

Introduction

Textual and contextual voices of translation

Cecilia Alvstad, University of Oslo

Annjo K. Greenall, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Hanne Jansen, University of Copenhagen

Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, University of Helsinki, University of Turku

Voices – marks of the tangle of subjectivities involved in textual processes – constitute the very fabric of texts in general and translations in particular. The title of this book, Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation, refers both to textual voices, that is, the voices found within the translated texts, and to contextual voices, that is, the voices of those involved in shaping, commenting, or otherwise influencing the textual voices. The latter appear in prefaces, reviews, and other texts that surround the translated texts and provide them with a context. Our main claim is that studying both the textual and contextual voices helps us better understand and explain the complexity of both the translation process and the translation product. The dovetailed approach to translation research that is advocated in this book aims at highlighting the diversity of participants, power positions, tensions, conflicts, and debates and how they both textually and contextually materialize as voices before, during, and after the translation process.

Keywords: translation, voice, multiple translatorship, translation pact, manifest voice, non-manifest voice

1. Introduction

The aim of this book is to explore the many voices involved in the long and often arduous translation process, both the voices that appear in the translated texts themselves and the voices that appear in surrounding texts that some way or another relate to the translated texts. The book offers a behind-the-scenes look at the complex machinery in motion behind every single translation: if the translator may be depicted as a performing artist, all the other agents involved may be seen as the production team around the stage or set – directors, scenographers, technicians, hairdressers, stagehands, roadies – or as spectators. Nonetheless, translators are still often referred to as though they were the lone originators of translations, and the volume at hand seeks to deal this myth a final blow.

The agents who read and shape translations – authors, publishers, translators, editors, copy editors, critics, librarians, and “non-professional” readers – express themselves in a variety of channels, such as introductions, letters, and reviews. This volume combines a study of agents’ voices as they come across in such *contextual* material with a study of the voices found in translated texts. Voices in and around translated texts mix and blend in intricate ways that reveal how translation is a matter of circulation of and confrontation between voices, and of constant negotiation and re-negotiation of meaning (Alvstad and Assis Rosa 2015).

The process of unearthing and disentangling voices in translated texts and surrounding texts has various sociocultural, ethical, and aesthetic dimensions, which are all, indirectly or directly, attended to in the contributions to this volume. The sociocultural question – who are the agents of translation? – is one that has obviously been asked before (cf. Pym 1998, 2000; Milton and Bandia 2009; Jansen and Wegener 2013), but investigations into it have rarely been combined with other pertinent questions, such as, What are the concrete imprints of the agents in the text? Why are the textual imprints as they are, and what effects do they have on readers? And how do readers act as agents in translation processes? The ethical dimension

concerns among other things the way in which translators have often been regarded as the only ones responsible for possible problems and errors and consequently left to “weather the storm” alone when a translation is criticized. The studies presented in this volume make it clear that more agents than the translator possess and exert power both during the selection and translation process and in shaping the final text, but as their influence is normally not acknowledged by either professional or non-professional readers, they are seldom held accountable. Finally, most of the agents studied in this volume were engaged in (re-)creating a product of aesthetic value, here understood as the literary text and bordering genres. Although the question of whether their involvement in a given case enriches or harms the aesthetic qualities of the text is only addressed in some of the contributions, it is nevertheless an issue that runs like an undercurrent throughout.

2. The voices framework

This volume is the result of work done within the research project *Voices of Translation: Rewriting Literary Texts in a Scandinavian Context*, funded by the Research Council of Norway (2012–2016). In its core, non-metaphorical meaning and as pertaining to humans and not animals, “voice” refers to the characteristic, individual physical sounds of speech, singing, and so forth that convey values, viewpoints, ideas, and other types of content. The notion can also be used metaphorically, as has been done in Translation Studies already (Alvstad 2013; Taivalkoski-Shilov and Suchet 2013). It has been used to describe several partly overlapping phenomena, related to the different perspectives or influence of the many agents involved in the shaping and reception of translated texts (cf. Buzelin 2005, 2011; Jansen and Wegener 2013; Alvstad and Assis Rosa 2015). “Voice” has sometimes been used for the stylistic

preferences of specific translators (cf. May 1994; Munday 2008) and for the voices of literary characters and narrators, as well as for the discursive presence of translators in translated texts (cf. Folkart 1991; Hermans 1996; Schiavi 1996; Mossop 1998, 2007; Taivalkoski-Shilov 2006; Bosseaux 2007).

