2016

Translation as (Global) Writing

Bruce Horner
University of Louisville, horner.bruce@gmail.com

Laura Tetreault

Articles

Translation as (Global) Writing

Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault

This article explores translation as a useful point of departure and framework for taking a translingual approach to writing engaging globalization. Globalization and the knowledge economy are putting renewed emphasis on translation as a key site of contest between a dominant language ideology of monolingualism aligned with fast capitalist neoliberalism and an emerging language ideology variously identified as *translingualism*, *plurilingualism*, *translanguaging*, and *transcultural literacy*. We first distinguish between theories of translation aligned with neoliberalism, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a critical approach to translation focused on the difference that a translingual approach insists translation makes to languages, language relations, and language users. We then describe ways that a translingual approach to language difference in writing can be pursued in the classroom through student experimentation with translation of ordinary texts and with paraphrase and interpretation. Treating all writing as translation, we argue, can help students and their teachers better engage with language difference as a feature of all writing rather than imagining such engagement to fall outside the norm of communicative practice.

In this article, we treat translation as a useful point of departure and framework for taking a translingual approach to writing, an approach, we argue, that is aligned with globalization "from below" contesting neoliberal fast capitalism. Following an overview locating a renewed emphasis on translation and emerging postmonolingual approaches to language and language relations in current conditions of globalization, we consider strategies by which writing can be taught as translation, including experimentation with conventional translation from one language to another as well as with the translation in meaning effected through such conventional practices as paraphrase and interpretation. Treating writing as translation, we argue, can help students and their teachers better engage with the productive labor on and with language difference as a feature of all writing, rather than imagining such engagement to fall outside the norm of communicative practice.

Translating Translation, Globalization, and Postmonolingualism

Translation is conventionally defined as finding equivalents in meaning and form in two languages: for example, the French *éducation* for the English *education*, *diversité* for *diversity, le monde* for *the world*. Without disputing the impossibility of an exact equivalence between languages of the sort obtaining in, say, mathematics (A = B, 3 = 1 + 2), such an approach to translation heralds—at least as an ideal—the erasure of any sign of a lack of equivalence, so that the fact, necessity, and labor of translation are rendered invisible (see Müller 207-08). In this approach, translation, again at least ideally, does not change the substance of what is translated, nor the languages to and from which that substance is translated or their relations to one another, nor the users of those languages or their relation to them. What is demanded in this approach is someone with mature (i.e., fully developed and settled) "native speaker" fluency in both languages, fluency that facilitates but is not affected by movement between them. Differences in language are seen as surface level, underneath which, it is assumed, resides a solid foundation of sameness— that which may be encoded differently but remains the same in any code.

This conception of translation is aligned with neoliberal fast capitalism's pursuit of globalization "from above," in which Visa can claim that "It's Fluent in Every Language," and Mastercard can counter, "Any time. Anywhere. Any Language" (Ganahl). As translation scholar Michael Cronin notes, translation plays a key role in the new globalized information economy of neoliberalism. For this economy, he writes, translation is "not simply a by-product of globalization but is a constituent, integral part of how the phenomenon both operates and makes sense of itself" (34). For "[i]f information is often hailed as the basic raw material of the new economy and significant economic gains are to be made from the production of goods with a high cognitive content, then it follows that language itself is not only a key factor in the expression of that information but it is also a crucial means in accessing the information" (16). Translators are thus "indispensible intermediaries in the new informational economy" and as such are pressured to meet its demands for translation that can spread information and products quickly and efficiently to global markets any time, anywhere, and in any language (16).

However, globalization in a broader sense encompassing globalization from below as well as from above—the growing global movement and exchange of people, ideas, and goods on terms contested by subordinated and dominant groups—has put renewed emphasis on translation not merely as a distinct form of writing but also as a feature and outcome of all writing—a feature that entails difficulty and friction—labor—and that produces rather than bridges or erases difference—under what Yasemin Yildiz has described as

our current "postmonolingual" condition.[1] From this perspective, translation is not a mechanical erasure of surface linguistic differences but, instead, an inevitable feature of all language practice insofar as the norm of such practice is not sameness but difference. Thus Yildiz uses "postmonolingual" to reference not any ostensible increase in conventional multilingualism but, instead, a break from monolingualist ideology's tenets of languages as discrete, stable, internally uniform entities each tied indelibly to specific, similarly discrete, stable, and internally uniform ethnic and civic identities, for and between which translations serve as neutral bridge. Under postmonolingual conditions, models of language are emerging that instead posit languages as internally diverse, interpenetrating, and fluid both in character and in relation to other languages and to social identities, which are likewise understood as multiple and fluid—the always emerging products of practices. Unlike conventional models of multilingualism favored by neoliberalism that favor an "additive" model of language difference (see Dor), a postmonolingual perspective treats even those utterances that appear to be glossally monolingual as potentially non-monolingual-ist in their production, as when English is appropriated and put to new work by those not identified as Anglo-American "native speakers" of English (see Lu, "Living"; Widdowson). Under such conditions, even reiterations of conventional English usages come to be seen as "different" rather than simply "more of the same" insofar as, relocated in time as well as space, such utterances now more clearly represent a choice by social historically located actors to both contribute to the sedimentation of the conventional and thereby also to recontextualize the conventional (Lu and Horner, "Translingual"). Difference, in short, is seen not as deviation from a norm of underlying sameness but, rather, as itself the norm and outcome of all language practice (Pennycook, *Language*).

