Gideon Toury

Culture Planning and Translation*

The present paper is programmatic in nature. It represents an initial attempt to approach translation both as a paradigmatic case of plan-able activity as well as an agent of planning applied in other cultural domains. Case-studies based on this mode of reasoning will be supplied later. Different, often partial formulations of the present line of argumentation were presented at several meetings over the last few years; e.g. in Tel Aviv, Amsterdam, Istanbul and Manchester. I wish to thank all those who attended those (and other) presentations for both encouragement and criticism. Some may be glad to find responses to their critical comments already incorporated in the text.

1

There was a time, back in the 1970s, when considerable energy, a substantial part of it scholarly, was invested in issues of language planning. For two decades or so, personalities such as Einar Haugen and Joshua A. Fishman made language planning a dynamic field of study, especially among sociolinguists, and many conferences and collections of articles were devoted to it during those years, often under titles emphasizing `advances' (e.g. Fishman 1974) or `progress' (e.g. Cobarrubias and Fishman 1983). A number of book-length monographs then followed, most notably Cooper 1989.

The scope of language planning as a field of **scholarly** occupation was meant to be rather broad. It was intended to apply to a lot more than language itself as a coding system, which represented the more traditional way of looking at planning. The expressed wish was now to tackle issues of intervention in current states of cultural-linguistic affairs in various different dimensions along with their interconnections, whose existence was taken for granted but whose nature remained in need of study, both descriptive and theoretical. Those

dimensions included:

* **status planning** (or so-called language *policy)*,

* **corpus planning** (or *codification*, on all possible levels; be it the coining of new terms, changes of spelling, modifications of morphology and syntax, the adoption of a new script, or whatever), and, finally,

* **planning for planning's sake**, including the enhancement of the intended status of the language in question (by way of implementing the policy agreed upon) and the dissemination of its codified varieties, first and foremost in the educational system. (See e.g. Karam 1974: 112ff.; Cooper 1989: Chapters 5-7)

Unfortunately - as was so often the case with fields of scholarly interest associated with language - attention was soon diverted mainly to codification again, which indeed lends itself to systematization, even formalization, with relative ease. The more ambitious program thus eroded, and to the extent that status planning and planning-for-the-sake-of-planning had not been abandoned altogether, they were certainly relegated to the periphery of scholarship, or else given excessive autonomy which divorced the two dimensions from corpus planning and blurred the foreseen interconnections. Total fragmentation was the inevitable result: Something which could easily have developed into a lot more than just language planning thus dwindled into considerably less than even that.

This dwindling was furthered by directing the searchlight to the immediate concerns of individual instances of language engineering rather than the mechanics of planning itself, or sometimes by raising objections to the very

legitimacy of intervening in an allegedly `natural' course of events (which is of course never natural). Whether in favor of planning or against it, the discussions now led were more and more ideological: The wish to *understand* cultural processes and the mechanisms underlying them was almost totally replaced by an attempt to *influence* such processes and change their course; namely, in a particular, more often than not `politically correct' direction.

The last decade has been marked by the foregrounding of cultural concerns in all the sciences of man, including the ones interested in language and language behavior. This development has already brought along substantial changes in the way phenomena `in the world of our experience' are approached, which students of translation were among the first to applaud - and adopt. There were even colleagues who nicknamed the 1980s the era of `cultural turn' in Translation Studies (e.g. Bassnett and Lefevere 1990), even though it is not always all that clear what this term was meant to cover.

Planning has always been a major force in culture and its dynamics. Therefore it is my contention that we will soon be witnessing renewed scholarly interest in the conditions underlying it, its mechanisms and the results of their activation. Judging from current trends in other fields, this interest will encompass a wide range of activities where language is involved, but in these too, it will no longer be limited to language as a code alone: the old program is bound to come to life again, albeit in a modified way. When this occurs, there is no way Translation Studies can remain out of bounds; and thinking in terms of planning is bound to affect the very way translating and translation(s) will be tackled and the kind of descriptions and explanations that will come to the fore. On the other hand, culturally-oriented conceptions of translation would not fail to serve as an example for the entire move. After all, it cannot be contested that translation is as much a means of effecting culture planning as it

is a paradigmatic case thereof.

