

Vidal Claramonte, M.^a Carmen África (2022)
Translation and Contemporary Art: Transdisciplinary Encounters
NEW YORK
ROUTLEDGE
ISBN: 978-1-032-21165-7
126 PÁGS.

In the words of its author, *Translation and Contemporary Art* aims “to analyse the connections and parallelisms between translation and contemporary art and to show how contemporary art sees and uses translation” (p. 3). However, it transcends this relationship by going further and becomes an essential book on communication, which explains in an impeccable way how in every verbal or non-verbal communicative process there underlies a process of semiotic or intersemiotic translation. In short, it places translation at the centre of communication; even more so, it places translation at the very soul of communication in any vital and social situation. This open-minded, daring and free-hearted perspective denotes a vision that is both intelligent and sensitive.

Translation in Contemporary Art explores the new approach to Translation contemplated in the “outward turn” postulated by Susan Bassnett and David Johnston, an interdisciplinary vision of Translation that is far removed from the traditional one and is in keeping with today’s global, multisemiotic world. As Bassnett points out in the magnificent foreword, the “outward turn” extends the notion of translation fostered by the “cultural turn” initiated with Lefevere’s *Translation, History and Culture* (1990) and followed by authors such as Bella Brodzki (2006), Piotr Blumczynski (2016), Siri Nergaard and Stefano Arduini (2011) with their notion of ‘post-translation’, extended in 2017 with Edwin Gentzler’s *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*.

Once the need to turn translation into a respectable discipline has been overcome (Bassnett 2014), its views are broadened in this new multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary stage to conceive it as a multifaceted process that is open to new challenges and opportunities. In other words, translation is conceived as a “travelling concept” (Zwischenberger, 2017) in search of a “translaboration” that brings it closer to other disciplines and territories, in the same way that disciplines such as ethnography, anthropology, or sociology have already adopted the concept of translation.

The book is divided into three main chapters: “Translating in the visual age: transdisciplinary routes”, “The artistic translator’s gaze” and “Translating with art”. In the first chapter the author situates the production of meaning in the context of a global visual culture in which

communication combines words and all kinds of sensory perceptions and vital landscapes and spaces. Not only do words communicate, but also images, sounds, music, noise, silence, movements, dance, cities, bodies, and shapes; in parallel, the meaning of a text derives not only from words but from non-verbal elements such as its typography, spelling, images, colour, etc. (Kress et al., 1996; van Leeuwen, 2021). Therefore, translation is not just an interlinguistic but also an intersemiotic process across cultures and languages (Bal, 1985/2009, Wilson and Mahler, 2012) that requires us to translate “not just with the eyes but with all other senses” (Campbell and Vidal, 2019) travelling across borders between words and looks.

As a consequence, in this multimodal digital era language has become “extra visual” (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001), and, hence, there is a constant process of translation from the verbal to the visual and vice versa (Clarke, 2007), from monomodal to multimodal texts (Kress, 2003, 2010; Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001), since communication is not only between languages but beyond languages (Lee, 2021). This view is linked to the linguistic perspective of cognitive pragmatists who analyze the process of interpretation in a global communication context or of critical discourse analysts who have evolved to include all non-verbal and multimodal factors in their observation of communication.

Since translation is a heterotopic activity between disciplines such as music, painting, dance and literature, and, in essence, it is a potential part of every communication process (Gentzler, 2003, 2015; Blumczynski, 2016), in the section “Expanding the notion of translation” Vidal advocates expanding the field and scope of translation studies, converted into a transdiscipline, in which new multimodal texts (video games, websites, song covers, illustrations, icons, tweets, films, graphic novels, dance performances, songs, and many others) and new non-traditional ways of telling demand new ways of translating (p. 8). To contextualize this need, the author briefly but very precisely reviews the historical evolution of translation and the spectacular changes that have taken place, especially since the 1980s. Thus, she starts from the initial prescriptivist vision that defended absolute equivalence and neutrality, as well as the invisibility and impartiality of the translator, and goes through the different perspectives that gradually surpassed this initial vision: from polysystem theorists (1960s), Bassnett’s *Translation Studies* (1980), Theo Herman’s concept of manipulation in 1985, Mary Snell-Hornby’s interdisciplinary turn in 1988, the cultural turn introduced by Bassnett and Lefevere in 1990, Lefevere’s (1992) reflections on power relations within textual practice based on Michel Foucault, and Tymoczko and Gentzler’s power turn (2002), up to the development of postcolonial translation studies and feminist translation theories.