Compositionists have grown familiar with a variety of competing terms that have emerged in response to this postmonolingual condition, including *plurilingualism*, *translingualism*, *translanguaging*, and *transcultural literacy*.[2] Not surprisingly, these are sometimes conflated with one another and with conventional understandings of translation practices (and with L2 writing), not only because of the "trans-" prefix many of them share but also because of the dominance of monolingualist definitions of language and language difference (e.g., French vs. Chinese). Just as translation is subject to competing inflections—some in alignment with neoliberalist aims of fast and efficient bridging of difference, some focusing on difference and difficulty as the norm of all translation and, indeed, all communicative practice—so terms like *translingualism* have likewise been subject to contradictory inflections. For example, while some writers have used "translingual" to designate writing with specific features (e.g., with what is recognized as code-meshing), others have argued

against such a designation as an unwitting reversion to monolingualist tenets in its reinforcement of discrete and stable codes (see Canagarajah, "Introduction," "Translanguaging"; Lu, "Metaphors"; Vance), and use "translingual" to refer not to a specific set of glossal features in utterances recognizable within monolingualism as different but instead to a specific orientation or set of dispositions toward all language and language use (see, for example, Lu and Horner, "Translingual").[3] Both translation and translinguality can be understood as referencing either technical means by which to overcome language difference as monolingualism defines language difference, or a shift in orientation toward recognizing difference and its production as the norm of all communicative practice.

In the former, translation is understood as a special case, a currently necessary if regrettable cost (to be minimized) of the communication of people, goods, and services between discrete, stable, linguistically homogeneous communities—what Mary Louise Pratt long ago critiqued as linguistic utopias ("Linguistic"). However, globalization in its broad sense has called that utopian vision into question and placed translation as in fact the norm of language practice—not simply in the sense that translation, as conventionally understood, is increasingly commonplace and in demand as a consequence of increases in communication between hitherto isolated groups resulting from changes to migration patterns and the development of global communication technologies and economic exchange, but also in the sense that translation now seems a feature of communicative practice even within what is recognized as the same language. What were seen as discrete, internally uniform, and stable sets of meanings and glossal forms shared by and defining members of discrete, homogeneous communities—Pratt's "linguistic utopias"—are now understood to be anything but discrete, internally uniform, stable, shared, or defining. English itself, as Alastair Pennycook has argued, is a language always in translation, no matter by or with whom it is practiced ("English" 33).

This latter notion of all writing as translation can help to counter the seeming alignment between an emphasis on language difference in scholarship on translation, translinguality, and plurilinguality, on the one hand, and, on the other, the celebration of language difference and flexibility as means to neoliberalist ends of expanding markets and exploiting workers (anytime, anywhere, and in any language), a potential alignment that has been the subject of critique by various writers (see for example Cameron; Dor; Flores; Heller, "Globalization," "Repenser"; Kubota). For, as Cronin argues, translation—especially nonliterary translation, which is often viewed in mechanistic terms as ideologically neutral—"is ideally placed to understand *both* the transnational movement that is globalization *and* the transnational movement that is anti-globalization" (1, emphasis added). For example, as L. G. Crane, M. B.

Lombard, and E. M. Tenz observe, researchers in human geography increasingly feel both the means and the pressure to "go global," which puts renewed attention on translation. As they explain, there are "increasing possibilities for comparative cross-national and cross-cultural research projects to take place, giving rise to opportunities for intellectual endeavour at a scale that was previously more difficult to access. . . . [N]o doubt, related to drives through funding initiatives requiring academics to engage in multinational research ventures" (39). Such research, they note, "has pushed issues around translation into the foreground of academic debates" (39). But researchers' actual engagement in translation, they discover, "produces moments of friction and hesitation [. . . at which] meanings and conceptualisations are challenged by new ideas and thoughts," the antithesis of the neoliberalist ideal for translation as a means of efficient one-way communication of knowledge (40).

Because nonliterary translation is often viewed as mechanical and free of ideological baggage, Cronin argues that it is most indicative of the language tensions embedded in globalization—if, that is, we take a critical approach to translation and the processes of mediation the work of translation entails. Such a critical approach focuses on what a neoliberal ideal of translation elides and aims to render invisible—the differences and difficulties Crane et al. report, not only bridged but produced through the process of mediation that translation entails: what Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing identifies as the "friction" inevitable and necessary to global exchange (Cronin 124-25; Tsing 6). The speed, efficiency, accuracy, and ideological neutrality of the neoliberal ideal for translation are from this alternative, critical standpoint chimeras masking difficulty and differences in the translation process that constitute the actual norm of translations and their inevitably contingent and ideologically inflected character.