Which is by no means the case now. Rather, in today's discussions of culture and language planning, to the extent that they are being held at all, translation is assigned very little room, if any at all. One need only go over periodicals such as *Language Problems and Language Planning* to become aware of the almost total non-existence of translation as a topic, or over leading periodicals in the field of Translation Studies to see that the socio-cultural notion of planning (in contradistinction to cognitive planning which is said to go on in one's `black box' as one is engaging in translation) is hardly ever present.

However, in the heyday of language planning too, back in the 1970s, translation could easily have been given a lot more prominence. This would have occurred too, one should assume, had status planning, and especially planning for planning's sake, been given as much attention as was codification. Because it is these two domains where translation as a culturally-relevant occupation has often played its greatest role: serving to try out the potentials of the planned system in an efficient way as well as present members of the social group which entertains the culture in question with appealing results.

True, when it came to particular cases, accounts could hardly do without mentioning recourse to translation, at least as a means of building a textual inventory. The role actually played by individual translations, or the translations of particular texts of external origin, in the evolution of a so-called target culture was also mentioned occasionally, especially in historical studies. Recommendations for future planners too, especially in individual communities and with respect to individual languages, often alluded to the use of translation. It was advocated, for instance, as a means of rationalizing the cost-benefit ratio (a topic dealt with in Thurburn 1971), that is, achieving quick, and relatively good results while investing a bare minimum of resources

such as time and effort, even plain money, as well as building on imported prestige. Thus, even John Wilkins, who invented a purely artificial Philosophical Language back in 1668, chose translation when it came to trying out his language and demonstrating its capacity to the readers of his mammoth treatise. How else could they have been made aware of the potentials of a language which had never been in any use? No less symptomatic is the fact that the text Wilkins cites in translation into the invented language and discusses at some length (Chapter IV) is a translation of the prest*Pater Noster*.

Anyhow, this is precisely where translation was normally left off: a mere mention, a recommendation `to consider the possibility' - or, at most, a demonstration of potentials, with or without a discussion. As far as I know, translation has never been regarded in any explicit way as a cultural (and textual-linguistic) phenomenon which is not only involved in the planning of some other domain such as literature, journalism, even language in general, but may also involve planning activities in and for itself; starting with the distinction between more and less appropriate source languages, text-types and individual texts and going all the way through to the establishment of individual target-language replacements, whether they are taken from among the existing options or created anew, and the establishment of that which would be regarded as the appropriate relationships between such a replacement and its counterpart in the corresponding source text (and see the methodological notion of the coupled pair of replacing + replaced segments in Toury 1995: esp. Chapter 4).

This is precisely what I have set out to do today; namely, to work out a first approximation for an area of intersection between the interests of Translation Studies, on the one hand, and Planning Studies, on the other. In doing so, I will start from both ends alternately and draw imaginary lines from each one of

them towards the other until the two finally cross. One point should be clear from the outset: my interest and approach will remain scholarly throughout. Thus, inasmuch as I'll be doing some planning myself, and not just talking about it, planning will only apply to the theoretical and methodological levels of the discipline of Translation Studies. Thus, it will only be offered to the virtual community of translation scholars, which is my targeted group. Beyond that, I won't even be advocating culture planning. I won't be propagating against it either: translation scholars belong to many different home-cultures, and it is up to each culture to make its own decisions and have its own struggles for and against planning outside of our virtual community.

I will start with a few preliminaries of planning as a factor in the shaping, reshaping and maintenance of collective entities in general, with the intention of getting to translation soon enough. At which point, point of view and direction of progress will both be reversed. My preliminary remarks will draw heavily on Even-Zohar's recent work (see references), which I find to be most pertinent to my own mode of thinking.