In the current context, we use metaphorical “voice” to refer to how individual or collective conceptions and attitudes are expressed by publishers, translators, and others in both contextual material and translated texts. In the same manner as each physical voice is recognizable and reflects the physical condition, size, and personality of the speaker (see Greenall in this volume), the metaphorical “voice” is related to the notions mentioned by Bakhtin (1981) that are the constituents of textual identity, such as speech manner, style, language, and axiological belief systems. Consequently, “voice” can be defined as the set of textual cues that characterize a subjective or collective identity in a text (Taivalkoski-Shilov 2015a:60).

In this book the concept of “voice” is an interpretive hypothesis (Williams and Chesterman 2002:73–75), meaning that it is being used for its potential to describe, interpret, and help researchers more fully understand a field consisting of various seemingly disparate elements that have previously been studied in a more disconnected fashion. Most essentially, the concept of voice links the contextual and textual dimensions: voices are simply found in both. Moreover, contextual and textual voices, originally a distinction drawn by Alvstad and Assis Rosa (2015:3–4), engage in complex, dynamic choreographies of give-and-take. Textual voices can rarely be untangled without knowledge of the context within which the text was produced, while contextual voices help with this untangling without necessarily telling the whole truth about textual voices: evidence concerning the type, influence, and interplay of voices found in contextual material may be either contradicted or corroborated by evidence found in the translations connected to such material, and vice versa (see Pym

1998:111–112). Therefore, observing voices of translation on both textual and contextual levels not only reveals a more complex and thus more complete picture but is also indispensable for a reliable analysis.

In this volume the contextual voices studied include those found in reviews, scholarly analyses, translators' introductions, footnotes, and correspondence between editors, translators, and other parties, as well as data generated during the research process, such as surveys and interviews. Some of the contextual material we study is what Genette (1987:7) refers to as paratext. But the difference between Genette's well-established term "paratext" and "contextual material" is not only one of what is included in the category, it is also related to focus. While it is central to Genette (1987:8) that paratext is an undetermined zone (*zone indécise*), a threshold (*seuil*), or a vestibule (*vestibule*) that offers the readers a way into the literary work (or helps them step back), we do not primarily focus on this threshold function when we study contextual material. And whereas Genette (1987:7–8) in his definition stresses that paratext is both what turns a text into a book and what makes it present itself as such to the world ("ce par quoi un texte se fait livre et se propose comme tel à ses lecteurs, et plus généralement au public"), "contextual material" clearly has a wider scope as it includes all kinds of materials related to a specific translation that allow us as researchers to shed light on the voices either in or around this text.

Another way of phrasing this distinction would be to say that Genette is primarily centered on paratext produced by authors (Alvstad 2005:71, 76; Summers 2013:14–15), while we in this volume have a wider focus and include a broad variety of material produced for and/or around literary texts and translations, such as translators' e-mail correspondence or research-generated surveys and eye-tracking data. Much of this material can neither be linked to the author nor help turn the text into a book, play a part in presenting it to the world, or influence the reading public in general. Thus, they do not sit well with Genette's term and

definition. We will therefore not speak of paratext when referring to materials that have come about as part of the research process but limit the usage of Genette's well-established term to materials that do play these roles.