Translation and/in Composition

While it may not seem initially obvious how questions about translation enter into a space like the composition classroom, we argue that translation offers a particularly rich framework for work in composition insofar as it brings to the fore the negotiation of language difference as well as ideologies of language difference that a translingual approach calls for. Writing instruction has always been institutionally structured as a key site for the negotiation of language ideology, whether through reproduction of the tacit policy of English-only monolingualism that has long dominated composition (Horner and Trimbur) or through cultivation of orientations critical of that ideology. And as Nelson Flores has argued of TESOL, composition teachers, too, have the option of working "to expose the constructed nature and ideological assumptions of all language practices [to] . . . resist neoliberalism's corporatist agenda" by helping students learn "how language can be consciously used

to experiment with new subjectivities and produce new subject positions" (517). In response to Flores's and other similar calls (Canagarajah, "Place"; Horner et al.), we argue that by focusing on translation, writing pedagogy can encourage translingual orientations to languages as always emergent and constructed "local practices" (Pennycook, *Language*) and thus the need for all writers to attend to and take responsibility in their writing—whether seemingly conventional or seemingly deviant—for the difference their choices inevitably make to such practices as local, contingent, emergent rather than sets of unquestionable standards or codes.[4]

Pennycook writes that translation is always implicated within the "traffic in meaning, a passing to and fro of ideas, concepts, symbols, discourses"—a traffic that is inevitably also a site for struggle ("English" 34). Pennycook locates this ideologically inflected view of an "activist translation" in relation to Lawrence Venuti's aim to "disrupt the assimilationary and domesticating tendencies that eradicate difference through translation" (qtd. in Pennycook, "English" 43). An activist translation approaches translation "neither in terms of the reductive and pejorative role it has been given within language teaching . . . nor only as the activity conducted by those who work to translate a text into one language or another . . . [but] as part of a much broader traffic in meaning" (Venuti qtd. in Pennycook, "English" 43). For Pennycook, translation characterizes all language use, with communication between languages merely "a special case: all communication involves translation," and conventional translation itself is "the key to understanding [all] communication" once difference is seen not as an alternative to normal practice but an inevitable outcome of writing ("English" 40). Treating all writing as translation allows us to see writers as always engaged in a process of negotiating and reworking common language practices, and to direct our attention and that of our students to exploring the responsibilities entailed by specific translational/writing practices for reproducing and revising languages and language relations.

While Pennycook is also arguing (in "English as a Language Always in Translation") for English Language Teaching (ELT) as translation—his twist on the conventional meaning ascribed to ELT—similar calls for a pedagogy of translation have emerged from literary studies. Emily O. Wittman and Katrina Windon, for example, argue that a translation studies course should be required of all undergraduate English literature majors to shift the monolingual nature of such departments (449). For Wittman and Windon, studying translation means paying attention to the ways in which meaning and origin are layered and multiple, and this attention is also necessarily implicated in power and the struggle over valuation. Translations reveal networks of power that circulate certain forms of language use and not others, bringing to light the usually hidden dynamics of what happens when writers work with what they

perceive as specific discourses or genres. This process illustrates how writers do not simply choose to assimilate into or resist particular norms, but are instead always reworking what are usually recognized as norms. A method of teaching translation in the sense of working with, on, and between conventionally demarcated languages is one step toward teaching all writing as translation in the specific way we are arguing for. Building on such calls for a pedagogy of translation in literature and Cronin's call for focusing on forms of translation and writing usually assumed to be mechanical and thus ideologically neutral, we argue for a focus on translation in the production of nonliterary writing—that is, in what is ordinarily identified as composition.

A composition pedagogy of translation would focus attention on production by emphasizing how translation, like all writing, is a site of struggle—labor—that contends with competing ideologies, resources, representations, and assumed expectations of readers, in addition to the writer's sense of identity and desire to claim particular identities. Translation between conventionally demarcated languages thus represents not a deviation from the norm but a more intensive version of what is true of all writing. Because translation between languages as conventionally defined works actively within this site of struggle, it can continually draw attention to its own production. But it is also possible to see all discursive performance as a process of production within this struggle of translation.

Viewing translation as labor in this sense dismantles the myth behind neoliberal claims about language and the potential alignment of some conceptions of multilingualism or plurilingualism with neoliberalist ideology. Neoliberalist ideology occludes such labor by treating language as commodity: hence its conception of translation as ideally the friction-free, mechanical transfer of meaning from one language to another. The occlusion of this labor constructs the myth that there is a linguistic commodity that is translated cleanly without change to the meaning, the languages to and from which the meaning is translated, and their relations to one another and to language users. But the reality is that language, language relations, and their users are always reworked as that ostensible commodity gets translated.