2

My starting point will be a comprehensive conception of culture as **a structured repertoire of options** which (a) organizes social interaction and (b) lends each move within a social group whatever significance it is regarded to have.

The use of the word `options', in this context, is not accidental. Rather, it implies that, in any given situation, choices have to be made. Nor are these choices ever totally free. Rather, they are constrained in various ways and to various extents. Membership in a collective entity and participation in its culture thus involve not only the acquisition of the repertoire as such, but also knowledge of the appropriateness/inappropriateness of whatever options are

included in it under different circumstances, the possibility of maneuvering between alternatives included.

If this is what culture and cultural behavior are taken to be, then planning would consist in any act of (more or less deliberate) **intervention in a current state of affairs** within a social group; whether the impetus for intervening originates in the group itself or outside of it.

In young, newly established cultures, planning may be equated with transforming inventories of alternative modes of behavior into structured systems (i.e. repertoires), or even first establishing the list of options itself and then introducing some order into it. In institutionalized cultures, where repertoires already exist (otherwise there would be no reason to regard them as `institutionalized' in the first place), culture planning would basically amount to an attempt to introduce new options which weren't there before, and/or get rid of old ones, and by so doing effecting changes in an extant set. It would also include ways of making the interfered-with repertoire accessible to the culture and its individual members so that it can be put to actual use. Intervention may also involve attempts to prevent changes which others may be trying to introduce, thus struggling to maintain an existing *status quo*. However, if indeed maintained, the prevailing state of affairs will have acquired a different status due to the very struggle which took place prior to its attainment and which has become a fact of the culture itself and its history; change again, albeit of a different kind.

Every individual in a collective entity is of course a user (or consumer) of the repertoire; consumer for the sake of active behavior within the group, to be sure, as well as the assessment of other members' behavior. Even if his or her behavior seems unique (and every instance of behavior does have a certain uniqueness to it), on the repertoremic level - that is, with respect to the

repertoire out of which all selections will have been made - it would be a realization of the existing options, which therefore more or less perpetuates the repertoire and the culture defined by it; a strong element of stability, to be sure! However, in all groups there are also a few members who act as producers on the level of the repertoire itself. Whether entrusted by the group with the task of doing so or whether self-appointed, these persons introduce new options and, by so doing, act as agents of change. It is these few who may be said to engage in planning activities; namely, in direct proportion to features such as consciousness and deliberateness, on the one hand, and success, on the other.

If it wishes to have any chance of success, planning is always in need of a power base. In fact, very often it is performed for the very sake of **attaining** power and building a power base rather than as a *bona fide* attempt to introduce a `desirable' change. The latter may well be a mere concomitant factor, even just a means to a totally different end. Be that as it may, planning is intimately connected with struggles for domination, as is every attempt to prevent it, stop it, or change its course.

Historical studies into various cases of culture and language planning have revealed that **disguise techniques** often act as important safeguards from losing such struggles, especially when power has not yet been won: risk seems smaller when the claim is made that there is actually very little new about what is being advocated, and especially when this claim is backed up by evidence; always selective, if not distorted. (And see, for instance, the way foreign words imported into Hebrew were disguised as if they were home-bred; first as a practice of individual importers, then as an official policy of the Academy of the Hebrew Language [Toury 1990]). By contrast, when planning, and especially the dissemination of planned goods, have proved successful and

some power has indeed been achieved, further planning seems to become much smoother. It may also become more direct, that is, freer of considerations other than the set goal itself and the ways to attain it.

Planning needn't be done in one sweeping move either, applied to all issues and cultural sectors at once. It can very well be realized in smaller-scale activities, performed in particular sectors of the culture and/or with respect to more or less defined issues. This is the reason why, for instance, the language used in translations can be a lot more, or a lot less controlled than the language used in non-translations without there arising any real problem of inappropriateness: while, on occasion, `acceptability as a translation' may well be similar to `acceptability' in general, the two are not always, and hence not necessarily, the same (see e.g. Toury 1995: 207-208; 1998: Section 4.9).