Nevertheless, when using the concept of paratext we will do so in a wider sense than in Genette's original definition. This is because of the evident differences between Genette's and our approach stemming from our focus on translated texts. This makes it impossible for us to regard the translations themselves as a kind of paratext, as Genette does (Genette 1987:372; for a critique of this aspect of Genette's approach, see Tahir-Gürçaglar 2002:45–47). Working with translations rather than originals furthermore makes it less relevant to compare paratext produced by authors with paratext produced for the translation. We therefore work with an expanded concept of paratext that has already been sketched out for Translation Studies by scholars such as Tahir-Gürçaglar (2002), Summers (2013), and Pellatt (2013a) The latter, for instance, widens the definition of paratext to include “any material additional to, appended to or external to the core text which has functions of explaining, defining, instructing, or supporting, adding background information, or the relevant opinions and attitudes of scholars, translators and reviewers” (Pellatt 2013a:1; for a further comment and development of these ideas, see Taivalkoski-Shilov and Koponen in this volume).

As regards textual voices, that is, the voices that occur *within* translated texts, we take into consideration both the narratological voices (of narrators and characters) and the traces that real-life agents such as authors, translators, editors, copy editors, and proofreaders leave in translated texts. The book examines textual voices in a selection of fictional and non-fictional prose and poetic texts, mostly contemporary, and predominantly translated either into or from a Scandinavian language.

Any study combining a look at textual and contextual voices will reveal that the production and consumption of a translation is far from a simple, linear process from agent

via text to receiver. Rather, it evokes Bakhtin's (1981) ideas of heteroglossia ("others' words") and polyphony ("multi-voicedness") as the principles behind any given text's architecture. As Roulet (1996:n.p.) has pointed out, "the discourse, or even a single utterance, of a speaker can enact different voices, corresponding to different discourses or points of view." According to Bakhtin (1981:293), speakers and writers use words that are always "half someone else's," that is, they use words whose meanings have been shaped in earlier communicative processes and that are always influenced by other parties in the more local communicative process. When we apply this to translation, it becomes clear that translations enact voices both from the source and target worlds (Taivalkoski-Shilov 2015a:60). One inescapable element in the process is obviously the pull of the source text. Another influential voice is that of the translation's copy editor, whose views on linguistic and stylistic issues in the target culture affect the transfer from the source text to the target text. Words, sentences, or passages may also be conditioned by voices from other directions, such as a previous translation into the same or another language (see Taivalkoski-Shilov 2015a), a review of the source text or a previous translation, or comments from the publisher or the author to the translator. Living source-text authors are interested parties regarding the words that the translator chooses, although their involvement in the translation process may differ greatly (on authors displaying a keen interest in the translation of their texts, see Jansen 2013 and in this volume). Moreover, the translator's embodied inventory of authoritative voices on linguistic, literary, or cultural issues (in other words, his or her knowledge), as well as external repositories of knowledge, such as dictionaries or search engines, may also be involved covertly or overtly, as may the voices of the family members, friends, and colleagues of the various agents (on the influence of fellow translators, see Jansen 2017). An endless number of voices can and do circulate in source texts as well as in translations: voices constitute the very fabric of texts. In this volume we show that by studying contextual

material and translated texts attentively, not as separate entities but as part and parcel, we can reach a better understanding of the mechanics behind this fabric.

In previous research, members of the Voices project have introduced certain concepts that the chapters herein both use and refine. One important new term is “multiple translatorship,” which Jansen and Wegener (2013:4, 30), drawing on Stillinger’s (1991) concept of multiple authorship, coined to refer to the multiplicity of agents that influence the production of translations, from the selection of texts to be translated to the appointment of the translator, the drafting of the translation itself, its revision by various other agents, its “wrapping” (layout as well as cover, illustrations, and so on), and its final marketing in the target context (Jansen and Wegener 2013:6). Acknowledging multiple translatorship implies, on the one hand, taking into account the whole chain of events related to the manufacturing of the translation and, on the other, emphasizing translation as a social practice that requires a high degree of interaction and collaboration between an array of different agents – much in line with the emphasis that Buzelin places on the hybrid, collective and ‘networky’ character of both the translation agent and the translation process (Buzelin 2005:216, 2011:10; Jansen and Wegener 2013:14–15).