Approaching translation as the labor of reworking language and meaning challenges the mechanisms of deproduction by which a translated text is understood to be (i.e., misrecognized as) transparent—as a direct recoding between languages (as in A = B).[5] A translation framework for writing views terms as always up for questioning, considers what slippages of meaning and perception occur in the spaces where one usage is substituted for another, and explores how these slips and transfers—intentionally or not—operate in relation to larger narratives and ideologies. As we discuss below, those adopting a translation framework might ask students to translate their own or others' texts

as starting points for discussing the differences in meaning and power relations that are negotiated in producing such translations; read different translations of the same text while noting points of tension between them; discuss what narratives are activated by certain terms and not others; and consider the ways writing ostensibly within the same language engages the same dynamics of difference, using paraphrase as a particular instance of everyday translation in composition.

Teaching Writing as Translation, Teaching Translation as Writing

We have argued that translation, rather than signifying a distinct form of writing, represents a more intensive version of the negotiation of difference in language that a translingual approach claims all writing entails. But without discounting the value of and need for courses focused specifically on teaching translation, we posit here that because the negotiation of language difference is more immediately apparent in translation writing, translation provides a useful framework by which to explore such negotiation in all writing. We are aware that composition has often invoked translation as a metaphor for writing that crosses over from one text, identity, or context to another while leaving unaddressed translation as a form of writing itself (e.g., Cook-Sather; Eubanks; Schor; Soliday, "Translating"). Granted, such a conceptualization of translation risks problematically reinforcing the stability of the texts, identities, or contexts to and from which meaning is carried over, as well as the stability of the entity transferred—like the problematics scholars have faced in conceptualizing knowledge transfer (see Beach). As Pratt has observed of invocations of "cultural translation," the concept "bears the unresolvable contradiction that in naming itself it preserves the distances/distinctions it works to overcome" ("Response" 95). But the resolution to such an unresolvable contradiction, we suggest, is to deploy the translation metaphor not so much to name the process by which to resolve predetermined conditions of difference but rather as an analytical tool by which to bring such contradictions to visibility (cf. Wagner 98.): as point of departure rather than endpoint. For, as Birgit Wagner observes regarding "cultural translation," "everything depends on the use you make of it" (99).

Thus, to teach writing as translation, we might best begin by teaching conventional translation as writing. So, for example, students can be asked to read different translations of a text and to examine what narratives are activated by different choices, and how they see those narratives connecting to larger ideologies. Students can also experiment with translating their texts or others' texts as a heuristic for generating multiple translations, working with whatever language resources they choose to bring to the task. These strategies can then be extended into translation across discourses or across media by

having students investigate how each act of translation changes a text, what narratives are activated by different choices each entails, and what ideologies and histories are illuminated by each.

The fact that students may see translation as unfamiliar or unusual in a writing class can itself serve to destabilize monolingualist ideologies by asking students to question why it is often taken for granted in the context of U.S. college composition that a writing class will only involve writing in something called Standard English. Using translation as an analytic framework, we can then have students explore the actual instability of the languages, discourses, genres, and meanings that translation ostensibly works with and between. Composition teachers and their students are familiar with the treatment of languages and discourses as discrete, stable, and associated with identity formation, invoked in the trope of students negotiating between home or cultural identities and a desired, or enforced, academic identity as they learn to write academic discourse and leave behind, or attempt to keep, what are categorized as their home languages. That trope figures students as having to decide whether to give up or somehow carry over elements of a home language or dialect—treated as stable, internally uniform, and discrete—into this new academic discourse. Academic discourse is represented as a stable, internally uniform category called college writing for students to be introduced to, on the way toward adopting an also supposedly uniform and stable academic identity. Debates such as those tied to "Students' Right to Their Own Language" then ask to what extent students should bring so-called home or nonacademic forms of discourse into academic writing, when these categories are seen as radically different from one another. These debates become especially fraught when language choices are tied so closely to invocations of identity.[6]

Alternatively, using translation as an analytic framework, we can reconsider the relations of difference that such conventional models posit. Such a reconsideration can work in two directions: to challenge the discrete character of languages, discourses, and identities posited as different, and, conversely, to challenge the uniformity—the sameness—to utterances ordinarily located within any of these. Having students produce multiple translations to and from English, drawing collaboratively on whatever language resources they have, can make apparent both the interpenetration of ostensibly discrete languages with one another, on the one hand (*éducation*/education, *chī* /chow, *haus*/house, etc.) and, on the other, the lack of uniformity within what are conventionally demarcated as individual languages (e.g., in French, *éducation*, *formation*, *apprentissage*, *enseignement*). Experimentation in producing multiple, multidirectional translations can thus challenge commonplace, dominant models of languages as singular codes and of translation as a matter of recoding, shifting the question from considering what the single correct translation might be, as

the code metaphor encourages, to considering the variety of possible translations one might propose, and with what consequences: for example, the consequences for meaning and argument of translating "education" as *éducation*, *formation*, *enseignement*, etc. As Weiguo Qu observes of a course for Chinese students translating to and from English, "A foreign language such as English may be . . . used to de-automatize habituated way of thinking, challenging and subverting the power relations embedded in the Chinese traditional rhetoric," power relations that occlude the diversity within that rhetoric and within English to render both of them seemingly internally uniform as simply Chinese vs. English (72). Qu reports that his students, forced to make a decision and a choice rather than imagining their task as translators to be algorithmic, "are changed to cognize the world in line with their own decisions and with what they themselves believe in. They want their own definitions, English or Chinese" (73).

