements on these topics.

[10] More extensive discussions of these points are found in Bhabha (1994) and Ashcroft et al. (1989).

[11] See Bhabha (1985, 1994) for a fuller discussion of the radical challenges of hybridity to hegemonic structures.

[12] A more detailed account of this material is contained in Tymoczko and Ireland (2003).

[13] The Penal Laws imposed considerable hardship on the Catholic population of Ireland and, hence, on most of the Irish-speaking population, forbidding, for example, education in Irish or the printing of Irish materials. See Moody and Martin (1987: 218-31).

[14] The Famine hit the Irish-speaking population disproportionately and disastrously. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Irish was the dominant language of the

country. From 1851, after the Famine, when 25 percent of the population were still Irish speakers, Irish speakers declined to 12 percent in 1911, according to census figures (Edwards 1973: 229).

[15] A more detailed account of cultural translation in Ireland is found in Tymoczko (2003). The beginning of the Irish Revival is usually dated from the publication of Standish O'Grady's groundbreaking adaptation of Irish legends and myths in English, titled *History of Ireland: The Heroic Period*, the two volumes of which were published in 1878 and 1880. O'Grady's work, however, is preceded by a century of translations from Irish into English.

[16] These issues are discussed at greater length in Tymoczko (1994, 1999a, 2003).

[17] Although the argument here is primarily made in terms of English-language literature in Ireland, most of the same general points could be made about Irish-language writing as well, which undertook cultural translation from English and entered a very creative period attributable in part to the expansion of the cultural field. Many of these developments are discussed in O'Leary (1994).

[18] The relationship between the innovative formal aspects of Irish writing and translation are discussed in Tymoczko (1999a: 90-121).

[19] Examples are found in Tymoczko (1999a: ch. 2).

[20] A full discussion of this complex topic is beyond the scope of this essay.

[21] These questions are discussed at greater length in Tymoczko (1999a: ch. 6), which traces the translation of "signature concepts" of early Irish culture, concepts that link values, practices, and social structures.

[22] Quoting Bourdieu, Fairclough (1989: 41) observes, "it is because subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing that what they do has more meaning than they know." See also the interesting discussion in Fairclough (1989: ch. 4) of the naturalization process operative in the formation of discourses and structures of discourse.

[23] Du Bois (1989 [1903]) and Fanon (1966 [1961]) both discuss double consciousness and the risk of pathology among imprisoned populations.

[24] See Ní Dhomhnaill (2003) for a personal account of her emergence as a poet in relationship to bilingualism.

[25] See Tymoczko (1999b). Scholars should also pay attention to issues related to language interface and translation in the works of diaspora authors based within dominant cultures, such as Salman Rushdie.

[26] A full exploration of this point is beyond the scope of this article. See Tymoczko (1999a: 278-98) for a more extensive consideration of the topic. See also Tymoczko (2000).