The interaction may take many forms, from dialogical exchange to prolonged negotiation or outright antagonism and open conflict. In fact, the interplay of voices in the decision processes inevitably invokes the notion of power, that is, the question of who is allowed to speak (Taivalkoski-Shilov and Suchet 2013:2) or, as rephrased by Jansen in this volume, of who is having a say. To have *a* say means that you are entitled to voice your opinion, but – as the indefinite article indicates – not necessarily that you are having the final say. To shed light on multiple translatorship, and not least on the role of the translator amid other agents, it is therefore necessary to understand “the relations of power underlying the process of translation in its various stages” (Wolf 2010:341). The parties involved are

bestowed with different degrees of agency, and as their preferences, allegiances, and agendas vis-à-vis the translated text most likely differ, the interaction may very well turn into a power struggle, as emphasized in many studies on translational interaction that adopt the Bourdieusian framework (for further references see, e.g., Inghilleri 2005 and Wolf 2007). However, multiple translatorship can also give rise to fruitful collaborative practices that are stimulating for the agents involved and add value to the final product. Actor-network theory, embraced recently by translation sociology (e.g., Buzelin 2005, 2007; Hekkanen 2009; Abdallah 2012), refrains from presupposing any kind of pre-established hierarchical relationship between the agents/actors involved and is therefore more suited to make room not only or primarily for competition but also for real cooperation – which the Bourdieusian framework seldom does (Chesterman 2006:19).

Several chapters in this book testify to various forms of both successful and less successful interaction and how these affect texts: from poet translators asking other poets for advice on translation challenges in Refsum's chapter, to co-translators discussing how to tackle the expectations, suggestions, and demands of the author, the publisher, and the copy editor in Jansen's chapter, to the role of publishers, proofreaders, and other non-translating agents responsible for the outcome and ultimate fate of the translated text, as discussed in Solum's and Senstad's chapters. Notwithstanding the ultimate nature of the collaboration, the agents other than the translator are all generally more or less invisible in the final translation product (even more invisible than the translator), which is precisely why it is necessary to study contextual material to uncover their ways of interacting, their possible impact on the translation, and their presence in the text.

Multiple translatorship is a reality in the genesis of the translated text. It is important to note, however, that the multiplicity of agents also includes those involved in the reception of translations. It could be claimed, following reception theorists such as Ingarden (1931) and

Iser (1976), that a translated text, like any text, remains non-actualized without readers. Or in the words of Eagleton ([1983] 2008:65), “[f]or literature to happen, the reader is quite as vital as the author.” Furthermore, readers, perhaps especially critics, can actually influence the translation product itself, for example in cases where their responses lead to concrete changes in (re)published translated texts (see Solum in this volume). Interpretative communities (Fish 1980) and readers’ individual characteristics, social backgrounds, and cultural and literary repertoires (McCormick 1994; Andringa 2006) affect the way translations are read, understood, and assessed. And even non-professional readers can influence the way other readers will interpret translated texts by framing them with paratexts in the form of negative or positive translation reviews in blogs, for example, or on Amazon or fan websites (Taivalkoski-Shilov 2015b, 2016).

Despite the entirely tangible existence of multiple translatorship, it is still the case that literary scholars, critics, reviewers, bloggers, and other non-professional readers often comment on translations as though the source-text author’s voice is the only one that is present in the text, and in doing so, they may inadvertently feed other readers’ predilection for disregarding all the other voices that have taken part in shaping the translation. Alvstad (2014) argues that sociocultural reading conventions alone can hardly explain why readers read translated texts as if they came directly from the original author’s pen. Instead, she suggests that many contemporary translated texts are rhetorically structured to be read as if they were written by the original author exclusively without the mediation of a translator or other translational agents. Alvstad coins the term “translation pact” to refer to this rhetorical structuring, which in her view makes it possible for readers to read translated texts as if they were solely the author’s even in cases when the voice of the translator is evident in the text (for examples, see Alvstad 2014: 281).