The consequences and motivations for such choices can be further explored through the narrative theory framework provided by translation scholar Mona Baker. Baker explains that the framing of events through narrative sets up "structures of anticipation" that guide interpretations (156). In terms of translation, this idea allows for an understanding of translational choices "not merely as local linguistic challenges but as contributing directly to the narratives that shape our social world" (156). For Baker, translators and interpreters play a key role in shaping social and political reality. In her examples, how translators reframe aspects of political conflicts when translating between Arabic and English invokes narratives of the War on Terror, American nationalism, and Islamic fundamentalism. But this narrative framework for translation can be applied not only to political conflicts but also to any site of ideological struggle—including that struggle as it plays out when we consider all writing as an act of translation.

We can consider translations, then, in terms of the narratives they activate: the identities, trajectories, values they (re)present. For example, a student in one of our classes, when asked to consider the various French terms she might use to translate the English "education," wrote:

> I, myself, would choose the French word *formation*. I find this term to relate to more situations that I am currently experiencing at Louisville. I am being trained to become a [_____] by first being trained in the general education requirements, and even before that I was being trained in high school to be educated to go to college.
>
> The relationship between word choice, thinking, and living to me suggests that the word you choose can cause you to not only understand more, but learn more. In doing so you can begin to change

words for others and make sense of what you are experiencing in your day to day life.[7]

The narrative this student offers is that of her education as a sequence of training preparing her for and leading directly to a fixed career—one for which she is ultimately being trained. However, she activates this narrative after having considered a range of other possible ways of translating "education," such as education as a kind of socialization into manners. As she writes earlier in the same paper, she started

> noticing that all education is involved with manners or how you behave. Through formal education we go to school, and interact with peers, and teachers who expect the students to behave in a certain way in that environment. Society teaches us what is "in" or popular, and also how we can further our knowledge on the popular people or items. Professionally we are expected to behave a certain way along with having the knowledge of the field you are in, if you did not it would be inappropriate.

While the student arrives at a sense of these competing narratives through considering different ways of translating "education" (into French), it should be apparent that this investigation leads to consideration within a single language—here, English—how "education" might be translated—e.g., as socialization, employment preparation or training, acquisition of general knowledge, etc. For translation is present not only in composing that involves shifts between languages, discourses, or media, but also in writing strategies that have become so commonplace as to not appear to merit attention at all as translation (i.e., as a negotiation and production of difference). Thus, to Cronin's observation that it is especially important to pay attention to forms of translation and writing that seem initially mundane, mechanical, and thus ideologically neutral, we can add that it is likewise important to recognize the dynamics of translation in writing that does not, after all, appear to require or engage these dynamics at all, such as translation within English. Doing so counters the conventional, dominant identification of difference with discrete languages (e.g., French versus English) by recognizing difference obtaining within these—even in iterations of what might appear to be the same.

In other words, we can apply frameworks such as Baker's to the study of writing not only across languages, but within the same language, showing how translation not only operates between what are recognized as separate languages, but within a seemingly—yet not actually—uniform language like English itself. As Baker writes, "by contrast to static, power-insensitive concepts like 'norms,' narrative theory recognizes that dominance and resistance not only shape our

behavior and discursive choices, but that they are also always in a relationship of tension" (167). Translation is a site where the linguistic activation of certain narratives of dominance and resistance plays out. This conception allows students of writing to pay deeper attention to this ever-present tension within any text—those read and those written.

Paraphrase as Translation

We take paraphrase as exemplary of the kind of writing task predominantly understood as mechanical and ideologically neutral but that, like the non-literary translations Cronin discusses, constitutes a site for negotiation of powerful differences. Paraphrase appears in many writing handbooks and online resources and is a feature of most writing classes that ask students to work with others' texts, often in lessons addressing ways to avoid plagiarism. Typically, paraphrase is treated as a means of representing the same ideas and information in words other than those used in the source text. For example, Purdue University's Online Writing Lab (OWL) describes paraphrase as "[y]our own rendition of essential information and ideas expressed by someone else, presented in a new form" and "[o]ne legitimate way (when accompanied by accurate documentation) to borrow from a source" ("Paraphrase"). Paraphrases are distinguished from summaries by being "a more detailed restatement" than summaries, and from plagiarism in using significantly different wording and in identifying the source text. (Of course, like many statements on plagiarism, the statement on paraphrase fails to acknowledge its source.)