The fullest move imaginawould of course involve the **invention** of a culture, or a cultural sector such as a language, a literature, a literary genre, etc.; starting from scratch, as it were. While theoretically possible, this option is normally interesting as a mental exercise only. Thus, even so-called `invented languages' - and it seems indeed easier to design a language than any other cultural coding system - are not really absolute innovations. More significantly, those invented languages that manage to attain a measure of success are bound to have relied heavily on **existing** repertoires (albeit existing elsewhere, of course, otherwise there would be little point in presenting the language as `invented'). One need only compare John Wilkins's Philosophical Language, mentioned above, with a language such as Esperanto to become convinced of the advantages of blending new and old (and/or disguising new as old!) for the sake of achieving success in planning activities, including the establishment of a group that would adopt the resulting system as its own language.

Nor need planning be fully linear; first setting goals, then devising methods for reaching them, and finally applying those methods in actual behavior. In fact, to the extent that planners wish to achieve more than momentary success, and stay in power, their activity will probably be spiral, involving constant assessments and reassessments; not only of the implementation but of the very methods and even the goals themselves. Thus, success in culture planning is often a result of certain flexibility with respect to one's positions, whereas rigidity may well lead to failure.

Finally, it is not at all necessary for every step in planning to be made in full consciousness, let alone leave visible traces in the form of records. Of course, the existence of written documents, especially if they reflect decisions that were actually made in a (more or less) official setup, renders the application of the term `planning' less controversial: the intervention itself would simply have been made transparent that way. However, even in fields such as architecture, or bridge building - conscious planning activities of the highest intricacy - not every aspect is planned, let alone documented, in this strong sense (which is something we tend to disregard as long as it hasn't backfired). I am therefore all in favor of some lenience in the application of the notion of `planning', at least in Cultural Studies: I believe it is usable - and useful - as long as it is useful in helping us to understand (and hence to explain) cultural processes and their products.

Once *any* intervention with a cultural repertoire is regarded as a possible act of planning, translation emerges as a candidate *par excellence* for (re)viewing in these terms. Most important of all, translation activities and their products not only can, but very often do cause changes in current states of affairs, often beyond the mere accumulation of individual texts (which is at best marginal, in terms of cultural change) and up to the level of repertoires itself. Many of the

changes brought about by means of translation are clearly not involuntary either. As is well known, the act of translation is purposeful in its very nature, a teleological activity where `success' (or `failure') are key notions; `success' and `failure' in terms of the requirements of the **recipient** culture, that is, which is precisely where planning activities may be said to have actually taken place.

Like all truly socio-cultural activities, translation is norm-governed by its very nature: it is subject to directives which draw from cultural agreements and conventions (see now Toury 1998). From the very decision to translate, which is never self-explanatory, through the choice of text-types and individual texts, to the adoption (or invention) of models and linguistic options on the receptor side. Translation also lends itself to **manipulation**, and quite easily so, which is a sure sign of the ease with which people-in-the-culture can be made aware of the conventions and norms pertinent to that activity, or its products, at least.

Thus, for instance, it is not at all surprising that, when the Frisians in the Netherlands decided to invest some effort in promoting their `language of limited diffusion' and build up an inventory of texts in the Frisian language, to serve as an important constituent of a coveted Frisian culture, they decided to turn to translation. Even less surprising is the texts they decided to use to begin their organized translational activities; namely, the Bible, on the one hand, and certain modern classics of children's literature on the other. Their focus was thus very much on the **status** of the texts (which they were trying to import) as well as on **marketing**, or at least **marketability**; certainly no less than it was on the **codification** of the language itself as used in the texts, including norms of text-formation. Nor was that pattern unique (and see Judith Woodsworth's 1996 account of the translation of A.A. Milne's *The House at Pooh Corner* into Romansch, a minority language of Switzerland.)