The translation pact may be created by means of translational choices on the textual

level as well as by paratexts that give readers the impression that the author is the only important enunciator in the text, that is, the only agent that aspects such as meaning, intention, and style can be attributed to. Considering what one might assume from previous work on illusionism and the translator's invisibility (Levý [1963] 2011:19–20, Venuti 1995, Jettmarová 2011:xxii–xxiii), translators and publishers do not strictly speaking need to conceal that they have intervened in the text for the translation pact to work, but they must either cover important changes or assure readers that such changes do not distort the story or discourse.

Even though the translation pact is a rhetorical structuring, meaning that it will *authorize* readers to read the translated book as if it were formulated directly in the target language by the source-text author, it will not *force* readers to read the text in such a way. Most Translation Studies scholars, for example, resist such modes of reading, generally attributing the words of the translated texts to the translator (or to the multiple translatorship) when writing about translations. It should also be noted that not all contemporary translations are structured to uphold the translation pact. Refsum in this volume, for example, examines a case where poetry translations are presented under the name of the translator rather than the name of the original author.

Several Translation Studies scholars (e.g., Schiavi 1996; O'Sullivan 2003; Munday 2008:11–15) have adapted Chatman's (1978) model of the narrative-communication situation by introducing an implied translator into it as a way of accounting for the voice of the translator in translated texts. Alvstad (2014:274–275) argues against such introductions of an implied translator into a narrative scheme, since the implied author in Chatman's model is the structuring principle of the text and since such a principle cannot be doubled – there is only one implied author also when several authors are behind the text (Chatman 1978:149). The indexical signs that make up the implied author (see Schmid 2009:161) change when a text is

translated. An implied author of a specific translation may therefore differ considerably from the implied author of the source text, and also from the implied authors of other translations of the same text. In the case Solberg studies in this volume, the implied author in the 1970 Norwegian translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe* is shown to come across as both more didactic and less sarcastic than in the French original text and in the Norwegian retranslation from 2000. This does not mean, however, that the structuring principle behind a translated text is theoretically of a different kind than the structuring principle behind a non-translated text.

Like the myth of the lone translator, the translation pact needs to be deconstructed. The various chapters of this volume do so by making it clear that the author's voice is only one among a multitude of voices constituting the fabric of translations. We are of course aware that not all participants in the chain of production and consumption of translations will necessarily welcome this kind of spotlight on the multiplicity of voices, since the translation pact and the myth of the lone translator both serve purposes that have established themselves over a long period of time. As we suggested already, however, there are ethical reasons for providing such a spotlight, for the responsibility for an infelicitous translation may well lie with someone completely different than readers are led to think.

The translation pact – and the issue of its deconstruction – can be linked to yet another set of newly introduced terms, namely, “non-manifest” and “manifest” voice (Greenall 2015a:47). The former is a voice that has played a role in shaping a text, and is thus in a certain sense “present” in the text, but it is one that is nevertheless not noticeable to the reader. Manifest voice, on the other hand, *will* be noticeable to the reader, or at least to some readers. While this immediately brings to mind Venuti's (1995) distinction between domestication and foreignization, the two sets of terms do not completely overlap, insofar as domestication does not always lead to non-manifest voice and foreignization does not always

lead to manifest voice. A recent example of the former is provided by the translations of the Harry Potter series into Norwegian, where the names of the various characters were strongly domesticated, leading to the translator's voice becoming manifest and receiving considerable media attention. Similarly, and perhaps surprisingly, foreignization may also sometimes coincide with non-manifest voice. An example of this is the way in which English-language expressions are currently being borrowed and calqued into Scandinavian language texts, causing numerous Anglicisms in these texts (Gottlieb 2005; Greenall, unpublished manuscript). As a result, a smattering of Anglicisms in translated texts will not necessarily draw attention to writers' or translators' voices, although whether this happens or not will strongly depend on the attitudes of individual readers, or groups of readers. Groups of readers who somehow see themselves as keepers of the language, or that harbor purist attitudes for other reasons, are likely to be on the prowl for such Anglicisms (and for someone to blame for them) no matter how common they are in current Nordic language use (see Solum in this volume).