Many popular writing handbooks and online resources illustrate this tension between making an idea new or putting it in your own words and accurately borrowing from a source or restating its ideas—assuming that changing the wording does not change the meaning. *The Everyday Writer* advises students that "a paraphrase accurately states all the relevant information from a passage *in your own words and sentence structures,* without any additional comments or elaborations. A paraphrase is useful when the main points of a passage, their order, and at least some details are important but—unlike passages worth quoting—the particular wording is not" (Lunsford 207, emphasis in original). The University of Wisconsin-Madison's online writer's handbook recommends that "you should *summarize or paraphrase* when what you want from the source is the *idea* expressed, and *not the specific language* used to express it [or] you can express in fewer words what the key point of a source is" ("Paraphrasing Vs. Quoting," emphasis in original).

While this advice is useful to student writers trying to understand the difference between quoting and paraphrasing, these examples also show a tendency to detach *idea* from *language,* revealing an underlying assumption that an idea can remain perfectly intact even if the language used to express it

is altered. Such treatments of paraphrase imply that there is a single meaning unchanged by the rewording effected through paraphrase, a meaning that successful paraphrase, like successful summary, preserves. (The Purdue OWL statement on paraphrase recommends paraphrase in part as a way to help writers "grasp the full meaning of the original" being paraphrased ["Paraphrase"]). But composition classes can instead analyze paraphrase not as a mechanical act of transferring meaning from one set of words to another—to put in other words what is in other, yet somehow equivalent, words—but instead as an act of reshaping meaning (cf. Roman Jakobson's description of intra-lingual translation or "rewording," or Frédéric François's concept of "reprise-modification") through an act of translation engaging, and producing, difference.[8]

For instance, asking students to produce, individually as well as collectively, different paraphrases of the same source text can reveal how paraphrase does not simply move or reproduce an idea found in one set of words to another or distill an idea but (re)shapes the idea itself and repositions the writer and the texts between which the writer is ostensibly moving that idea. Students can come to see how paraphrases activate different narratives through word choice, syntax, organization, and so forth, revealing many layers of ideological complexity. (The same can be done with summary, a term which belies the difference produced in summary by alluding to mathematical equations [e.g., of 5 as the sum of 3 + 2]).

This treatment of paraphrase answers calls for a translingual approach that "recognizes difference *as* the norm, to be found not only in utterances that dominant ideology has marked as different but also in utterances that dominant definitions of language, language relations, and language users would identify as 'standard'" (Lu and Horner, "Translingual" 585, emphasis in original). More specifically, studying intra-linguistic acts of translation such as paraphrase can reveal the difference produced through utterances of what is claimed to be the same. Engaging students in considering such forms of intra-lingual translation reveals all writing as simultaneously producing difference, even in the attempt to iterate "the same," whether through rewording accomplished in paraphrase or summary or through recontextualization of the conventional (see Lu and Horner, "Translingual").

Conclusion

The authors of "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" encourage "renewed focus by students of writing on the problematics of translation to better understand and participate in negotiations of difference in and through language" (308) and identify translation studies among the disciplines on which the work of pursuing a translingual approach draws (Horner et al. 309-10). In this essay, we have argued that translation pro-

vides a particularly useful analytical framework by which composition teachers and students can address the negotiation of difference in and through language. This negotiation operates by challenging dominant, monolingualist ideological models of language, language relations, and language users as stable, discrete, internally uniform sets—models that provide the foundation for neoliberalist notions of and demands for translation as the ideologically neutral and friction-free bridging of difference to communicate the "same." Ultimately, this framework helps to identify the production of difference in writing that aims at merely re-presenting, in other words, nothing more than "the same," such as paraphrase. Using translation as an analytical framework, engagement in multiple and multidirectional translation between languages reveals the fluidity between and internal change and diversity within what monolingualist ideology posits as ostensibly discrete, stable, and internally uniform, and the contingent character of knowledge and its interdependent relation to its written representation in intra-lingual translation—what monolingualism posits as requiring and engaging no translation at all. Multiple and multi-directional inter- and intra-lingual translations can reveal the ideological work accomplished in what monolingualist and neoliberalist ideology posits as in fact ideologically neutral.

In short, translation can serve as a means of re-imagining the difference always already made by composition students, like all writers, through their labor with and on language. As our discussion above suggests, such work, like the work Crane et al. experienced in taking up translation, "produces moments of friction and hesitation . . . [at which] meanings and conceptualisations are challenged by new ideas and thoughts" (40). But while such experience is at odds with neoliberalist ideals of clear and efficient communication, it remains the actual norm of communicative practice, as the concrete labor of translation, conventional and otherwise, testifies, notwithstanding what commodifications of the products of that labor might have us believe. In its concern with and production of difference, translation can make a difference in how composition teachers and students understand their work, and in the kind of difference they might work toward.

Notes

1. The literature on globalization is enormous and growing. For a sampling of recent work addressing globalization in composition studies, see Darin Payne and Daphne Desser, Wendy Hesford et al., Bruce Horner and Karen Kopelson, and David S. Martins.

2. For accounts of these and other terms, see Suresh Canagarajah, "Afterword," "Translanguaging"; Council of Europe; Ofelia Garcia; Keith Gilyard; Juan Guerra; Horner et al.; Bruce Horner, Christiane Donahue, and Samantha NeCamp; Lu,

"Metaphors"; MLA; Danièle Moore and Laurent Gajo; Geneviève Zarate, Danielle Lévy, and Claire Kramsch.

3. The matter is further complicated by the fact that individual writers have sometimes shifted from one term to another, bespeaking both the inadequacy of existing terms (e.g., *multilingualism*) to capture postmonolingual conditions and practices and the disputed meanings of any one of them. Compare, for example, different terms and meanings argued for in Horner and Lu, "Resisting"; Lu and Horner, "Translingual Literacy"; Horner, Donahue, and NeCamp; Canagarajah, "Afterword," "Codemeshing," "Translanguaging," *Translingual;* Suresh Canagarajah and Andrew Wurr. Yet further complications arise from the challenges of translation (see, for example, Claire Kramsch; Moore and Gajo, esp. 142-43, 145-46).

4. Cf. Horner et al.'s warning that the translingual approach "calls for *more,* not less, conscious and critical attention to how writers deploy diction, syntax, and style, as well as form, register, and media" (305).

5. We can see the deproduction of translation, for instance, in the elision within English teaching of attention to translated texts *as* translations (Venuti 328).

6. For an account of the dilemmas this model poses, see Lu, "From." For a counter model, see Soliday, "Politics."

7. The student's work is here cited with her written permission on the condition of it remaining anonymous. In accordance with the assignment to which her text responds, the student is also referencing here a discussion of the relation of vocabulary to "thinking" and "living" in Lu and Horner, *Writing Conventions.*

8. There is a rich tradition of francophone scholarship on paraphrase useful for theorizing writing as translation (Donahue). See, for example, Marie-Madeleine de Gaulmyn; Catherine Fuchs; Bertrand Daunay; Zarate, Lévy, and Kramsch; as well as François.

Works Cited

Baker, Mona. "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics* 17.2 (2007): 158-69. Print.

Beach, King. "Consequential Transitions: A Sociocultural Expedition beyond Transfer in Education." *Review of Research in Education* 24 (1999): 101-39. Print.

Cameron, Deborah. "Globalization and the Teaching of 'Communication Skills.'" *Globalization and Language Teaching*. Ed. David Block and Deborah Cameron. London: Routledge, 2002. 67-82. Print.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Afterword: World Englishes as Code-meshing." *Code-meshing as World English: Pedagogy, Policy, Performance*. Ed. Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez. Urbana: NCTE, 2011. 273-81. Print.

---. "Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging." *Modern Language Journal* 95.3 (2011): 401-17. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Ed. Suresh Canagarajah. New York: Routledge, 2013. 1-10. Print.

---. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *CCC* 57.4 (2006): 586–619. Print.

---. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics Review* 2 (2011): 1-28. Print.

---. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.

---, and Andrew Wurr. "Multilingual Communication and Language Acquisition: New Research Directions." *The Reading Matrix* 11.1 (2011): 1-15. Print.

Cook-Sather, Alison. "Education as Translation: Students Transforming Notions of Narrative and Self." *CCC* 55.1 (2003): 91-114. Print.

Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. 2001. Web. 2 December 2015. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf>.

Crane, L. G., M. B. Lombard, and E. M. Tenz. "More than Just Translation: Challenges and Opportunities in Translingual Research." *Social Geography* 4 (2009): 39-46. Print.

Cronin, Michael. *Translation and Globalization*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Daunay, Bertrand. *Éloge de la paraphrase*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2002. Print.

de Gaulmyn, Marie-Madeleine. "Reformulation et Planification Métadiscursives." *Décrire la Conversation*. Dir. J. Cosnier and C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1987. 167-98. Print.

Desser, Daphne, and Darin Payne, eds. *Teaching Writing in Globalization: Remapping Disciplinary Work*. Boulder: Lexington Books, 2012. Print.

Donahue, Christiane. "'Words for Other Words' and the Nature of Composing." CCCC. Tampa, FL. 21 March 2015. Conference Presentation.

Dor, Daniel. "From Englishization to Imposed Multilingualism: Globalization, the Internet, and the Political Economy of the Linguistic Code." *Public Culture* 16.1 (2004): 97-118. Print.

Eubanks, Philip. "Understanding Metaphors for Writing: In Defense of the Conduit Metaphor." *CCC* 53.1 (2001): 92-118. Print.

Flores, Nelson. "The Unexamined Relationship Between Neoliberalism and Plurilingualism: A Cautionary Tale." *TESOL Quarterly* 47.3 (2013): 500-20. Print.

François, Frédéric. *Morale et mise en mots*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994. Print.

Fuchs, Catherine. *La paraphrase*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982. Print.

Ganahl, Rainer. "Free Markets: Language, Commodification, and Art." *Public Culture* 13.1 (2001): 24-38. Print.

Garcia, Ofelia. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Print.

Gilyard, Keith. "Cross-Talk: Toward Transcultural Writing Classrooms." Severino et al. 325-32.

