



Changes of Translation Definition and Turns of Translation Studies

LONG Jixing^{[a]*}

^[a] School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou city, China.

* Corresponding author.

Received 9 August 2012; accepted 20 October 2012

Abstract

Since the twentieth century, translation studies has made great progress. The study of translation ushers one turn after another. Throughout the recent history of translation studies, few scholars review the appearance of the turns from the perspective of translation definition. From the academic perspective and on the basis of Thomas Samuel Kuhn's paradigm theory, this article discusses the relationships between the changing definitions of translation and the turns of translation studies. It chooses the definitions of translation proposed by the most famous theorists to analyze. And, the mainly two turns and the new trend of contemporary translation studies are attributed into three paradigms (linguistic paradigm, cultural paradigm, and social and psychological paradigm) to discuss. By a careful research, the article comes to a conclusion that the changes of definitions and the turns of translation studies affect and contact each other closely. The definition of translation determines the scope of translation studies. A new definition that is widely accepted always generates a new turn and the new turn tends to breed a next new definition, and so on and so forth, hence the development of translation studies.

Key words: Definition of translation; Translation studies; Paradigm; Paradigm shift; Turn

LONG Jixing (2012). Changes of Translation Definition and Turns of Translation Studies. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 8(5), 35-43. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ccc/article/view/j.ccc.1923670020120805.2156> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020120805.2156>

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1950s, with the development of such disciplines as linguistics, literature, anthropology, sociology, psychology and the rise of deconstructionism, feminism, postcolonialism, more and more theories are applied to translation studies. The introduction of the theories from various kinds of disciplines and thoughts not only offers new perspectives for translation studies, but also brings new turns to it. Throughout the recent history of translation studies, there are mainly two turns of translation studies: the linguistic turn and the cultural turn. And as the social and psychological turn has been proposed and viewed as the next turn and the future developing trend of translation studies, this article chooses these three main turns to analyze and tries to expose a fact that behind these turns are actually wars of definitions of translation.

As a specific turn of translation studies is one of the nuclear parts of translation studies, the study of translation and its turns attracts some scholars' attentions. Abroad, the representative figures are Susan Bassnett, André Lefevere, Jeremy Munday, Mary Snell-Hornby, and Edwin Gentzler and so on. In China, there are few scholars such as Wang Ning, Lü Jun, Xie Tianzheng have ever studied on the turns in translation studies.

Although the scholars show great interests in the turns of translation studies, few of them review the appearance of these turns as a result of the change of translation definition. As a matter of fact, translation definition plays a great role in translation studies as well as the turns of the methodology. On the one hand, it is the central part of translation studies, not only defining the nature of translation, but also determining which text can be regarded as translation. On the other hand, it is the crucial factor for the turns of translation studies. It confines the range of study. Besides, few of them study the turns systematically. In fact, according to Thomas Samuel Kuhn's Paradigm theory, the different turns of translation studies can be fallen under different paradigms. That is to

say, any turn of translation studies can all be viewed as the study under a corresponding paradigm.

This article focuses on the influence of definition on translation studies. Firstly, by comparing the old translation definitions and turns with the new ones, the aim is to probe into the interaction between translation and the turns. Based on the findings, it then tries to make clear how the definitions influence the transform of the turns as well as the development of translation studies.

1. FROM THOMAS SAMUEL KUHN'S PARADIGM THEORY TO PARADIGMS OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

Kuhn is a famous American historian of science and philosopher of science. From the studies on the history of science, he proposes and develops some important notions which play a great role in the development of sociology and philosophy of science, especially the proposition of paradigm theory, which greatly improves our understanding of science and has far-reaching impacts on not only natural science but also social science.

In his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Kuhn puts forward his paradigm theory which relates closely to normal science. Paradigm originates from one or some famous people's achievements and Kuhn maintains that achievements which share the following two characteristics can be referred to as paradigms: firstly, the achievement is "sufficiently unprecedented to attract an enduring group of adherents away from competing modes of scientific activity"; secondly, the achievement is "sufficiently open-ended to leave all sorts of problems for the redefined group of practitioners to solve" (Kuhn, 1962, 1970, p.10). Later on, he defines paradigm as an accepted model or pattern. So to sum up, paradigm can be regarded as a research mode or pattern which is concluded by a scientific group at a specific time, and in turn, guides their research.

Although Kuhn's work is concerned with the ideas in science, he pointed out in the preface of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, the theory of paradigm is appropriate for humanities and social science. After the publication of this book, his model in science was being applied to a wide variety of areas of academic, intellectual, and social activity. Kuhn's paradigm has two senses:

One is global, embracing all the shared commitments of a scientific group; the other isolates a particularly important sort of commitment and is thus a subset of first. The first sense is a sociological one; it is a very broad notion, encompassing the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by members of a given community (Bird, 2000, pp. 67-68).

In addition to this, whether the paradigms can co-exist or not in a specific time is the main difference between social science paradigm and natural science paradigm. As one of the essential elements of Kuhn's theory, paradigm

shift not only appears in natural science, but also shows up in social science. In social science, different paradigms can co-exist, whereas in natural science, this phenomenon is uncommon, the old paradigm will be replaced entirely by a new one.

In the field of translation studies, owing to the factors such as the interests of scholar, cultural and historical reasons, scholars usually choose a definition of translation as the research orientation in a certain period of time. That is, as a scholastic community, they study under the same paradigm. Since the definition of translation not only describes and interprets the basic properties of translation, but also determines its connotation and extension, it is the core and basic part of translation studies. Therefore, on account of difference in understanding the definition of translation, contemporary western translation studies can be ascribed to three paradigms: linguistic paradigm, cultural paradigm, and social and psychological paradigm. And meanwhile, the turns of translation studies can be viewed as paradigms shifts.

2. WARS OF TRANSLATION DEFINITION BETWEEN PARADIGMS

It is clear that different paradigms of translation studies have different views on translation. As the definition of translation plays a central role in forming the paradigm of translation studies. Therefore, the shifts of the paradigms can be viewed as the results of the development of definitions, and to some extent, the results of the wars of definitions.

Before entering into the analysis of the conflicts between the definitions, the sense of definition of translation has to be defined here. According to *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, translation is an extraordinarily broad notion and can be comprehended in many different respects such as "a process", "a product" and "the transfer of written texts" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, 2004, p.181). In this article, the definition of translation discussed is in wide sense.

2.1 A Dispute Between Linguistic Paradigm and Cultural Paradigm

Linguistic paradigm is closely related to the definitions of translation from the perspective of linguistics. Roman Jakobson divided translation into three kinds, "Intralingua translation", "Interlingua translation" and "Inter-semiotic translation" (Venuti, 1959, p.114). In his opinion, the transfers inside the same language, between different languages, and even between verbal signs and nonverbal signs can all be regarded as translation. The definition of translation proposed by Catford, Nida and Newmark are on the basis of Jakobson's definition, especially his definition of Interlingua translation. Catford defined translation as "an operation performed on languages", that is, "a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another" (Catford, 1965, p.1). Nida shifted the focus from

the form of the message to the response of the receptor and proposed the concept of “dynamic translation -- the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style (Nida & Taber, 1969, 2003, 2004, p.12). Translation, in Newmark’s opinion, was “rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text (Newmark, 1988, 2001, p.5). According to them, translation refers to the substitution of texts from one language to another or meaning exchanges between languages, and the focus of translation studies is equivalence.

The definitions of translation in linguistic paradigm have advantages. For the first time, a model for translation studies is established through they strictly defining. Besides, they introduce the theory of modern linguistics into translation studies and from then on theorists begin to use scientific way to study translation.

Although the definitions of translation in linguistic paradigm have significant impacts on translation studies, with the development of translation studies, the deficiencies are shown gradually, and four limitations can be generalized. In the first place, their views of translation are limited to linguistic level. This mostly dues to the theoretical foundation for it is only based on linguistic theory. Their definitions of translation are all concerned with a relation between languages. Translation, under the circumstance, is nothing but a transform of languages. In the second place, they emphasize on equivalence. Whether equivalent, dynamic equivalence, functional equivalence or focusing on text is connected with equivalence. As a matter of fact, over emphasizing on equivalence can only lead to binary opposition and hinder the development of translation studies at last. In the third place, the consideration of context and translator’s subjectivity is neglected. Last but not least, they are prescriptive definitions rather than descriptive definitions.