It is important to note that the notions of non-manifest and manifest voice embrace more broadly the voices of all agents, not just translators: the voices of publishers, editors, translators, and other agents may be either non-manifest or manifest in contextual as well as textual material, and also in spoken or sung performances of translations (Greenall 2015a and in this volume). This is important, because while agents' voices may be non-manifest in the actual translated texts, their voices may be highly manifest in contextual material – which again underscores the importance and value of a combined approach.

3. Presentation of the contributions

3.1 Opening the field

The book is divided into three parts: “Opening the Field,” “Charting the Field,” and “Traveling the Field.” The first part, consisting of this introductory chapter, aims to open up new paths for research. All the subsequent contributions take the concepts introduced here further, illustrating them and discussing them by referring to an array of different contextual and textual phenomena. The contributions in the second part, “Charting the Field,” do so by emphasizing theoretical discussion, while those in the third part, “Traveling the Field,” are more strongly empirically oriented.

All the contributions to the volume include both textual and contextual perspectives, revealing the intricate connections between the translation product and the agents behind it. Some of the contributions take the voices of the translational agents as their point of departure, analyzing different kinds of contextual material and considering how the agents in question impact on the concrete translation product. Conversely, others take the translated text as their primary empirical material, while at the same time considering the agents who produced it. When applied to the assorted empirical material being studied in this volume, these two complementary approaches give rise to highly diverse methodologies that still remain consistent within the overall framework of voice. As mentioned above, the textual material studied here stems mainly from the literary genre, as can in part be explained by the makeup of the Voices group (see below). But we also believe that literature provides a plentiful “hunting ground” for us, since it comprises such a wide array of voices, which allows us to to broadly chart the impact of such voices in the translation process and product. As some of the contributions indicate, however, the framework that we are developing can

also be used for texts that fall outside the scope of literary texts in a narrow sense.

3.2 *Charting the field*

Annjo K. Greenall expands the concept of voice to include multisemiotic voice, focusing on Scandinavian singers who not only translate other singers' songs but also perform these translations. Greenall argues that this kind of translation illustrates well how the borderline between the (musico-)textual and the contextual may sometimes be blurred, and moreover that both textual and contextual voices, in this and other forms of translation, involve a strong element of performativity.

Taking up the notion of the translation pact, **Kristina Solum** shows how this pact was challenged in three recent debates in the Norwegian media. The debates concerned the quality of both literary translations and translation criticism, and also shed light on the involvement of publishers, copy editors, and proofreaders in the given cases, whose impact on the translation products is usually ignored by critics and readers alike.

In the subsequent chapter, **Idun Heir Senstad** emphasizes the publisher's role in shaping as well as marketing translations. She discusses the case of a Cuban-American author, Cecilia Samartin, whose novels based on life in Cuba have become bestsellers, but only in translation into Norwegian. The focus is on the possible role that various translational agents played in this process, especially the Norwegian publisher, whose unconventional publishing strategies may explain this remarkable phenomenon of the "bestseller-in-translation."

Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and **Maarit Koponen** shift the focus to readers. They examine the reading process of a translated academic text, Michel Foucault's *Histoire de la sexualité* as translated by Kaisa Sivenius, when introduced by three different paratexts (the

translator's preface, a sociologist's afterword, and a critical review). The analysis indicates that a given paratext, as well as the readers' study background, will influence the way they react to a translated academic text. In other words, contextual voices pave the way for readers' perceptions of textual voices also in translated non-fiction.

Christian Refsum's chapter homes in on poet-translators, that is, poets who translate other poets, and examines the complex relationship between authorship, translatorship, and ownership. Both textual and contextual material, such as correspondence between such poet-translators, are taken into account. Refsum shows how translating other poets brings about changes in the poet-translator's own poetry, using as an example the Norwegian poet Jan Erik Vold.