Guerra, Juan C. "Cultivating Transcultural Citizenship: A Writing across Communities Model." *Language Arts* 85.4 (2008): 296-304. Print.

Heller, Monica. "Globalization, the New Economy, and the Commodification of Language and Identity." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7.4 (2003): 473-92. Print.

---. "Repenser le plurilinguisme: Langue, postnationalisme et la nouvelle économie mondialisée." *Diversité urbaine* (Automne 2008): 163-76. Print.

Hesford, Wendy, Eddie Singleton, and Ivonne M. García. "Laboring to Globalize a First-Year Writing Program." *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse.* Ed. Donna Strickland and Jeanne Gunner. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2009. 113-25. Print.

Horner, Bruce, Christiane Donahue, and Samantha NeCamp. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *CCC* 63.2 (2011): 269-300. Print.

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *CCC* 53.4 (2002): 594-630. Print.

Horner, Bruce, and Karen Kopelson, eds. *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions.* Carbondale: SIUP, 2014. Print.

Horner, Bruce, and Min-Zhan Lu. "Resisting Monolingualism." *Rethinking English in Schools: A New and Constructive Stage*. Ed. Viv Ellis, Carol Fox, and Brian Street. London: Continuum, 2007. 141-57. Print.

Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. "Opinion: Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73.3 (2011): 303-21. Print.

Kramsch, Claire. "Contrepont." Zarate et al. 319-23.

Kubota, Ryuko. "The Multi/Plural Turn, Postcolonial Theory, and Neoliberal Multiculturalism: Complicities and Implications for Applied Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics* (2014): 1-22. Print.

Jakobson. Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "From Silence to Words: Writing as Struggle." *College English* 49 (1987): 437-48. Print.

---. "Living English Work." *College English* 68 (2006): 605-18. Print.

---. "Metaphors Matter: Transcultural Literacy." *JAC* 29.1-2 (2009): 285-93. Print.

---, and Bruce Horner. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English* 75.6 (2013): 582-608. Print.

---. *Writing Conventions*. New York: Penguin Academics, 2008. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea A. *The Everyday Writer.* 5ᵗʰ edition. Boston: Bedford St. Martin's, 2015. Print.

Martins, David S., ed. *Transnational Writing Program Administration*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2015. Print.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World." *MLA Commons.* Modern Language Association. 2007. Web. 2 December 2015. <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>.

Moore, Danièle, and Laurent Gajo. "Introduction: French Voices on Plurilingualism: Theory, Significance and Perspectives." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6.2 (2009): 137-53. Print.

Müller, Martin. "What's in a Word? Problematizing Translation between Languages." *Area* 39.2 (2007): 206-13. Print.

"Paraphrase: Write It in Your Own Words." *Purdue Online Writing Lab*. Purdue University. n.d. Web. 4 June 2015. <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/owl-print/619/>.

"Paraphrasing Vs. Quoting—Explanation." *The Writer's Handbook*. The Writing Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. 29 August 2014. Web. 4 June 2015. <https://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/QPA_PorQ.html>.

Pennycook, Alastair. "English as a Language Always in Translation." *European Journal of English Studies* 12.1 (2008): 33-47. Print.

---. *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Linguistic Utopias." *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments Between Language and Literature*. Ed. Nigel Fabb, Derek Attridge, Alan Durant and Colin MacCabe. New York: Methuen, 1987. 48-66. Print.

---. "Response." *Translation Studies* 3.1 (2010): 94-97. Print.

Qu, Weiguo. "Critical Literacy and Writing in English: Teaching English in a Cross-cultural Context." Horner and Kopelson 64-74.

Schor, Sandra. "Composition Strategy as Translation." *College English* 48.2 (1986): 187-94. Print.

Severino, Carol, Juan C. Guerra, and Johnnella E. Butler, eds. *Writing in Multicultural Settings*. New York: MLA, 1997. Print.

Soliday, Mary. "The Politics of Difference: Toward a Pedagogy of Reciprocity." Severino et al. 261-72.

---. "Translating Self and Difference Through Literacy Narratives." *College English* 56.5 (1994): 511-26. Print.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005. Print.

Vance, John. "Code-Meshing Meshed Codes: Some Complications and Possibilities." *JAC* 29.1-2 (2009): 281–84. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence. "Translation and the Pedagogy of Literature." *College English* 58.3 (1996): 327-44. Print.

Wagner, Birgit. "Response." *Translation Studies* 3.1 (2010): 97-99. Print.

Widdowson, Henry G. "The Ownership of English." *TESOL Quarterly* 28 (1994): 377-89. Print.

Wittman, Emily O., and Katrina Windon. "Twisted Tongues, Tied Hands : Translation Studies and the English Major." *College English* 72.5 (2010): 449-69. Print.

Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham UP, 2012. Print.

Zarate, Geneviève, Danielle Lévy, and Claire Kramsch, dirs. *Précis du plurilinguisme et du pluriculturalisme*. Paris: Éditions des archives contemporaines, 2008. Print.