Some theorists criticize the definitions and once propose improving suggestions with regard to these deficiencies. For example, Werner Koller points out “many definitions tend to be normative rather than descriptive, as they frequently state not only what translation is, but also what it is supposed to be” (Koller, 1979, 1992, as cited in Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, 2004, p.182). Ernst-August Gutt, Leo Hickey, Basil Hatim, Ian Mason etc. introduce pragmatics into translation studies. Gutt criticizes the previous theories and approaches, especially equivalence and the descriptive-classificatory approach. In his point of view, “equivalence-based theories” only emphasize on “systematic comparison” and “the notion of equivalence itself may not be truly evaluative in nature but merely comparative”, so it is “inadequate for evaluating translation” (Gutt, 1991, pp. 13-14). As to descriptive-classificatory approach, he points out that it will cause “over-specification” and lead to “a loss of generalizing power” (p.20). As to the deficiencies, he introduces relevance theory

developed by Sperber and Wilson into translation studies. From the perspective of relevance theory, Gutt deals with two important aspects of translation: “the notion of translation” and “the significance of changes in context often involved in translation work” and translation, in his opinion, is an “interpretive use of language” (pp. 41, 46). Hatim and Mason also emphasizes on the pragmatics of translation. They view translation not only as a process of language transference, but also a process of communication under the social situation. As to pragmatic approach, Hickey mentions that the approach “attempts to explain translation -- procedure, process and product -- from the point of view of what is done by the original author in or by the text, what is done in the translation as a response to the original, how and why it is done in that way in that context” (Hickey, 1998, 2001, p.4).

The definitions of translation in cultural paradigm overcome the shortcomings of the definition mentioned above. Taking the definitions proposed by André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett for example, from the perspective of ideology and poetics, Lefevere, proposed translation as re-writing. Susan Bassnett, together with Lefevere, redefined the object of translation studies as “a verbal text within the network of literary and extra-literary signs in both the source and target cultures” and expanded the text of translation to the “inter-temporal” and “intercultural” (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998, 2000, pp. xi,135) field.

It is not difficult to find out that the definitions improve a lot. They begin to consider the context of translation. And instead of the prescriptive way, they advocate the descriptive way; Moreover, they pay attention to the influence of cultural aspects on the target text rather than the equivalence between the source text and the target text. Finally, they are interested in the subjective of the translator.

To sum up, the definition of translation in linguistic paradigm differs from that of in cultural paradigm in many respects. Firstly, they have different concerns. In linguistic paradigm, the focus of the definition is language itself, whereas in cultural paradigm, the focus changes to culture aspect such as ideology, poetics, politics, society, economy and cares about how these culture factors influence translation; the definition of translation in linguistic paradigm emphasizes equivalence, such as formal equivalence, functional equivalence, whereas in cultural paradigm, the emphasis shifts to the roles which the target text plays in the target culture. Secondly, they differ in their attitudes towards the translator. The definition in linguistic paradigm ignores the subjectivity of the translator, whereas the definition in cultural paradigm emphasizes it. Defining translation as a rewriting implies the initiative of the translator. Thirdly, their way for translation studies are different. The definition in linguistic paradigm is a prescriptive definition focusing on what translation should be, whereas that in cultural paradigm is a descriptive one describing what translation is.

2.2 A Dispute Between Cultural Paradigm and Social and Psychological Paradigm

In the same manner, the focus of the definitions in social and psychological paradigm is different from that of the definition in culture paradigm. As a proverb goes, there is no best, only better. So there is always a battle between the new and the old.

From the analysis in 2.1, it is easy to find that compared with the definitions of translation in linguistic paradigm, the definitions of translation in culture paradigm have made great progress. They begin to pay attention to the cultural aspects such as ideology, poetics, and economy, and take the subjectivity of translator into consideration. Unlike the definitions before, they use a descriptive way rather than a prescriptive way to define translation and so forth. In spite of the advantages, they still face challenges with the development of translation studies. Taking the focus for example, although they concern about the influence of culture, they pay more attention to the role of the target culture and show little interest to the source culture. The model of study is still a binary opposition one. They do not escape from talking about source text and target text, author and reader, domestication and foreignization etc..

As to the deficiencies, the definitions of translation in cultural paradigm are also challenged by the theorists both at home and abroad. Especially the introduction of the ideas of philosophy, deconstruction, post-colonialism and feminism into translation studies provides new perspectives for defining translation, and the view of translation in cultural paradigm improves again. On the basis of hermeneutics, George Steiner puts forward understanding as translation. According to Jacques Derrida, the source text and its translations in a symbiotic relationship are chains of signification and all the translations are translations of translations. Douglas Robinson, and Tejaswini Niranjana, from the perspective of post-colonialism, shows us vivid pictures on how translation represents the will of the ruling class and is used as their tool for controlling people in colony. Lawrence Venuti even proposes foreignizing translation and appeals for the translators to resist the culture hegemony in the United States.

Based on fiction study in Latin America and in the meantime absorb the theories of post-structuralism, the theorists of translation studies define translation from a new perspective -- fictional perspective. Similar to the complicated plots of fiction, there are also various kinds of understanding for a text and no text has only an understanding, therefore all of the understanding can be viewed as translation. Besides, the version of the original text is not the only one that can be regarded as a translation. Some versions do not have the original texts, they are just versions of versions, but they can also be viewed as translation. From the analysis of the fictions especially Jorge Luis Borges's fiction, it is clear for us to see the

binary opposition of the previous study is indistinguishable: "translators are authors; translation is as creative as original writing; and disorder is as acceptable as order" (Gentzler, 2008, p.115). All writings can be seen as translation.

The discussion above shows a clear picture of the definition of translation from the fictional perspective. Compared with the definitions before, it has lots of advantages. It breaks down the traditional binary opposition. It views translation as a creative activity and gives translation an equal position as the original. All writings are translations which broadens the scope of translation studies. Despite of the contributions it made, with the development of translation studies, its lack of attention to psychology is shown gradually. When Sherry Simon and Emily Apter appeal for attention to the mutual influence of psychology and translation, and Apter proposes three zones (geographical, social and political, and psychological zone) for translation studies, the deficiency of the definition in cultural paradigm is emerging again.

The definition of translation in social and psychological paradigm of translation studies not only considers the linguistic and cultural aspects of translation, but also introduces psychology into translation studies. From Edwin Gentzler's point of view, it is translation that constructs us; it is translation that forms our identity. Based on the studies of the situation of translation in various areas such as the United States, Canada, Brazil, Latin America, and Caribbean, Gentzler connects the progress of human history with translation and puts forward the history of translation in the Americas is a history of identity formation. He also argues that "the plurivalence of pan-American translation needs to be seen not only in terms of socio-cultural history, but also in terms of its psychological implications" (p. xii). Translation, in his eyes, is a creative activity, not merely a linguistic operation, but one of the means by which an entire continent defines itself. As we have mentioned before, Gentzler agrees with Sherry Simon's definition of translation: writing that is inspired by the encounter with other tongues, including the effects of creative interference.

3. TURNS AS PARADIGM SHIFTS

In this part, the article will further examine the relationship between the definitions of translation and the turns of translation studies. The definition of translation deduces the research paradigm and determines the scope of translation studies. With the expanding of the definition, the scope of translation studies is widening. The widening of the scope leads to the turns of translation studies. As mentioned before, in this article, the focus is on the most influential translation definitions and the three main turns of translation studies. In general, within the main turns, there are also some sub-turns, e.g. there is pragmatic turn within linguistic turn; there is empirical turn, translation

turn, power turn, globalization turn, fictional turn within cultural turn. The shifts of the sub-turns do not move in a straight line for some of the sub-turns did not build upon each other. Therefore, as far as the three main turns are concerned, though the study scope is widening with their transforms, the shifts between them cannot be viewed as linear development. Nevertheless, from the perspective of translation definition, the transforms of the main turns can be regarded as paradigm shifts with the wars of definitions.

3.1 Linguistic Turn

The Linguistic turn of translation studies begins in the 1950s. It is a counteraction to the traditional epistemology. Translation studies before the 20th century belongs to the philological paradigm which is empiricism-oriented and characterized by empirical, perceptual and critical methods. With the emerging of modern linguistics, translation studies shifts from empiricism to scientism and begins to analyze texts in systemic and structural way. Ferdinand de Saussure's ideas of structuralism lays the foundation for modern linguistics and makes far-reaching impacts on the shift of translation paradigms from philology to linguistics. In the 19th century, the research methods of linguistics are mainly based on the mechanism and the positivism. In the late 19th century and early 20th century, the approaches are frequently encountering confusions in the aspect of epistemology for lacking perspective as a whole. Since the publication of Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* in 1916, the ideas of structure and system have been applied to linguistics. Saussure's theory marks the beginning of modern linguistics. There is even a great upsurge in language study in the 20th century. As to translation studies, from the 1940s on, it begins to be integrated closely with modern linguistics. Many linguistic theories are introduced and translation theorists try to define translation in a scientific way, among them, Catford, Nida and Newmark make greatest contributions. In their efforts, translation studies, then, enters the linguistic paradigm and starts to analyze the transform of languages from the perspective of structuralism. The shift of paradigms indicates the coming of the linguistic turn.

In linguistic paradigm, translation studies, with the introducing of linguistic theories, has become closely related to Saussure's modern linguistic theory and the concept of structuralism. In *Course in General Linguistics*, Saussure points out two main relations for language study: Syntagmatic Relation and Paradigmatic Relation. The former one deals with the relations from horizontal direction, while the later one deals with the relations from vertical direction. As to translation, the choice of words can be regarded as paradigmatic relation and the combination of the words to form sentences can be seen as syntagmatic relation. Modern linguistics does a good job on analyzing the two relations. According to *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*.

Linguistics did fairly quickly come to the task of modeling meaning both at word and sentence level. To describe meaning at word level, it produced concepts such as denotation, connotation, componential analysis, and semantic fields; and to describe sentence meaning it generated concepts such as presupposition and entailment (Baker 1998, 2000, 2004, p.122).

On the basis of modern linguistics, many translation theorists do well in applying the structural thought to translation studies. Taking Nida for example, he defines translation as the transference of messages from one language to another and views it as a valid subject for scientific description. On the basis of Noam Chomsky's Transformational Generative Grammar, he proposes his own analytical method.

Simpler version of deep structure analysis, in which complex structures or sentences are first reduced to Kernels, or simple sentences, using just the four categories of object, event, abstraction and relation; ...deep structure and transformational grammar would seem to have effected very little to the study and theorization of translation (p.123).

Catford, on the other hand, defines translation as the replacement of textual material between two languages. On the basis of Firth's linguistic theory and Halliday's functional linguistics, he establishes the linguistic theory of translation. Newmark, likewise, views translation as the meaning exchange between two languages and he focuses on textual analysis. Overall, the linguistic turn introduces the method of structuralism into translation studies. Compared with previous definitions, the definitions of translation in linguistic paradigm emphasize on the study of linguistic structure. In the 1970s, James Holmes advances the understanding of translation and rectifies its name as translation studies. In the article *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* (1972), he draws a map for translation studies and divides the study into two parts: pure study and applied study.

First of all, it must be sure of the linguistic turn as a milestone, a historical step for translation studies. Retrospect the turn, definition plays a central role. Compared with the definitions of translation before the 1950s, the definitions after the 1950s are much more progressive. "Traditionally, translation scholars (pre-Jakobson) attempted to imagine and define what literary translations should be. Today, translation scholars (post-Jakobson) by and large attempt to discover and describe what translations are rather than what they should be." (Gentzler in Baker; Baker, 1998, 2000, 2004, p.167) As the remarkable theorists, represented by Jakobson, Nida, Catford and Newmark, define and study translation from the perspective of linguistics, the linguistic paradigm of translation studies comes into being. In this paradigm, translation is viewed as the transform of languages and the focus is equivalence. On account of the definition concerning with the study of language, many linguistic approaches are applied to translation studies, which arises the linguistic turn of translation studies. Owing to the

application of linguistic approaches, on linguistic level, the understanding of translation studies advances quickly.

Though translation studies makes great advances in linguistic paradigm, the understanding of translation is restricted in linguistic level and the study of translation is merely concerned with linguistic system. In other words, the knowledge of translation only focuses on the relationship between language and translation and the scope of study is narrowed in linguistics. With the development of social thought, the limitation of the definition is showing. As a complicated activity, only concerning with the linguistic level is far from being enough. John L. Austin's speech act theory shifts the focus of inter-linguistic to that of extra-linguistic and the study of pragmatics lift upsurge. Translation theorists then begin to show interest in context. As a result of context study, in linguistic paradigm, brings the pragmatic turn of translation studies. The study of translation is no longer confined to the transformation of languages and more aspects are taken into consideration. Translation studies appeals for a boarder scope. Under the circumstance, many theorists begin to redefine translation. Among them, Bassnett's and Lefevere's definitions are most influential. Bassnett emphasizes on context and Lefevere regards translation as rewriting. Both of them appeal for introducing cultural factors into study. It is mainly their effort that leads to the shift of paradigm from linguistics to culture and their definition of translation brings the cultural turn of translation studies.

3.2 Cultural Turn

From the 1980s on, translation studies have seen the transform from linguistic paradigm to cultural paradigm. With the shift of paradigms, the scope of translation studies is widening with the broadening of definition and the cultural turn of translation studies emerges. The cultural turn is another subversion of the epistemology of translation studies. It emerges as a reaction to linguistic paradigm. As mentioned before, the upsurge of structuralism has played a great role in translation studies. The definitions of translation which are influenced by the thoughts of structuralism lead translation studies in linguistic paradigm. In linguistic paradigm, the study of translation is on linguistic level, and translation is only seen as the transform of languages. Since the 1960s, with the emerging of deconstructionism, post-colonialism, feminism etc., the thoughts of post-structuralism begin to influence translation studies. The previous study is challenged and the factors which are excluded in linguistic paradigm are taken into account in translation studies. With the introduction of more and more factors, the understanding of translation is improving. Some translation theorists then redefine translation. Among them, the most influential definitions are proposed by Lefevere, Bassnett, Benjamin, Derrida etc., especially Lefevere's and Bassnett's definition which brings the

cultural paradigm of translation studies. The shift of paradigm from linguistics to culture marks the coming of the cultural turn.

It is important to note that "cultural turn" was first proposed by Bassnett and Lefevere in the anthology *Translation, History and Cultural* (1990). It consists of papers presented at a conference held in Warwick in 1988 and the original title of the introduction is: Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The "Cultural Turn" in Translation Studies. In the essay *The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies*, Bassnett recalls "we co-wrote the introductory essay to the volume, intending it as a kind of manifesto of what we saw as a major change of emphasis in translation studies" (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998, 2000, p.123). Since the 1980s, the cultural paradigm of translation studies has emerged. With the wars of definitions, the scope of translation studies is broadening. From then on, translation studies views lots of changes.

As mentioned above, Bassnett and Lefevere's definition of translation shifts the linguistic paradigm to the cultural paradigm and in the meantime brings the cultural turn for translation studies. In cultural paradigm, translation is viewed as rewriting. That is to say, writing can be seen as a kind of translation. Due to the definition, the focus of translation studies shifts from language to context. In fact, the change also transfers the study of translation in structuralism to that of in post-structuralism. As more and more culture factors are taken into consideration and the introducing of theories from post-colonialism, deconstructuralism, feminism etc., the scope of translation is widening, and later on even understanding can be seen as translation. In subsequent, translation studies also sees plenty of turns such as "power turn" (Tymoczko & Gentzler, 2002, 2007, p. xxviii), "empirical turn, globalization turn" (Snell-Hornby, 2006, pp. 115, 128), "fictional turn" (Gentzler, 2008, p.108). They are the important complements of the cultural turn, and among them, the power turn is quite influential.

Cultural turn stimulates theorists' interests in concerning about cultural aspects. Since the 1990s, as the rising of post-colonial studies and the growing impact of Michael Foucault's power theory and Pierre Bourdieu's culture and power theory, the relationship between power and translation has attracted a great number of scholars' attention. By analyzing the roles translation played on different social groups, their found power is a motivating factor in cultural domains. In general, it is inevitable for a translation to render the total meaning and information of the source text for the manipulation of target culture and ideology. That is to say, every translation, to some extent, represents one or some other classes' ideology and poetics. In general, strong cultures always gain the discourse right in cultural communication and they take translation as a way to express their ideas and to control the weak cultures. As to some less powerful cultures, they usually intentionally misread the translations so as to

resist the culture invasion such as cannibalism. Therefore, the power relationship between powerful culture and weak culture and their impacts on translation have become the focus of the post-colonial translation studies at that time and attract many theorists' interest later studies.

With the introduction of various theories from other subjects or thoughts, the understanding of translation, then, is changing gradually, especially the introduction of the ideas from post-structuralism that once again exerts an immense effect on translation studies. From the perspective of post-structuralism, all readings are misreading and every reading is rewriting. Therefore, there is no translation which can reflect the original one completely, and what's more, even the original one is not stable and there is even no original one. Walter Benjamin states translation gives new life to the previous work. Jacques Derrida remarks all translations are translations of translations. Roland Barthes puts forward the concept of "text", which is different from the previous ones, refers to process rather than the work itself. He points out "there is no such thing as literary 'originality', no such thing as the 'first' literary work: all literature is 'inter-textual'" (Eagleton, 1996, p.119). As the death of the author becoming a slogan for modern criticism, the theorists of translation studies no longer pay much attention to the author but to the understanding of the work. Under the impact of these thoughts, the knowledge of translation is deepening. The previous understanding of translation cannot provide proper knowledge for translation studies at that time, it appeals for a new one. The study of translation in Latin American brings hope.

The theorists in Latin America turn to the fiction writers for ideas on which to base a theory of translation. Jorge Luis Borges develops the concept of infinite possibilities of language. In *The Garden of Forking Paths*, Borges mainly tells a story about the discovery of an extraordinary novel by a spy. The novel is like a labyrinth, and characters can choose all the alternatives. It is so miraculous that every character's every different choice will lead to a different ending. Analogy to translation, it is not difficult to find that there are various kinds of understanding for a work and no work has only one understanding, therefore the theorists regard all of the understanding as translation. In the circumstances, previous binary opposition is eliminated. Translation studies is not restricted to the study of author and original text, instead all understanding of a work and all readings on a work are brought into the field of study.

The definition of translation in fictional turn widens the scope of translation studies. Since the emerging of fictional turn, the dichotomies in translation studies are eliminated. And also the understanding of translation extends to reading. In other words, reading can be also seen as translation. From these changes, we have to say that fictional turn greatly promotes the development of translation studies. Nevertheless, translation studies always is in what progress

ceaselessly. The introduction of psychoanalysis and the recent study in Americas by translation theorists provide new perspective for translation studies.

3.3 Social and Psychological Turn

Social and psychological turn is the future developing trend of translation studies. In the book *Translation and Identity in the Americas: New Directions in Translation Theory* (2008), Edwin Gentzler proposes that "the next turn in translation studies should be a social-psychological one, expanding a functional approach to include social effects and individual effects" (Gentzler, 2008, p.180).

As the name implies, social and psychological turn has close relation with the study of psychology and sociology. The introduction of psychoanalysis plays a great role for translation studies as it arousing attention for identity study. Psychoanalysis is mainly based on the theory of Jean Laplanche, Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan, the last two of which are especially influential. Freud believes the mental condition of human being is composed of three stages, id, ego and superego. Only if we keep the three ones in balance can we maintain health. In most cases, our neurosis owes to the repression of id and we usually translate our mental condition into dream. Lacan associates Freud's theory with language study. He regards unconsciousness as the essence of language and points out that the nature of human being is unconsciousness, "I am not where I think, and I think where I am not" (Eagleton, 1996, p.147). Both Freud's and Lacan's theory show a close connection between the formation and identity. Since our mental condition now is influenced by the memory of past, psychoanalysts usually try to recreate the sights of the past so as to find out the specific demand which is repressed. "With a psychoanalytic reworking of an event, through the process of transference, an alternative translation is possible, one that is less repressive and more therapeutic" (Gentzler, 2008, p.184). In addition, recent study of translation in the Americas also connects with identity study. Based on the studies in the United States, Canada, Brazil, Latin America and Caribbean, Gentzler proposes that it is translation that forms people's identity in the Americas. And he elucidates additionally that the form of translation he discusses in the study is "less translation of written text than a form of remembering and rehistoricizing that extends beyond the constraints of any single language" (*ibid.*).

As Gentzler defining translation as a social and psychological activity which forms the identity of a nation, translation studies is stepping into a new paradigm -- social and psychological paradigm. The shift of paradigms again broadens the scope of translation studies. As the focus transfers from text to mind, this time, the scope includes not only language, context, but also the inside world of human being. With the broadening of the scope, translation studies will usher in a new turn -- the social and psychological turn.

CONCLUSION

Based on Thomas Kuhn's Paradigm Theory and focusing on the definitions of translation from the renowned theorists, this article attempts to find out how the definitions of translation influence translation studies. In order to achieve the goal, two kinds of relationship have been studied: the relationship between the definitions of translation and the turns of translation studies; the relationship between the definitions of translation and the

development of translation studies. As for the first one, it is found that the war of definitions makes a tremendous impact on the turns of translation studies. In other words, translation studies ushers in new turns with the broadening of definition. For the second one, as the widening of definition as well as the shifting of turns, the scope of translation studies is expanding.

Combined with the thought background, the focal points of the article can be summarized and attributed into a table as follows:

Table 1
The Turns of Translation Studies

Turns of translation studies	Thought background	Representative	Focus of definitions	Scope of study
Linguistic turn	Saussure's modern linguistics and structuralism	Jakobson, Nida, Catford, Newmark	Transform of language	Language
Cultural turn	Post-structuralism	Bassnett, Lefevere Benjamin, Derrida, Vieira	Cultural aspects→ the impossibility of text	Context→ Context and text
Social and Psychological turn	Post-structuralism and psychoanalysis	Simon, Apter, Gentzler	Social and psychological aspects	Society and human mind

The definition of translation proposed by the famous theorists has a far-reaching impact on translation studies. As it is recognized and favored by more and more colleagues, it sets up a study paradigm and a new turn of study emerges. The shifts of definition expand the scope of study and lead to the turns of study. As a result, translation studies continues to advance forward. At first, translation was defined as the transform of language, therefore translation studies only focused on the language study. Later on, with the influence of cultural thoughts, the introduction of other disciplines and especially the development of translation studies, the definition of translation has undergone many changes. It is viewed as a rewriting, a creative activity and now even an activity which forms the identity of a nation. Meantime, the scope of translation studies is expanded from language study to cultural study, fictional study and recently social and psychological study. The widening of scope brings new turn of translation studies, e.g. cultural turn, power turn, and fictional turn.

In conclusion, the definitions of translation and the turns of translation studies affect and contact mutually. The definition of translation determines the scope of translation studies. With the broadening of definition, the study scope is widening. And the widening of scope leads to the born of a new turn. As a result of a new turn, a new definition comes into being. That is to say, a new definition generates a new turn and the new turn tends to breed a next new definition and so on and so forth. Finally, the interaction of the definitions and the turns promotes the development of translation studies.

REFERENCES

- Barker, M. (Ed.). (1998, 2001, 2004). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge./ Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1998, 2001). *Constructing Cultures -- Essay on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bird, A. (2000). *Thomas Kuhn*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. (2nd ed). Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc..
- Gentzler, E. (2008). *Translation and Identity in the Americas: New Directions in Translation Theory*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Gutt, E. A. (1991). *Translation and Relevance -- Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hickey, L. (Ed.). (1998, 2001). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Holmes, J. (2000). The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 172-185). London and New York: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (2000). On linguistic Aspects of Translation, In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 113-118). London and New York: Routledge.

- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.). London: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd..
- Lefevere, A. (1992, 2004). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London & New York: Routledge/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988, 2001). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York & London: Prentice Hall/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1969, 2003, 2004). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997, 2004). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing/Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Simon, S. (2006). *Translating Montreal: Episodes in the Life of a Divided City*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tymoczko, M. & Gentzler, E. (Eds.). (2002, 2007). *Translation and Power*. University of Massachusetts Press/Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.