Throughout this evolutionary process, progress has been made towards increasing the translator's visibility and greater importance has been given to sociological and cultural context factors. Thus, moving from the cultural turn to the "sociological turn" (Wolf and Fukari, 2007), closely related to the previous one, we arrive at the "translational turn" (Bachmann-Medick, 2009), which strengthens the interest in cultural translation processes by framing them in the context of multicultural societies. These would be followed by the "technological turn" (Cronin, 2010), the "post-translation" (Gentzler, 2017) and the "outward turn" (Bassnett and Johnston, 2019), in which this contribution is framed.

In contrast to the self-satisfied perspective of an "inward turn" to which some are returning, in which translation is seen as an isolated, mechanical, instrumental process, the "outward turn" is an agile, dynamic movement, neither static nor constrained by norms and institutions, which understands translation as independent, but not isolated, inherently interdisciplinary and requiring a whole range of tools and methods, since it focuses on broader translinguistic aspects and transcultural processes, and leads to a "translational turn" in other areas and disciplines (Gentzler, 2003). The outward turn grants the necessary importance to the social and technological context in which the translator's activity takes place, which goes beyond the limits of the conventional written text and involves all senses and activities.

In this respect, in his notion of text, Gentzler (2013) transcends the written text, as discourse analysts such as M.A.K. Halliday (*Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*, 1978; *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*, 1989) had already done when interpreting texts in their immensely varied range of social contexts. As a consequence, translation is understood as a multilayered, heterotopical and heterotypical process, not only interlinguistic and intercultural, but also intersemiotic, which is linked, as it cannot be otherwise, to an equally broad concept of "culture". In contrast to pigeonholed and restrictive conceptions and definitions of culture (Eagleton, 2000), culture is understood as a multimodal, mutable and infinite process of total translation (Torop, 1995).

This intimate relationship between translation and culture leads translation to focus on artistic production. Translation must be an activity open to other disciplines such as art, architecture, psychology, philosophy, or economics (Arduini and Nergaard, 2011), in a way that is not simply "interdisciplinary" but "transdisciplinary", because it is not only the what that matters but also the how. Following Bassnett (2017), translation must be integrated into programs and studies of all kinds, not purely the Humanities; moreover, it is not only relevant for those who know more than one language, but it concerns mono-

lingual speakers, since we all engage in intralingual and intersemiotic activities.

For example, messages communicated through images, music, films, paintings or dance are “visual translations” of the real (Akcan, 2012). In other words, works of art are semiotic systems that communicate through interwoven channels; even ‘copies’, such as Sherrie Levine’s photographs, are post-translations because copying involves a process of translation, which, in turn, becomes a new creation. Similarly, all writing is a rewriting, which implies translating, which, in turn, implies creating and so forth. In this sense, translation would not be a merely functional and temporary instrument, but rather a precondition underlying communication and, therefore, language and culture. In short, translation and art are in constant movement and are in essence undefined.

From this new perspective, artistic or translational creation is conceived in a broader way; for example, painters communicate with perspective, chiaroscuro, chromatic variety, etc., dancers communicate with their body through kinesemiotics. If we transfer this to an opera, such as *Lucia di Lammermoor* based on Sir Walter Scott’s novel *The Bride of Lammermoor*, this becomes a new sung, acted and staged creation where verbal and non-verbal elements of different kinds interact in a meaningful way. Similarly, translators also have at their disposal not only linguistic but also non-verbal resources that make their work not an imitation but an interpretation.

In a very relevant way, in this outward turn we do not look from the inside of translation outwards to broaden its scope and its relationships with other disciplines, but rather we look at translation and other disciplines and activities from the outside and perceive how all of them participate in translation and are indeed translation in essence. The author explains this with the clear example of images: an image “translates” reality and communicates it to us, and, when we look at it, we also contemplate our own relationship with that image. Translation thus becomes a way of giving back to the other the right to look.

The second chapter, “The Artistranslator’s Gaze”, explores the idea that our way of contemplating and narrating the world today is a way of translating it. In an age of digital technology and social networks, with our “commitment to look” (Gal, 2005) we must be able to embrace and appreciate the “effet de réel” (Barthes, 1968) of visual signs, as well as their grammar, ideological implications and cultural differences in depth, as a product of a particular society and culture. Indeed, images reflect political, ideological and economic purposes, and are disseminated through various commercial and institutional channels. This view is in line with that expressed by critical discourse analysts such as Norman Fairclough or Teun van Dijk in works such as *Lan-*

guage and Power (1989), *Ideology* (1998) or *Language and Ideology* (2010).

In the section “The Image as a Constructed text”, the author stresses this idea and debates the communicative power of images, their capacity to manipulate or to be a vehicle for political criticism, as W.J.T. Mitchell (1986) and John Berger (1972) argued, who wondered whether the way we look affects what we know and what we perceive.

As is evident, we are dealing with a pragmatic view of communication and meaning in which the cognitive context of each individual and his or her way of looking and interpreting decisively influences his or her knowledge. In this regard, Sperber and Wilson’s *Relevance Theory* (1986/1995/2002) and its application to translation by authors such as Ernst Gutt (*Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, 1991/2000) delves into the way in which our cognitive context is based on our previous knowledge and experience, and is modified according to the new inputs received; in turn, it is this background knowledge and experience that makes us perceive and interpret new stimuli and experiences in different ways. When Vidal quotes Fabbri (2017), for whom “communication does not occur between identical subjects but between subjects who have their own codes and subcodes” (p. 32), we are dealing with what cognitive pragmatists explain as the cognitive context, because everyone interprets according to their previous knowledge, ideas, etc.

In today’s world where everything becomes images, the image itself has undergone a post-linguistic rediscovery. Thus, the “linguistic turn” began to expand into a “pictorial turn” (Mitchell, 1972) or “iconic turn” (Boehm, 1994). Depending on the more or less profound relationship between the verbal (sayable) and the visual (visible), there will be hybrid constructions of a different nature (image/text, image-text or imagetext for Mitchell (1994)), to be interpreted by the “readerviewer” or, rather, “readerviewertranslator”. All of them will present a personal vision of reality, which, in turn, is necessarily historical and socio-cultural.

The section “Images in Translation Studies” argues for a definition of translation that embraces this variety of multisemiotic products and activities (Baker, 2014) present in our globalized, fragmented and multicultural environment. The author emphasizes the need to take into consideration factors such as the context in which the text is created, its senders and recipients, and its cultural community. In short, the author advocates considering the pragmatic factors of the communicative event, both verbal and non-verbal. Unfortunately, some subjects such as “Pragmatics applied to translation”, which emphasized the importance of the context and the participants in the communicative event and dealt with issues such as multimodality and the relationship between the verbal and the non-verbal, have disa-

appeared from various translation curricula. In fact, in order to expand the concept of translation and its scope, it is necessary to broaden the mindset of many translators and translation teachers, given that some have not assimilated the importance of interdisciplinarity, the philological basis or the relevance of the non-verbal in communication. In addition, as Vidal points out, it would also be necessary to include translation subjects in curricula from other areas and not only those typically related, given the ability of Translation to connect disciplines. In short, it is a matter of reading the world as if it were a text, because it will give us the key to how it is made and to our own lives.

In “The Translator’s Gaze”, Vidal proposes moving from a translation model based on the word to one based on the gaze when translating. It is about transcending the limits of Jakobson’s intersemiotic translation, because communication does not only occur at the linguistic level, but at all sensory levels (gestural, olfactory, visual...) (Campbell and Vidal, 2019); therefore, translation does not only occur between verbal sign systems, but also between verbal and non-verbal ones in a multimedia and multimodal environment and between different cultures.

The importance of non-verbals in communication has already been addressed by experts in non-verbal communication such as Fernando Poyatos (*La comunicación no verbal*, 1994; *Textual Translation and Live Translation: The total experience of nonverbal communication in literature, theater and cinema*, 2008; *Literary Thesaurus of Nonverbal Communication: A Tool for Interdisciplinary Research*, 2017). In translation, perceiving through the senses of another opens the door for the receiver to feel and experience new sensations, so translating also becomes a physical, affective and sensory activity. Vidal proposes interesting examples of interactive and living art in which meanings are produced and reproduced, created and recreated from word to image and vice versa in a continuous inter-translation. As, for example, in the poems that Treadaway translated into scent, or in exhibitions such as ‘TransARTation! Wandering Texts, Travelling Objects’ (2017) in which words are translated into other senses in the form of experiential translations that cross disciplines.

Vidal defines very important concepts such as “visuality”, which, beyond the physical vision when looking at a work, has to do with how that vision is constructed, depending on each context, community, time, class, gender, etc., and with power relations (Mirzoeff 2006, 2011). Also very relevant is the concept of “Artisttranslator”, related to the process of rewriting, since it becomes a redressing and refashioning, as in Ghada Amer’s post-translations of fairy tale characters. These rewritings and reinterpretations can be seen as cognitive “ecocities” (Balsera and López, 2015).

Translation, then, consists in recognizing the profound cognitive

potential that arises from the relationship between the gaze and the object contemplated. The author proposes such significant examples as Velázquez's *Las Meninas*, a meta-picture, "an encyclopaedic labyrinth of pictorial self-reference", that represents the essence of life and serves as a perfect model of translation in its game of representation, and which has served for famous post-translations by artists such as Picasso or Manolo Valdés. The important thing is not what is presented in the painting but what it represents: to question the real and the visible, because the real only exists when it is perceived and to see it is to create it. This is exactly what cognitive pragmatics posits. The real only exists in the mind of the one who perceives it, because everything passes through the filter of our mind and our senses, of our beliefs, and previous experiences.

In the third chapter, "Translating with Art", we discover how contemporary art is so active and alive that it requires a critical and respectful gaze, a looking back in constant translation. At this point, the book invites us to stop and reflect, and we realize that art teaches us to understand the reality of the non-real and the unreality of the real, and how either of these circumstances can change if we look at them differently. We also assimilate the idea that, as Gentzler (2017: 7) pointed out, translation, or post-translation, transcends all boundaries of linguistic communication because it is a "cultural condition" that underlies communication in general.

The section "Words in art" addresses the relationship between word, object and representation in art, which reminds us of linguistic studies on the relationship between concept, sign and object, represented, for example, in Saussure's semiotic triangle or in Ogden and Richards (1923) term/symbol/object semiotic triangle. In art, language becomes part of the artistic object as just another image. Authors such as Duchamp, Dalí and especially Magritte reflect on this relationship in their works; while Magritte plays with the relationship between a real pipe and its artistic and linguistic representation, Kosuth does the same with a chair. Other artists would have chosen another object and would present, represent and translate reality in a different way from their own ideology. Again, we reflect, as a cognitive linguist would, on the fact that we all experience reality differently, because we do so from our personal cognitive context, shaped by our own experience and prior knowledge.

The author reflects on numerous examples of conceptual art that play with the relationship between image and text: imagetexts such as the novel *Purloined* (2000) composed of loose sheets of more than a hundred different novels in their original format; like the words painted on the wall of a gallery by Weiner; or the use of colour to contextualise the words of Robert Barry.

The work of Cindy Sherman, "Art that Post-translates", deserves

a special section. She uses her own body as a text, deconstructing the female stereotypes created by patriarchal society and analyzing the male gaze of the female body and the female gaze regarding this process. This self-translation of identity, or rather, of women's identities in different cultures and from different ideologies becomes the self-translation of the rest of women, our self-translation. In this process, Sherman seems to anticipate from art the outward turn and post-translation, as her "poses" transcend different levels of representation and translation; furthermore, other artists post-translate her work, such as Yasumasa Morimura.

This process of copying what is appreciated and loved is very typical of 21st century art. We have learned to value the importance of repetition, copying, reduplication, in short, of translation, which was not valued compared to the value of the original. In this game of ecocities (Balsera and López, 2015), copies and versions acquire their own value.

In the last section "Translation in Contemporary Art", the author offers an updated list of exhibitions, such as "Lost in Translation", projects and interdisciplinary encounters between contemporary art and translation, as well as specialized magazines on the subject. These examples, which address concepts such as globalization, cosmopolitanism, identities, migrations, fragmentation, etc., "challenge the word-based model of 'the reading'" (Apter, 2007) and force us to acknowledge that translation transcends mere 'signification' and becomes a way of reading and experiencing language. Translation must therefore be able to deploy its full multimedia discursive potential.

Art rethinks the relationship between the local and the global, the political and the aesthetic, the linguistic and the intercultural. From the art world, we also think about the voiceless, the unrepresented, misrepresented or partially represented by official institutions and powers, such as migrants and refugees. In an era of rereading and rewriting, of a new cartography of art (Weibel, 2017), art becomes the magnifying glass that allows us to contemplate changes in society, since art is today an "art of transnational transitionality" (Smith, 2013).

In conclusion, far from the traditional view of translation in which translators should be impartial and invisible, the new definitions are culturally determined and power-related. Translation studies, like linguistic currents such as Critical Discourse Analysis, have broadened their outlook in today's globalized world, incorporating concepts such as manipulation, ideology, power and asymmetry. In this new vision, translation is a continuous interpretation and rewriting, translating is not "representing" an original, but "creating" a new original (Bassnett, 2014). In this process the translator must use all of his or her senses, because translation is not a linguistic transfer of words but an intersemiotic and sensory experimentation in which the text (or the painting,

the dance, the film) is read, said, heard, acted, smelled, etc. Obviously words matter, but the world is “multimodal, hybrid, multicultural, cosmopolitan, global and asymmetrical” and it is not enough to attend to language but to all semiotic systems.

In line with Bassnett and Johnston’s “outward turn”, Gentzler’s “post-translation”, and Campbell and Vidal’s “experiential translation”, in numerous artistic works we observe the transition from the sign as a representation of the world to the image of the world as a textual sign. In this opening of the outward turn, opening up to other disciplines is enriching; the “image-to-word translation” facilitates moving between genres, media, and bodies of knowledge and also approaching the marginal.

In sum, translation is not understood as a word-to-word process, but as a “poetic, political and experiential mode” (Bal and Morra, 2007) that is not simply fulfilling a function of the original, but rather it is releasing its potential by creating a new original. In this process of total immersion, the translator employs all his or her limbs and senses (Campbell and Vidal, 2019) and “the reading” turns into “the looking” (Apter, 2007 ; Clarke, 2007). Hence, as the author concludes, translation allows us to look beyond simply seeing and thinking about ourselves when we look.

In conclusion, a cornerstone of this bold and essential work is the open conception of translation, conceived as an inherent part of every communicative act of our existence, even of those not necessarily related to more than one language, because translation is conceived as an interpretation of things or words into words in an infinite journey.

MARÍA DEL MAR RIVAS CARMONA
Universidad de Córdoba (España)
mmrivas@uco.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6298-842X>

Fecha de Recepción 21/10/2022
Fecha de Publicación 01/12/2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2024.i32.24>