The second part of the volume concludes with an essay by **Susan Bassnett** on the textual instability of many classical texts, for which neither a definite source text nor a definite source-text author exists. Bassnett draws attention to the fact that the so-called originals of many classical texts are the product of centuries of interventions by scribes, editors, scholars, patrons, publishers, and translators, and pays particular attention to the work of contemporary translators into English of classical texts originally written in Ancient Greek, Latin, Old Welsh, and Old Irish.

3.3 Travelling the field

Hanne Jansen's chapter is mainly centered on translators and the drafting of translations but also looks into the sometimes conflictual collaboration with other translational agents such as the publisher and the copy editor. With an eye toward shedding light on two co-translators' problem-solving strategies, Jansen explores the e-mails they exchanged over a two-year period while translating Claudio Magris's novel *Alla cieca*. She shows how both Magris

himself and a wide range of other agents influenced the work carried out by the two co-translators, at times to the chagrin of the latter.

In the subsequent chapter, **Jeroen Vandaele** asks why Elvira Lindo's Manolito books, a series for children that was a huge success in Spain, rarely gained the same popularity abroad. As a possible explanation, Vandaele looks at the typical strategies of omission and/or adaptation employed in translations into different languages when dealing with the narrator's colloquial and comically outspoken voice and with controversial stereotypes such as gendering, racism, and domestic violence.

Ida Hove Solberg compares two Norwegian translations of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe*, from 1970 and 2000, respectively, with special attention bestowed on how the authorial voice is rendered in the two versions. The 1970 translation differs consistently in this respect both from the French original and from the 2000 translation, as commented on in reviews of the latter. As the author shows, the former translation tends to explain philosophical terms, omit cultural items, and remove or hedge Beauvoir's more caustic remarks about women, with the result that the implied author becomes more didactic and less sarcastic.

Christina Gullin's chapter returns to the translation pact, this time examining the critics' role in its propagation. Gullin points out striking differences in the reviews of the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish translations of Nadine Gordimer's novel *Get a Life*, differences that may be explained by the fact that the various critics had indeed read three different texts, as Gullin illustrates in her close reading of examples from the three translations.

The geographical and historical scope of the volume is again widened in the last contribution, in which **Roberto Valdeón** shows how the voice of one author, Pedro Cieza de León, a chronicler of the Spanish conquest of the Americas, has been transformed by a

succession of translators' and academics' voices. As Valdeón illustrates, various agents have appropriated the text in question (written in 1553) according to their culturally determined ideologies, and more specifically, how they have altered and used the topic of sodomy to suit their own ideological agendas.

4. The Scandinavian context

Of the eleven studies presented in this volume, eight have a Scandinavian flavor, insofar as the translations they study are either into or from a Scandinavian language (Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish) and/or the paratexts they study have arisen within the Scandinavian context; if we also include Taivalkoski-Shilov and Koponen's chapter, nine of the eleven studies relate to the wider Nordic context (which comprises Finland and Iceland in addition to the three Scandinavian countries). The particular focus on Scandinavia brings attention to a linguacultural area that has so far been largely neglected within Translation Studies. Thus, an additional benefit of this book is that it provides an overview of translation-related activities within the Scandinavian countries, making it available for comparison with the situation elsewhere in Europe and the world at large.

Though translators are relatively well organized throughout the Nordic countries, this is perhaps especially true for Norway. In 2006, for example, a five-month campaign among translators led to improved remuneration and terms of work (see *Oversetteraksjonen 2006*); conversely, copy editors and proofreaders are actually much less organized in Norway than in many other countries (Solum, unpublished manuscript).

A key player in the 2006 campaign was the Norwegian Association of Literary Translators, whose mandate is to actively create and spread knowledge about translations and translators. The association is currently establishing an online dictionary of translators inspired by the one developed by academics in Sweden (<http://www.oversattarlexikon.se>).