This marks the promised change of focus and reversal of direction in our observations. I will make a fresh start now at the translational end and try to work my way up to the notion of planning again.

3

As is well known, cultures resort to translating as one possible way - and a highly controllable one, at that - of filling in gaps in themselves. On whatever level.

A void in a cultural sector may of course be more or less noticeable to the people-in-the-culture, nor is the only way of filling a void which *has* been noticed to turn to translation: a gap can also be filled with an untranslated (that is, alien) entity, especially in a society whose members share several languages. A non-translational entity can also be produced; namely, within the possibilities of the recipient culture itself, and, finally, the gap can be left open, at least for the time being. To be sure, the very realization of the existence of a gap in one's own culture is often triggered by the presence of an extant option elsewhere, which may or may not be selected as a fill-in later on: one sees something in another culture and wishes one had something similar in one's own.

Be that as it may, any realized fill-in within a culture can be taken as an indication that a void has once been felt. In retrospective observations of translation, which are by far the most common ones, this is precisely what we would normally start with: fill-ins which raise questions as to what gaps they were designed to close, in what domains those gaps occurred and on what grounds they presented themselves.

Observations of this kind allow us to regard acts of translation as initiated by the *receiving* culture; the act itself, and especially the shape it has taken, and

hence the make-up of the end-product along with the relations that link it to its counterpart in another culture and language assumed to have served as its source; all important constituents of any notion of [assumed] translation (Toury 1995: 31-35; 1995a). This target-oriented assumption seems semiotically valid even if sometimes - for instance, in so-called `colonial' situations - an alleged gap may be factually pointed out for a recipient culture by a patron of sorts - a planning agent by every standard! - who also purports to `know better' how that gap may best be filled, and does all that from an unquestionable position of power (and see Dollerup's 1997 attempt to distinguish between `translation as imposition' and `translation as requisition'). Even under such circumstances, a more persuasive approach would involve a kind of disguise again, even so much as false pretense. Thus, it would often proceed not from the factual existence of an option in another culture and try to simply impose it on the receiving one. Rather, it would point out that there is something missing in the prospective receiving culture, which should actually be there and which, luckily enough, already exists elsewhere and can therefore be taken advantage of.

As already mentioned, in the simplestof cases (which are still all too often those translation scholars stick to), both deficiency and fill-in seem to consist in mere **textual entities**. Being an instance of performance, any text is of course unique; it may be more or less in tune with prevailing norms and models, but in itself it is a novelty. This holds for translated texts too. In fact, the novelty claim would still hold for the n^{th} translation of a text into a given language; be it for the second or the hundredth time: it is the *resulting* entity which is crucial here, the one which would actually be incorporated into the target culture; and this entity will *always* have never been there before. Unless, of course, one is willing to take Borges' speculations on "Pierre Menard, author of the *Quixote*" at face value and apply them to the process of generating

translated texts.

Now, wishing to introduce a text into a given culture by way of translation, including the resolution to retranslate (rather than reprint an existing translation, submit it to revision, or simply forget all about it), always involves a series of (interconnected) decisions; and since it always entails some change on behalf of the receiving culture, be it ever so slight, those can be perceived as **planning activities** by their very nature. The more so if and when possible implications of the introduction of the text in question into the target culture are actually heeded, thus influencing decision-making itself.

In more complex cases, not only individual texts may be introduced into a culture, but hitherto non-existing **models** too; be they text-types, or models for the representation of reality, or for linking episodes in a story, even modes of language use (or sometimes imported legitimation for the adoption of extant options which have remained [relatively] unused so far). This is of course a much more radical, repertoremic sense of placing new options at the disposal of a culture. Clearly, changes of this magnitude would tend to involve groups of texts rather than single instances of linguistic performance; either a number of texts which embody a recurring pattern carried over from the source culture or (more often, it seems) texts which have undergone a similar act of transfer within the receiving culture itself, and hence independently of the features their counterparts--sources may have had in the contributing culture(s).

Of course, the likelihood of incurring changes in the receiving culture beyond the mere presence of a hitherto unknown text is no production mishap. Rather, it is in the very nature of translation as a mode of cultural behavior, which planners have always been aware of. Thus, while translation events are indeed initiated by the target culture and intended to cater for its needs, they are often designed to **deviate** from patterns which have become sanctioned within that

culture. A certain portion of these deviations - though not necessarily all of them - may be associated with the felt need to retain invariant at least some features of the immediate source text, a postulate which seems to have been an integral part of most notions of (assumed) translation, notwithstanding the enormous variability of this so-called `equivalence postulate'; in reality and theory alike (see now Halverson 1997; in press).

Be the reasons for deviation from target-culture conventionalized patterns as they may, the obvious result is that it is not unusual for translations to be quite **distinct** from non- translational entities and even advertise their foreignness, including the deviations (or novelties) themselves, which may be associated with their foreign origin. In various cultures, tolerance of anomalies (even though not necessarily all anomalies, on all levels at once) has been known to have been much greater in acts and products marked `translational' than in non-translational behavior. Which lends initial justification to the introduction of novelties by means of translation acts and their results. In fact, very often, an amount of deviance from target-normality in texts assumed to have been translated is considered not only acceptable, or even justifiable, but actually preferable to complete conformity to models pertaining to the domestic repertoire: Too smooth a translation is sometimes regarded with suspicion, evidently assuming that smoothness must have been achieved at a price. Such a price is often regarded by people-in-the-culture as too high, even if its exact nature remains concealed from most of them.

The fact that deviations from sanctioned patterns occur and may be noted by the people-in-the-culture, who may even like it that way, breeds an inherent possibility of **manipulating** these reactions; for instance, by producing the `required' deviations more or less at will. This would bring translational activities even closer to the notion of planning.

A striking reflection of the possibility of manipulating translation and translational deviations from target- culture conventions is the phenomenon of **fictitious translations**; original texts which utilize features that people- in-the-culture have come to associate with translations (see Toury 1995: Excursus A). These texts are then presented to the culture - and often accepted by its members - as products of genuine, text- induced acts of translation: another disguise, another mode of false pretense. Interestingly enough, work on dozens of cases, originating in various cultures and periods of time, from the Middle Ages until today, has revealed that there is hardly a single case where the decision to pseudo-translate, and the way this decision was implemented, could not be accounted for in terms of a more or less deliberate attempt to introduce new options into a culture while neutralizing many of the objections that might have arisen, had the novelties been offered in a straightforward, non-disguised manner. Is there a better demonstration of planning? And is this kind of planning not intimately connected with the very nature of translation, its own initial `plan-ability' and the ease with which it lends itself to manipulation?!

In many cases, attempts to disguise novelties, whether home-bred or borrowed or mixtures of the two, as translational importations have proved highly successful too: the novelties introduced through fictitious translations were indeed added to the receiving culture as options, with the result that the entire structure of its repertoire underwent change; often in a foreseen, if not planned direction. It is not rare to find cases where the new options actually reached the cultural epicenter itself; either immediately, or (more often) following a period of struggle for acceptance, which may have involved additional adjustment to the receptor culture too. Suffice it to mention the role of the novella *Papa Hamlet* in the creation of a uniquely German brand of literary naturalism at the end of the 19th century known as the *konsequenter Naturalismus*, the role of

The Book of Mormon in the establishment of a new religious sect in the US a few decades earlier, or the role of some 300 paperbacks featuring a guy named Patrick Kim, a CIA agent of Korean descent, in the establishment - as well as legitimization - of a subgenre of "spy books" in Israel of the 1960s and 1970s.

4

What **teachers of translation** in professional or academic institutes are doing can also be re-interpreted as a case of planning, and quite easily so. After all, teaching - which is planned by its very nature - is also a planning activity *par excellence*.

One would think that persons, who have, after all, been entrusted by society itself with the training of translators rather than letting them hatch slowly under `free' societal circumstances, would see their task as imparting modes of behavior to the non-experienced the way they are normally practiced in the culture, thus preparing them for acceptance into the group of practicing translators. Of course, even if this were the case, it would still have counted as an instance of planning. However, very often this is not what happens at all. What students of translation are actually being offered normally draws on anadmixture of concepts borrowed from sources deemed (by curriculum designers and teachers) more `respectable' than the behavior of flesh-and-blood translators under real socio-cultural conditions; mainly scholarly disciplines such as linguistics, text-linguistics, communication studies or pragmatics. These concepts are supplemented by intuitions, sometimes very good ones, but all too often seasoned with a speck of wishful thinking. In the most extreme cases, the claim is even made (at least implicitly) that there are things that simply *should*, or should *never*, be done; by virtue of what translation allegedly `is', that is, and not by virtue of a changeable and changing convention; in fact, very often in sharp contrast to socially- relevant conventions.

Of course, there is an ideology underlying this attitude, as there is underlying most acts of planning; and ideologies tend to breed their own norms. Thus, many teachers of translation see their task precisely as intervening in an existing state of affairs and effecting changes within it. Most of them would of course claim that this state of affairs is `bad', and in sore need of `improvement', but it would still be **change** that they would be after; and in a situation which others may well find perfectly satisfactory, or wish to see change in a different direction.

Teachers do what they do from a position of almost absolute power vis-à-vis their students, power granted to them by the institutions they work in, and - at least by extension - by higher authorities still; sometimes, though by no means always, and certainly not necessarily, on the strength of their having been recognized by society in their own capacity as practicing translators. However, the position of a teacher within a training institute does not necessarily imply similar power vis-à-vis society at large, even though this is precisely what the teachers may be said to be struggling for.

To use slightly different terms: training institutes often act as closed societal groups, having their own conventions and norms of how to behave `properly', in accordance with those conventions. These norms they are trying to impose on all newcomers to the group (namely, the students), and through them - on society and culture as a whole. Is there a more obvious case of `culture engineering'? Which is however not always all that successful: Transition from the closed group of the institute into the world is not always smooth and unpainful. Thus, it is often the case that the unfortunate graduates have to undergo a process of forgetting a great deal of what they were taught, and adjust, at least in part, to prevalent norms of socio-cultural appropriateness; ironically enough, often the very same norms their trainers wished to see

changed... Much the same as journalists and writers are often made to suspend a substantial part of the grammar they learnt at school as they are playing these particular roles.

By the same token, many proponents of contemporary ideologies of translation also indulge in culture planning; at least to the same extent that they do theoretical thinking and a lot more than they are interested in accounting for rather than merely criticizing what `real' translators have been known to do in `real-life' situations. In actual fact, what many of them are mainly after is the formulation of guidelines, even so much as instructions for appropriate - e.g. politically correct in whatever terms - behavior, which should be different from the kind of translational behavior which was regarded normative up till now; a noble cultural goal which may even be achieved, but not really a scholarly one.

5

What I have been saying about translation in Sections 3 and 4 of the present paper was taken almost verbatim from my *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond* (Toury 1995). The only thing of essence I added were a number of explicit interpolations about planning, and those were more in the line of clarifications than additions, let alone real changes in the original line of argumentation. Which means that recognizing the relevance of the notion of planning to the study of translation, as well as recognizing the relevance of the study of translation to our understanding of what culture planning may involve, has come about rather late. It evolved in small, gradual paces too.

Most of the points made in the book were made in a series of articles published in the 1980s. Thus, everything was formulated as part of a translational discussion proper, with no initial intention of invoking the notion of planning. In fact, the word `planning' itself was hardly used in them; not even in the 1995 book, for which much of the older stuff was rewritten. I know for sure, because

I counted! The argumentation simply evolved *towards* this notion; namely, from the material itself.

Was it really a totally unplanned move, as it seems to have been?

On second thought, it may be claimed that movement towards viewing translation in terms of planning started in the mid-1970s, with the first large-scale application of the notion of norm to the study of translational behavior (Toury 1977, 1978). As I see it now, it shouldn't be too difficult to work out correlations between the two systems of notions, those connected with planning, on the one hand, and those connected with translation as a norm-governed activity, on the other; however, this task, which may be of interest for the history of our discipline, goes way beyond what I set out to do in this programmatic essay.

Note

* A somewhat shorter version of this article was read at the International Conference "anovadores de nós - anosadores de vós", Vigo, 1997.

References

Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere. 1990. "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights. The `Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies", in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History and Culture*. London-New York: Pinter, 1990. 1-13.

Borges, J. L. 1970. "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*", in *Labyrinths*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970. 62-71.

Cobarrubias, J. and J.A. Fishman, eds. 1983. *Progress in Languages Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin etc.: Mouton.

Cooper, R.L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.

Dollerup, C. 1997. "Translation as Imposition vs. Translation as Requisition", in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl, eds.*Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress - Prague 1995*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. 45-56.

Even-Zohar, I. 1994. "Culture Planning and the Market", in "http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers/plan_clt.html".

Even-Zohar, I. 1997. "Factors and Dependencies in Culture: A Revised Draft for Polysystem Culture Research", in *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* XXIV:1. 15-34.

Even-Zohar, I. 1997a. "Repertoire and the Wealth of Entities", in "http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers/rep-wea2.html".

Even-Zohar, I. 1997b. "Culture Planning and Cultural Resistance", in "http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers/plan_res.htm".

Even-Zohar, I. 1997c. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer", in *Target* 9:2. 373-381.

Fishman, J.A., ed. 1974. *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.

Halverson, S. 1997. "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies: Much Ado About Something", in *Target* 9:2. 207-233.

Halverson, S. in press. "Conceptual Work and the `Translation' Concept", in *Target* 11:1.

Karam, F.X. 1974. "Toward a Definition of Language Planning", in Fishman 1974: 103-124.

Thorburn, Th. 1971. "Cost-Benefit Analysis in Language Planning", in J. Rubin and B.H. Jernudd, eds. *Can Language Bw Planned?* The University Press of Hawaii, 1971. 253-262.

Toury, G. 1977. *Translational Norms and Literary Translation into Hebrew, 1930-1945*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University. [in Hebrew]

Toury, G. 1978 [[1]1976]. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation", in J.S Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broeck, eds. *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven: acco, 1978. 83-100.

Toury, G. 1990. "From One Signifier to Another: Modified Phonetic Transposition in Word-Formation and Translation", in R. Arntz and G. Thome, eds. *Übersetzungswissensch: Ergebnisse und Perspektiven. Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss zum 65. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1990. 191-198.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. 1995a. "The Notion of `Assumed Translation': An Invitation to a New Discussion", in H. Bloemen, E. Hertog and W. Segers, eds. *Letterlijkheid Woordelijkheid/Literality Verbality*. Antwerpen/Harmelen: Fantom, 1995. 135-147.

Toury, G. 1998. "A Handful of Paragraphs on `Translation' and `Norms'", in *Current Issues in Language and Society* 5:1&2 (1999). 9-31.

Wilkins, J. 1668. *An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*. London.

Woodsworth, J. 1996. "Language, Translation and the Promotion of National Identity: Two Test Cases", in *Target* 8:2. 211-238.

Please use following for referencing:
Toury, Gideon (in press). "Culture Planning and Translation". Forthcoming in: *Proceedings of the Vigo Conference "anovadores de nós - anosadores de vós"*, eds. A. Alvarez et al.

Available electronically from:
(http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/~toury/works).

Toury, Gideon (in press). "Culture Planning and Translation". Forthcoming in: *Proceedings of the Vigo Conference "anovadores de nós - anosadores de vós"*, eds. A. Alvarez et al.
© All rights reserved.
Available electronically from:
(http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/~toury/works).