Together with the Norwegian Critics' Association it was also instrumental in raising awareness among both literary critics and translators with a project titled *What Can Be Said about Translations?* (*Hva kan man si om oversettelser*), headed by Jon Rognlien, an established Norwegian translator, subtitler, and critic who has also been an active member of the Voices of Translation project (see below and Solum's chapter).

The *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project arranged a series of seminars over a four-year period (2011–2014). According to Rognlien (personal communication), the most rewarding one was a workshop with twelve invited critics who had been asked to translate in advance the same excerpt from a certain novel. Rognlien reports that the critics were quite astonished by how much their drafts differed from one another and also from the published translation, making them more aware of how subjective a translation is, and indeed must be. As mentioned above, Solum in this volume discusses three debates in the Norwegian press – debates that were prompted by highly critical reviews – and she also explores whether Rognlien's project may have played into these debates.

The volume's emphasis on contemporary Scandinavia notwithstanding, our overall aim is to provide a general framework that is applicable also beyond Scandinavia and current translation practices. The notion of voice has enough breadth and specificity to be used as an interpretive lens within a broad range of areas and contexts, as is shown in the contributions to this volume from Bassnett, Valdeón, and Taivalkoski-Shilov and Koponen. We also hope that the framework we present here will be applied beyond the genre of literature. Theatre translation, audiovisual translation, and interpreting are all fields in which, for example, the physical aspects of voice are vital; here, we believe that particularly Greenall's chapter can serve as a point of departure. Another example would be localization, post-editing, and journalistic translation, where voice seems to have additional facets to the ones we identify here. Notably, the agents who engage with these activities are not always identified as

translators, and it would therefore be valuable to explore them from within a voice framework.

5. Voices of and in the research process

In the process of studying the translational voices in question here, we ourselves have become part of the empirical field we study, by producing yet another layer of contextual material – namely, the chapters in this book. Here, our own voices are interwoven with the voices of our research objects. Furthermore, like publishers, editors, translators, and readers, we too have interacted with a large number of people from various backgrounds and fields, people who have influenced our interpretations and decisions along the way, who have, in other words, helped shape and mold our voices. While working on this volume we have discussed our ongoing research with colleagues and at a series of seminars organized at the University of Oslo, the University of Copenhagen, the University of Helsinki, and the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim. An international advisory board and a panel of translation practitioners have been very important participants at these meetings.

The intense collaboration between researchers and practitioners in the field of translation has constituted an attempt at maximizing our engagement with current issues and challenges within the profession. It has also been a way for us to listen to a set of experienced translational and editorial voices that obviously express important insights about our object of study and that allow us to learn from and be influenced by these voices. The collaboration has also been intended to be two-way: we hope that translation practitioners who read this volume can benefit from our work as much as we have benefited from the insights of the members of

our panel of practitioners. In other words, we hope that our voices will circulate, raise discussion, and enhance future translations, translator training, and translation research.

With this in mind, we wish to thank the members of our advisory board (Susan Bassnett, Reine Meylaerts, Jeremy Munday, Anthony Pym, and Tore Rem) and the members of our panel of translation practitioners (Thomas Harder, Jon Rognlien, and Dina Roll-Hansen), for their valuable input to our various drafts. We also wish to thank Alexandra Assis Rosa, Jenny Brumme, Iris Fernández Muñiz, Isis Herrero López, Inger Hesjevoll Schmidt-Melbye, Åse Johnsen, Siri Nergaard, Kirsten Marie Øveraas, Outi Paloposki, Eva Refsdal, Signe Kårstad, our two anonymous reviewers, the publisher's three anonymous reviewers, Yves Gambier in his capacity as general editor of the *Benjamins Translation Library*, as well as Isja Conen and others at John Benjamins who made this book possible. We thank Stig Oppedal for copyediting the volume and for the various suggestions and contributions he has made also to the content. Research for this volume was carried out under the auspices of the *Voices of Translation: Rewriting Literary Texts in a Scandinavian Context* project, which was supported by the Research Council of Norway (project no. 213246) and the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo.