transLogos 2023 Vol 6 Issue 1
Tellioğlu, Banu, pp. 21–44
https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/transLogos.53

The Unconscious of Translation

Banu TELLİOĞLU*

Since the 1980s, a substantial body of literature has emerged exploring the application of psychoanalytic theory in the field of translation. Lawrence Venuti's article, "The Difference That Translation Makes: The Translator's Unconscious," occupies a prominent position within this body of literature for two significant reasons: First, challenging the descriptive paradigm for neglecting the translator's unconscious while primarily focusing on norms that influence translational behavior, Venuti's article urges translation scholars to engage in comprehensive descriptive and critical analyses of the translator's unconscious. Second, unlike most studies in the field, this article provides concrete examples and attempts to demonstrate how such analyses can be conducted. Building upon Venuti's article as a case study, this paper aims to identify potential methodological challenges in translation criticism practices that employ psychoanalytic theory as a framework and explore how a text-centered approach can help overcome them. To accomplish this objective, this study begins by reviewing the application of psychoanalytic theory in literary criticism, emphasizing the shift in focus from the author to the formal features of the work. It then focuses on the approach that prioritizes the formal features of the work as the primary object of analysis and highlights the methodological implications associated with exploring the unconscious of the text. Following this, the study scrutinizes whether Gideon Toury's descriptive approach excludes the translator's unconscious as an object of research, as suggested by Venuti, and if so, explores potential explanations for this exclusion. To assess the effectiveness and limitations of Venuti's methodology, the study critically analyzes two examples presented by the theorist. Ultimately, the study argues that the focus of translation criticism should be on the unconscious of translation and suggests that the concept offers valuable insights for our methodological inquiries in psychoanalytic approaches to translation criticism.
Keywords: psychoanalytic theory; psychoanalytical literary criticism; translation criticism; the translator's unconscious; the unconscious of the text

1. Introduction

In his article titled "The Difference That Translation Makes: The Translator's Unconscious" (2013), Lawrence Venuti called upon translation scholars to use psychoanalytic

* Assistant professor at Kırklareli University.
E-mail: banutellioglu@klu.edu.tr; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2969-4993.
(Received 19 January 2023; accepted 20 May 2023)

theory more systematically:[1]

> In order to study the translator's unconscious, the translation scholar must obviously bring to the translation process or product a set of theoretical assumptions drawn from the psychoanalytical tradition. Without such assumptions, the translator's unconscious does not become visible or available for analysis, and errors, even in translations produced by the most accomplished of translators, will not acquire any significance beyond their status as errors. (55)

It is worth noting that translation scholars had already begun to show interest in psychoanalytic theory as early as the 1980s before Venuti wrote his article. *Meta*, for instance, published an issue in 1982 that explored the relationship between psychoanalytic theory and translation. Although only three of the articles in this issue were authored by translation scholars, they represent the first indication of interest in psychoanalytic theory within the context of translation, which continued throughout the 1990s and increased particularly in the early 2000s. In 1998, another journal, *TTR*, dedicated an issue to psychoanalytic theory and translation, laying the groundwork for subsequent researchers who utilized psychoanalytic theory as a framework in their work (Frota 2007, 4). Thus, over the past four decades, a substantial body of literature has emerged, featuring contributions from prominent researchers in translation studies, including Antoine Berman, Rosemary Arrojo, and Douglas Robinson, among others.[2]

[1] The article was first published in 2002 in the edited volume *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline* and later reprinted as Chapter 2 of Venuti's 2013 book titled *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*. For the study in your hand, I have used this reprinted version.

[2] Antoine Berman's seminal work, *The Experience of the Foreign* (1992), originally published in 1984, stands as a pioneering contribution in addressing the translator's unconscious. Berman posits that during the act of translation, translators inevitably exhibit certain tendencies that distort the structural integrity of the foreign text and divert the translation from its intended purpose. Therefore, he believes that a meticulous textual analysis is imperative in uncovering these tendencies. Translators themselves must strive to identify the precise junctures at which these inclinations arise, acknowledging that they undermine their practice. Berman terms this process of inquiry as "the psychoanalysis of translation" (6). Rosemary Arrojo stands out as the first translation scholar, to the best of my knowledge, to apply fundamental ideas from psychoanalytic theory to the field of translation pedagogy. In her paper titled "Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, and the Teaching of Translation" (2012), originally written in 1993 in Portuguese, she questions the rationalist belief that knowledge can be completely mastered or controlled, offering valuable insights for the teaching of translation. Douglas Robinson, in his work *Translation and Taboo* (1996), aims to transform readers' perspectives on the act of translation by drawing inspiration from psychoanalytic theory. In pursuit of this objective, the scholar follows in the footsteps of Jacques Lacan and directs attention towards the deep-rooted taboos that continue to influence our contemporary thoughts on translation. Robinson's book titled *Who Translates?: Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason* (2001) also draws on Lacan's notion of the Other: anything that we perceive as external, beyond our conscious comprehension, and beyond our control is considered the Other. Robinson's objective is to investigate the complex dynamics at work as translators channel these diverse Others, shedding light on how translators establish and present their identities (10–11).

Venuti's article (2013) distinguishes itself from most other works in this body of literature, as it argues that translation scholars should engage in comprehensive descriptive and/or critical analyses of the translator's unconscious. Moreover, it demonstrates how such analyses can be conducted through concrete examples, unlike most studies within the field, which often limit themselves to theoretical discussions on psychoanalytic theory and translation. Referring to Gideon Toury, the founder of the descriptive paradigm, Venuti complains that the descriptive tradition mainly focused on norms as factors that determine the translator's choices, while neglecting their unconscious. Norms, "the linguistic and cultural resources that a translator internalizes over the course of a professional career" in Venuti's words, could easily be retrieved and articulated through introspection or critical examination (33). The unconscious, however, eludes comprehension and may require investigation by another individual or perhaps by the translator herself in a subsequent analytical context. According to Venuti, if translation scholars desire to learn more about the nature of translation and the way translation creates meaning, they should pay attention to errors, "misconstructions or misreadings that are symptomatic of an unconscious motivation, a repressed anxiety, an unsatisfied desire" (55). Venuti claims that extensive descriptive work on the translator's unconscious is necessary because it is only through such descriptive work on the translator's unconscious that it is possible to uncover the distinctions "between different aspects of the translator's unconscious, between the translatorly and the personal, the cultural and the political" (33). To achieve this purpose, Venuti examines errors in various translated texts and attempts to relate these errors to the translators' unconscious using an eclectic methodology, which encompasses a diverse range of strategies including the comparison of segments from the foreign and translated texts, the provision of historical context, references to the authors' or translators' personal backgrounds, and consultation with other expert translators.

Based on a critical evaluation of Venuti's methodology, this study seeks to identify potential methodological pitfalls in translation criticism that utilizes psychoanalytic theory as a framework and explore how a text-centered approach can help address these pitfalls. To achieve this objective, I first conduct a review of the application of psychoanalytic theory in literary criticism, emphasizing the shift in focus from the author, content, and reader to the formal features of the work. This review is organized thematically rather than chronologically and predominantly draws upon Terry Eagleton's classification of psychoanalytical literary

criticism, which provides valuable insights into the methodologies employed within each category. Subsequently, I focus on the approach that prioritizes the formal features of the work as the primary object of analysis. The intention here is to elucidate the methodological implications associated with tracing the unconscious of the text. Following this, I investigate whether Toury's descriptive approach disregards the translator's unconscious as a subject of inquiry, as posited by Venuti, and if so, explore potential explanations for this omission. Finally, I analyze two examples presented in Venuti's article to assess the effectiveness and limitations of the methodology utilized by the theorist.

2. Psychoanalytic Theory and Literary Criticism

Psychoanalytic theory, introduced by Sigmund Freud in the late nineteenth century, has been used as a conceptual framework or rather as a critical method in literary criticism since the early twentieth century. Eagleton, in his famous book *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1996), divides psychoanalytical literary criticism into four categories "depending on what it takes as its object of attention" and states that it "can attend to the *author* of the work; to the work's *contents*; to its *formal construction* or to the *reader*"[3] (155). The first literary critics who utilized psychoanalytic theory in literary criticism before the 1950s adopted the approach that takes the author as the object of attention. The main aim of this approach was to uncover the author's unconscious by analyzing the literary work. These critics treated works of literature as fantasies or dreams that reveal the author's repressed desires, tended to relate the author's literary choices to their personal life, and drew conclusions about the author's psyche. They would, for instance, analyze the characters in a work to unveil the author's unconscious desires since they held the idea that the characters in the work reflect the suppressed aspects of the author's psyche (Fox 1995, 429–430). The second approach Eagleton (1996) mentions, namely the approach that focuses on the content of the work, aims to analyze the events, the characters, and/or some symbols in the work with the help of psychoanalytic theory, and it represents a long tradition that prevails even today. Eagleton claims that

> [m]ost psychoanalytical criticism has been of the first two kinds, which are in fact the most limited and problematical. Psychoanalysing the author is a speculative business, and runs into just the same kind of problems we examined when discussing the

[3] All emphases are original unless otherwise noted.

> relevance of authorial 'intention' to works of literature. The psychoanalysis of 'content' - commenting on the unconscious motivations of characters, or on the psychoanalytical significance of objects or events in the text - has a limited value, but, in the manner of the notorious hunt for the phallic symbol, is too often reductive. Freud's own sporadic ventures into the field of art and literature were mainly in these two modes. (155)

According to Eagleton, the initial approach of psychoanalyzing the author based on their work is akin to traditional critical approaches, which presume an inseparable link between the work and the author, with the work serving as a testament to the author's thoughts and intentions. Eagleton describes this approach as "speculative business" since he believes that it is impossible to discern the extent to which the author's state of mind is reflected in the text just as it is incorrect to assume that a work accurately reflects the author's intentions. The second approach, which involves employing psychoanalytic theory to explain the content of the work, has its dangers too. Trying to uncover the unconscious motives of the characters, or to display the psychoanalytical significance of the objects, images, or events that appear in the text, the critic may neglect the work's overall integrity, reducing the significance of the work to the events it portrays or to the emotional states of the characters. Even worse, in a hunt for symbols, the critic may become overly fixated on a specific object, thereby overlooking its true significance or insignificance within the entirety of the work.

Contemporary critics believe that Marie Bonaparte's 1933 study titled *Edgar Poe: Étude psychanalytique* (*The Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe: A Psycho-analytic Interpretation*) embodies both of the aforementioned approaches, primarily because it attempts to draw a parallel between Edgar Allan Poe's work and his state of mind, seeing his work as a clinical reality (Tristán 2014, 56). Moreover, in pursuit of symbols that can be explained by psychoanalytic theory, Bonaparte goes so far as to associate, for instance, the white splotch of a cat in one of Poe's stories with the milk of the poet's mother (Wright 2003, 42–43). Another example is Frederick Crews's criticism of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. According to Crews, the protagonist's journey to Central Africa is a clear reflection of the author's desire to return to his mother's womb (Ellmann 1994, 2). Contemporary critic Maud Ellmann states that the interpretations of Bonaparte and Crews are "imaginative," but they do not pay attention to "the literary resonances of the texts" (ibid.). In short, both Bonaparte and Crews leave aside the literary form of the texts and focus only on the psychological states of the authors and/or the content of the works.

The approach that takes the reader as an object concentrates on how the work appeals to the reader's repressed desires and fantasies; however, the main issue that the critic focuses on here is the psychology of the reader. In other words, unlike the "almost exclusively author-centered" approach, this type of psychoanalytical literary criticism primarily aims at "analysing the response of the reader" (Wright 2003, 61). To be able to do this, Eagleton (1996) suggests, the critic attempts to explore the relationship between the text and the reader, highlighting how the formal aspects of a literary work create certain reactions in the reader. The approach is mainly based on the idea that thanks to certain formal devices in a work of literature, the reader faces their repressed desires and troubling anxieties and is able to build a defense against them. American critic Simon Lesser, for instance, believes that literature helps ease the reader's anxieties and makes sure that the individual is committed to the existing social order. Norman Holland, similarly, tries to show how the reader shapes their identity through the process of interpretation, ultimately revealing a comforting sense of unity within themselves. According to Eagleton, however, there are several fundamental problems with these studies. The first problem concerns the presupposition that literature has the function of treating the reader. Both Lesser's and Holland's works seem to ignore the idea that most modern works "pulverize order, subvert meaning and explode our self-assurance" (158). The second problem is that the original emphasis classical psychoanalysis placed on the split subject is replaced by an emphasis on the unity of the ego. This replacement is a clear sign of the assumption that there is an essence of personal identity that could be extracted from one's personal experiences.[4] Finally, in this approach, literature is viewed as a form of therapy, or as an instrument that helps to change the personality traits that do not conform to the social norms, and "the Freudianism which began as scandal and affront to middle-class society becomes a way of underwriting its values" (159).

The final approach Eagleton (1996) mentions, namely the approach that takes the formal structure of the text as an object, was particularly informed by Jacques Lacan's expansions to psychoanalytic theory and focused on language. In Lacanian theory, the unconscious is understood as being structured like language. This is not only because it operates through metaphor and metonymy but also because it is composed primarily of

[4] Eagleton (1996) associates this assumption with the movement of American ego-psychology, which he believes is "a domesticated version of Freudianism which diverts attention from the 'split subject' of classical psychoanalysis and projects it instead onto the unity of the ego" (158).

signifiers rather than stable meanings. When a person dreams of a horse, for example, it is not immediately apparent what this image signifies. It could have numerous conflicting meanings or be part of a chain of signifiers, each with multiple meanings. The horse image is not a sign in the traditional sense, as defined by Saussure, since it does not have a fixed signified linked to it. Instead, it is a signifier that can be connected to various signifieds, and it may also bear traces of other signifiers in its vicinity. The unconscious is therefore a continuous movement and activity of signifiers whose signifieds are often inaccessible because they have been repressed. In other words, the unconscious is a process that involves the "constant fading and evaporation of meaning," and "any attempt to convey a whole, unblemished meaning in speech or script is a pre-Freudian illusion" (146–147).

This idea brought about important innovations in literary theory, placing "language and communication" at the center of literary criticism (Wright 2003, 121). The decline of the author had already led to a dissolution of the bond between the author and work, resulting in the literary text being granted autonomy. Gradually, critics left aside the idea that the text has a fixed and stable meaning shaped by the author's intention. Instead, they focused "on the workings of the text as psyche, based on the theory that the unconscious is structured like a language" (114). In short, the object of psychoanalytical criticism was now the text itself, or its formal construction, and what the critics wished to reveal was the unconscious of the text, rather than the unconscious of the author.

3. The Unconscious of the Text and the Unconscious of Reading

But methodologically speaking, what does it mean to focus on the unconscious of the text? According to Umberto Eco (1994), it means critically interpreting a text "in order to discover, along with our reactions to it, something about its nature" (57). Eco believes that Jacques Derrida's psychoanalytical reading of Poe's "The Purloined Letter" is a very good example of such a critical interpretation since throughout his analysis of the story, Derrida

respects the intention of the text (*intentio operis*), i.e., the formal features and integrity of the text.[5] Eco says:

> When [Derrida] draws an interpretation from the fact that the letter is found in a paper holder hanging from a nail under the center of a fireplace, Derrida first takes "literally" the possible world designed by the narration as well as the sense of the words used by Poe to stage this world. Then he tries to isolate a second, "symbolic" meaning that this text is conveying, probably beyond the intentions of the author. Right or wrong, Derrida supports his second-level semantic interpretation with textual evidences. In doing so he also performs a critical interpretation, because he shows how the text can produce that second-level meaning. (57–58)

Eco further claims that Derrida's reading is in direct contrast with Maria Bonaparte's psychoanalytical reading of "The Purloined Letter" because although Bonaparte starts with a satisfactory textual analysis, she ends up relating some of the evidence she finds in the text to Poe's private life, totally ignoring the intention of the text. Therefore, Eco concludes, she does not critically interpret Poe's text, but uses it for her own purposes. This also means that Bonaparte analyzes the unconscious of the author, whereas Derrida chooses to focus on the unconscious of the text (58).[6]

In his work titled "Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis" (2000), Ellmann also explicates Derrida's notion of tracing the unconscious of the text. According to Ellmann, "[w]hen Derrida argues that [traditional] psychoanalytic criticism fails to attend to the originality of the literary signifier, he means that it ignores the form in an obsession with the content of the literary text" (214). Interestingly, although he is the pioneer of the idea that the unconscious represents a perpetual fading of meaning, Lacan faces criticism from Derrida for embracing such a traditional approach in his analysis of Poe's short story "The Purloined

[5] Jacques Derrida's essay "The Purveyor of Truth" (1975) is a critique of Jacques Lacan's analysis of Edgar Allan Poe's short story "The Purloined Letter." In this essay, Derrida also offers his own analysis of the story. While acknowledging the risk of oversimplifying Derrida's arguments, it can be briefly stated that his essay showcases how the movement of the letter across various hands and contexts underscores the non-fixed nature of meaning. For other analyses on the same story including Maria Bonaparte's and Jacques Lacan's, see Muller and Richardson 1988.

[6] It would be inaccurate to claim that Eco's views completely align with those of poststructuralist, particularly deconstructionist critics. Eco's perspective, which limits the role of the reader to the intention of the text (*intentio operis*) and regards the text as the sole parameter of potential interpretations, is restrictive when compared to the deconstructive approach. The deconstructive approach grants the reader much more freedom to "select the level of relevance from which to start in their interrogation of a text" (Pisanty 2015, 53). It also rejects the notion that the text inherently contains criteria that determine the acceptability of an interpretation. Nevertheless, Derrida's approach in "The Purveyor of Truth" can safely be described as text-centered. Maud Ellmann (2000) claims that while Derrida would refute the idea that deconstruction is a type of formalism, his focus on the unique qualities of the literary signifier aligns him with a broader tradition of thinkers which can be traced back to the Russian Formalists and the French Symbolists (213).

Letter": In his eagerness to extract a psychoanalytic truth, Lacan completely overlooks the story's literary qualities. According to Derrida, however, the quest for truth cannot be fulfilled in literature as it evades such a pursuit. Similar to the purloined letter, the meaning of a literary text remains elusive and cannot be definitively determined. This does not suggest that the meaning is inexpressible. Instead, it suggests that the meaning of a literary work is fluid and circulates among the readers of the story, akin to how the letter is passed among Poe's characters, always slipping out of their grasp. This indeterminate nature of meaning is not limited to texts that are conventionally considered literary, as Derrida's analyses of Freud's work demonstrate how certain characteristics of his writing such as the employment of metaphors, narrative tricks, mythological reminiscences, and idiosyncratic style create spaces for new interpretations (ibid.). In short, for Derrida, the concept of the unconscious of the text primarily alludes to the repressed meanings in a text; meanings which are concealed but which can be traced via meticulous scrutiny of the literary devices of the text, employing deconstructive reading strategies.

Eagleton's notion of investigating the unconscious of a text is, to a certain extent, similar to Derrida's. According to Eagleton (1996), the critic should first and foremost concentrate on what is absent or ambiguous in a text, since a work of literature "does not exactly say what it means or mean what it says" (154). In an attempt to explain how the critic can, or in fact should, utilize psychoanalytic theory, Eagleton states:

> [W]e are constructing what may be called a 'sub-text' for the work -a text which runs within it, visible at certain 'symptomatic' points of ambiguity, evasion or overemphasis, and which we as readers are able to 'write' even if the novel itself does not. All literary works contain one or more such sub-texts, and there is a sense in which they may be spoken of as the 'unconscious' of the work itself. The work's insights, as with all writing, are deeply related to its blindnesses: what it does not say, and *how* it does not say it, may be as important as what it articulates; what seems absent, marginal or ambivalent about it may provide a central clue to its meanings. (155)

The methods suggested here are closely related to Freud's theory of dreams and the subsequent elaboration that Lacan contributed to this framework.[7] Eagleton, following Lacan's lead, states that Freud's views on dreams are extremely important because they allow

[7] Lacan perceives the dream not in Freud's traditional sense as a manifestation and indication of repression, but rather as a form of discourse. This perspective allows for a psychoanalytic exploration of dreams as a means to gain insights into literature, just as the study of literature can provide us with a deeper understanding of the unconscious (Fox 1995, 432).

us to consider the work of literature as a mode of production. According to Eagleton, the ways dreams and literary works are processed are essentially very similar. Just as the dream transforms raw materials such as unconscious desires into products with the help of certain techniques, the work of literature processes raw materials like language or other literary texts and transforms them into a product. "The techniques by which this production is carried out are the various devices we know as 'literary form'" (157). When a psychoanalyst analyzes a dream, they focus not only on the "dream-text," i.e., the content of the dream, but also on the "dream-work," i.e., the way the dream is processed, by paying special attention to "distortions, ambiguities, absence and elisions which may provide a specially valuable mode of access to the 'latent content', or unconscious drives, which have gone into its making" (158). Literary criticism can do the same. It can focus on the unspoken words, repetitions, inconsistencies, or ambiguities in a text. It can investigate what the work conceals; or in other words, it can attempt to uncover the sub-text the work creates, which can be thought of as the unconscious of the text. In short, literary criticism can go beyond just analyzing what a text says, and instead focus on how it functions or creates meaning (ibid.).

Highlighting the text as the primary object of analysis and exclusively concentrating on the unconscious of the text entails potential pitfalls. A rigid interpretation of text-centered criticism may establish a unidirectional relationship between the critic and the text, where the critic assumes an equivalent position to that of an analyst. In this role, the critic solves the ambiguities of the text through interpretation and deciphers its symbolic meaning, just as an analyst solves the problems of the analysand through analysis. Is it possible to adopt an alternative approach that may help prevent the critic from assuming such a dominant position in the critic-text hierarchy? In her article titled "From the Text-as-Symptom to the Critic-as-Analysand: New Approaches in Psychoanalytic Criticism" (2013), Lorelei Caraman-Pașca states that a new generation of critics, such as Shoshana Felman, Jean Bellemin-Noel, Pierre Bayard, and Peter Brooks, represents a paradigm shift towards what is referred to as the unconscious of reading. This new approach places greater emphasis on the process of reading and interpretation and how it affects and transforms both the work and the reader/critic. Therefore, the focus is on mutual interaction between the unconscious of the reader/critic and that of the text, and since the aim here is to demonstrate how they interact and transform each other, the critic-text hierarchy is avoided (87–92).

Shoshana Felman's work provides a valuable perspective for exploring the methodological implications of prioritizing the unconscious of reading. In her essay titled "Turning the Screw of Interpretation" (1977), Felman introduces a novel approach to psychoanalytical reading, which involves analyzing a text in conjunction with its critical readings. She applies this approach to Henry James's novella *The Turn of the Screw*, and upon close examination of the rhetoric used in the critical debates surrounding the work, she discovers that the discourse of the critics reproduces the key motifs found in the text. Felman says: "Even more than the debate's content, it is its *style* which seems to me instructive: when the pronouncements . . . are examined closely, they are found to repeat unwittingly -with spectacular regularity- all the main lexical motifs of the text" (98).

Consequently, Felman argues that the reader/critic is inevitably influenced by the text and performs it by repeating it. According to her, it is not the reader/critic who comprehends the text, but rather the text that comprehends the reader/critic (115). The authority of presumed knowledge, in other words, resides within the text, not the interpretation. Felman challenges the conservative versions of text-oriented practices by reversing the hierarchical relationship between the text and the critic and by liberating the text from its previous passive position as the object of analysis. It is also important to note that methodologically, her approach can still be considered text-centered since she primarily focuses on the rhetoric employed within texts and their critical evaluations. The following passage clarifies her position regarding her methodological inclinations, aligning closely with those of Derrida and Eagleton:

> Our reading of *The Turn of the Screw* would thus attempt not so much to *capture* the mystery's solution, but to follow, rather, the significant path of its flight; not so much to solve or *answer* the enigmatic question of the text, but to investigate its structure; not so much to name and make *explicit* the ambiguity of the text, but to understand the necessity and the rhetorical functioning of the textual ambiguity. The question underlying such a reading is thus not "*what* does the story mean?" but rather "*how* does the story mean?" How does the meaning of the story, whatever it may be, rhetorically take place through permanent displacement, textually take shape and take effect: *take flight*. (119)

As we can see, Felman's innovative perspective not only underscores the active role of the text in shaping the interpretative process but also highlights the significance of analyzing the formal construction of (critical) works. The importance she ascribes to the way texts generate meaning and how critics can exploit ambiguities within them to uncover traces of

meaning that constantly shift and elude their grasp underlines her inclination towards a text-centered approach and her affinity with the deconstructionist perspective.

4. The Translation Process in Gideon Toury's Descriptive Approach

At this juncture, we should turn our attention to the field of translation studies, with a particular emphasis on Toury's descriptive approach. As expounded in the introductory section of this study, Venuti asserts that Toury, the founder of the descriptive paradigm, deliberately excludes the translator's unconscious as an object of research. Moreover, Venuti implies that the popularity of the descriptive school within the field is a primary contributing factor to the long-standing neglect of the translator's unconscious.[8] The major objective of this section, therefore, is to clarify whether Toury excludes the translator's unconscious as a research object and if so, to scrutinize the underlying rationales behind such a decision. To achieve this objective, it becomes imperative to examine Toury's perspective on the translation process.

In "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies" (1982), Toury uses the metaphor of a "black box" to refer to the translation process (25).[9] Although he states that the translation process, just like the translated text itself, is an empirical fact and thus an object of research in translation studies, he argues that it is impossible to grasp exactly what happens in the translator's mind during this process, which resembles a black box. In other words, it is impossible to describe precisely how the translation process works and how translation decisions are made. Therefore, researchers can only attempt to tentatively reconstruct the translation process by drawing on observable facts and using "the theoretical assumptions and hypotheses established in translation studies proper as well as in the framework of other adjacent disciplines including, of course, psychology" (ibid.). According to him, researchers should first start their endeavors with the observational facts, i.e., the translated texts, and then "proceed towards the reconstruction of non-observational facts, and not the other way

[8] For a similar claim, see Frota 2007.
[9] The first theorist to use this analogy was James Holmes, the famous translation scholar who announced the emergence of translation studies as an autonomous discipline and emphasized the importance of descriptive studies in his article titled "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies," first published in 1972. In the article, Holmes also expressed the hope that in the future the highly complex process of translation "will be given closer attention, leading to an area of study that might be called translation psychology or psycho-translation studies" (Holmes 2000, 177).

around" (ibid.). Otherwise, the reconstruction process may become precarious as its testability becomes compromised.

Toury's conceptualization of the reconstruction of the translation process is elucidated further in his seminal work, *Descriptive Translation Studies — and Beyond* (2012). In Chapter 14 of the work that concentrates on experimentation, Toury cites a couple of experimental studies conducted within the field. For instance, he mentions a study that aims to measure translators' eye movements and a study investigating the potential link between the dilation of simultaneous interpreters' pupils during the translation process and their cognitive workload. Subsequently, Toury delves into an examination of think-aloud protocols, wherein participants are instructed to engage in translation while verbalizing their thoughts throughout the process. The translators' verbalizations are recorded and, if possible, videotaped so that their facial expressions and body language can also be analyzed. Detailed transcriptions of these recordings are then meticulously scrutinized, with the expectation that the findings from this data analysis will provide valuable insights into the translation process (269–270). While Toury expresses certain reservations about these protocols, he nevertheless maintains that such experimental techniques can be utilized to reconstruct the translation processes as long as researchers pursue "more small-scale, and hence more easily testable hypotheses" (275).

Based on the evidence presented thus far, Venuti's claim regarding Toury's exclusion of the translator's unconscious seems to hold valid. Toury does not explicitly or implicitly address the translator's unconscious as a factor influencing the translation process. While he acknowledges the potential for investigating the translation process within the field of translation studies, his notion of process reconstruction pertains to experimental studies that entail testable hypotheses. Hence, it is reasonable to infer that Toury's notion of reconstructing the translation process does not encompass the exploration of the translator's unconscious. Furthermore, although Toury proposes to use hypotheses established in the field of psychology, it appears that his reference does not pertain to hypotheses derived from psychoanalytic theory. This exclusion can be attributed to the inherent challenges in empirically testing assumptions related to the translator's unconscious. Toury strongly advocates for establishing translation studies on a scientific foundation, emphasizing the translation product over the translation process. This emphasis on empiricism may be regarded as a reflection of his positivist inclinations and his aspirations to elevate the status of

the discipline in its early stages. Nevertheless, his insistence on working with observable and testable elements interestingly aligns him with literary critics who adopt a text-centered approach. Like these critics who prioritize the formal structure of literary works over considerations of the author's unconscious, Toury directs attention towards the translated text itself, leaving aside the translator's unconscious.

5. The Translator's Unconscious: Pitfalls and Contributions

Evident from the title he selects for his work, "The Difference That Translation Makes: The Translator's Unconscious" (2013), Venuti presents a divergent viewpoint. Venuti initiates his article with William Weaver's proposition that translation is a product of the translator's unconscious rather than conscious decision-making. According to Venuti, the number of studies within translation studies that explore the implications of this crucial assertion is quite limited. The predominant reason for this scarcity, he believes, lies in the dominance of the descriptive paradigm, which has led translation scholars to prioritize linguistic and cultural factors influencing translators' choices, often describing easily recoverable and analyzable norms rather than focusing on the translator's unconscious. Venuti contends that studies by scholars of psychoanalytic theory also offer limited contributions to translation studies. Following Freud's perspective, these studies often understand translation either as a concept illustrating how unconscious material transforms into symptoms and manifests itself in dreams, or as a concept displaying how these symptoms and dreams are interpreted by psychoanalysts. Venuti declares that his primary objective is to focus on the act of translation and to explore how unconscious material is reflected in the translator's choices during this intricate process involving language and culture. In other words, he attempts to reconstruct the translator's unconscious which affects the translator's decision-making process and becomes visible in the translated text (33). To do so, he explicitly states that he will utilize poststructuralist theories in his study and proceeds to illustrate, through concrete examples, how the translator's unconscious can be reconstructed by drawing inspiration from theorists such as Jacques Derrida, Jean Jacques Lecercle, and Jacques Lacan (34). In the following pages, I will focus on two of Venuti's examples and undertake a critical evaluation of the methodologies he employed. It should be noted here that the rationale behind selecting these particular examples lies in the fact that one of them embodies a methodology that is

riddled with challenges, while the other demonstrates an inspiring approach. I anticipate that the juxtaposition of these two examples will effectively highlight the contradictory stances adopted by Venuti in his article, while also elucidating my own perspectives on the utilization of psychoanalytic theory in translation criticism.

The first example I would like to discuss involves a translation of a poem, which Venuti (2013) presents to illustrate the political dimension of the translator's unconscious. Drawing upon Freud's concept of the slip of the tongue, he focuses on Donald D. Walsh's 1972 translation of Pablo Neruda's poem "En Ti La Tierra."[10] Initially, Venuti compares the opening lines of the two poems and contends that "Neruda's simplicity is displaced by the artificiality of Walsh's poeticism" (43). He then shifts his attention to the primary example, which he associates with the translator's unconscious: the rendering of the phrase "los ojos mas extensos" in the penultimate line of the poem as "spacious eyes." According to Venuti, this choice is "unusual" since the adjective "extensos" has much closer English equivalents, such as "vast" or "wide" (ibid.). However, what Venuti finds particularly intriguing is that the English phrase evokes the opening line of a renowned anthem-like poem, "America the Beautiful" by Katherine Lee Bates, which is often sung at public events.[11] To explore this potential echo, Venuti consults "accomplished translators of Spanish language poetry" (44). Among them, Eliot Weinberger suggests that the phrase in question 'could' evoke associations with "America the Beautiful" and that Walsh's choice was 'probably' not a conscious decision. "*One never knows*," Weinberger says, "but *my guess* is that 'for spacious skies' was not conscious – but one of those things stuck in the back of the brain that just comes out" (ibid.; emphases are mine). Building upon this insight, Venuti delves into Walsh's educational background and professional accomplishments, leading him to assert that the

[10] Presented here is the English rendition of the poem by Donald D. Walsh: "Little / rose, / roselet, / at times, / tiny and naked, / it seems as though you would fit / in one of my hands, / as though I'll clasp you like this / and carry you to my mouth, / but / suddenly / my feet touch your feet and my mouth your lips: / you have grown, / your shoulders rise like two hills, / your breasts wander over my breast, / my arm scarcely manages to encircle the thin / new-moon line of your waist: / in love you have loosened yourself like sea water: / I can scarcely measure the sky's most spacious eyes / and I lean down to your mouth to kiss the earth" (Neruda 1972, 2–3; in Venuti 2013, 42). Pablo Neruda's poem is as follows: "Pequeña / rosa, / rosa pequeña, / a veces, / diminuta y desnuda, / parece / que en una mano mia / cabes, / que así voy a cerrarte / y llevarte a mi boca, / pero / de pronto / mis pies tocan tus pies y mi boca tus labios: / has crecido, / suben tus hombros como dos colinas, / tus pechos se pasean por mi pecho, / mi brazo alcanza apenas a rodear la delgada / linea de luna nueva que tiene tu cintura: / en el amor como agua de mar te has destado: / mido apenas los ojos mas extensos del cielo / y me inclino a tu boca para besar la tierra" (Neruda 1972, 2–3; in Venuti 2013, 42).

[11] Katherine Lee Bates's poem titled "America the Beautiful" is as follows: "O beautiful for spacious skies, / For amber waves of grain, / For purple mountain majesties / Above the fruited plain! / America! America! / God shed his grace on thee / And crown thy good with brotherhood / From sea to shining sea!" (Venuti 2013, 43).

translator's choice of "spacious eyes" is "undoubtedly" a manifestation of his unconscious, specifically reflecting an unconscious political desire (ibid.). Venuti explains this idea as follows:

> Neruda's "En Ti La Tierra" is a love poem in which the poet-lover concludes a sensual description of the woman he loves by comparing her to the earth. . . . The analogy is certainly retained in Walsh's translation, but the acoustic remainder alters its significance: the lover leans down to kiss, not simply the earth, or the earth-likened woman he loves, but America the Beautiful, the United States, a nation that undergoes some degree of personification in Bates's poem. (44–45)

According to Venuti, Walsh's translation is motivated by an unconscious desire that a significant Chilean poet, known for his leftist critiques of American capitalism in works like the 1966 play *Splendor and Death of Joaquin Murieta*, should instead allude to a nationalistic image of the United States to convey his feelings toward this nation (45). In the remainder of the section devoted to the example, Venuti attempts to support his views by providing details about the Cold War period and Chilean–US relations during this era and drawing conclusions about the translator's ideology based on very limited information about his life. In a concluding effort to establish a connection between this information and the translated poem, he reverts to a limited stylistic comparison and asserts that the translation exhibits significant deviations from the Spanish text, specifically through the translator's utilization of the subjunctive mood and future tense. According to him, these particular choices by the translator indicate that the translation unfolds the encounter with the woman in a more gradual manner compared to the Spanish text, thereby emphasizing the significance of the kiss in the line that echoes the American poem. This emphasis, he believes, "is symptomatic of the intensity of the translator's unconscious desire for a conservative ideological resolution to the Chilean crisis" (47).

At this point, let us try to elaborate on the major problems in Venuti's critique, underlining the inconsistencies between his practice and the poststructuralist framework he embraces. Firstly, it can be argued that in this particular instance, Venuti falls short of providing a critical interpretation and instead uses the translated text to serve his own agenda, reminiscent of Bonaparte's approach since, in pursuit of a phonetic similarity that can be explained by the notion of the slip of the tongue, Venuti disregards the literary features and the poetic integrity of the translated text. What seems to be an unusual choice of the translator simply reminds Venuti of the opening lines of an American poem, and he fixates on the

resemblance between two phrases, "spacious eyes" and "spacious skies," overlooking the possibility that the translator may have intentionally chosen the word "spacious" in the phrase "spacious eyes" to achieve a poetic effect similar to that of the Spanish poem. Venuti's fixation on this resemblance renders him oblivious to the sibilance in the phrase "spacious eyes" which mirrors the sibilance in the Spanish phrase "los ojos mas extensos." Furthermore, because Venuti neglects to analyze both poems in their entirety, he cannot observe that both the translated text and the foreign text feature multiple occurrences of the ['s'] sound in the lines preceding and succeeding the aforementioned phrase, which strengthens the possibility that the translator aimed to mirror this phonetic element in the translation. What is even more intriguing is that Venuti seeks validation from expert translators, attempting to eliminate—or perhaps evade—this possibility. His strong desire to find a suitable example of a slip of the tongue leads him to prioritize consulting other experts rather than analyzing the stylistic features of the translated work. Despite receiving tentative responses from these experts, Venuti remains undeterred in constructing his interpretation based on the resemblance between the phrases "spacious eyes" and "spacious skies."

The second methodological problem is closely related to the first. Despite claiming to adopt a poststructuralist perspective, Venuti explores the life of the individual translator, Donald D. Walsh, and the sociopolitical context of his time, in an attempt to illustrate how Walsh's unconscious manifests itself in the translated text. In essence, by seeking the basis of his interpretation beyond the boundaries of the translated text and particularly within the translator's life, Venuti ends up with a psychoanalytical interpretation of the translator, which inevitably gives rise to highly speculative or even "imaginative" conclusions, borrowing the phrase from Ellmann (1994, 2). For instance, as an administrator of the Modern Language Association of America, Walsh coauthors a report on foreign language education advocating the benefits of learning foreign languages for the country. Venuti (2013) regards this piece of information as a clear indication of Walsh's "conservative stand," and he deems Walsh's use of the phrase "spacious eyes" in the translation as a distinct marker of this political inclination (45). While it is conceivable that Walsh may have had nationalist sentiments and that his unconscious political desire may have influenced his choice of the phrase in question, it is equally plausible, as previously mentioned, that the phrase was deliberately selected to achieve sibilance, irrespective of Walsh's political affiliations. Ultimately, no matter how much information we possess about the author's/translator's life, our attempts of establishing

a direct correlation between this information and the author's/translator's unconscious will unavoidably lead to speculations.[12]

The second example I would like to focus on concerns a passage from Alan Bass's translation of *L'écriture et la Différence* (*Writing and Difference*) by Derrida, where Venuti (2013) identifies two contradictory sentences that deviate in meaning. Upon comparing the translation to the French text, Venuti uncovers an error made by Bass: The first sentence of the passage asserts the impossibility of transferring the materiality of the foreign text to the target language through translation. The translator's choice of the demonstrative adjective "that" for the indefinite article "un," however, results in the opposite meaning in the fourth sentence, suggesting that the materiality of the foreign text can indeed be transferred to the target language through translation (38).[13] Thus, what initially appears as a simple mistake ultimately leads to a significant inconsistency. To demonstrate that Bass's error cannot be attributed to incompetence, Venuti examines the translator's educational and professional background, highlighting his experience in translating Derrida's texts and his current role as a psychoanalyst. What, then, might have caused Bass to make such a mistake? Venuti proposes that this error exemplifies what Freud referred to as "misreading." The mistake reveals an unconscious desire of the translator, namely the desire that "a translation will restore the source text in its entirety, in its materiality, without loss or gain, that the translation will establish such a similarity to the source text as to overcome the irreducible differences between languages and cultures" (39). Subsequently, building on Lacan's theory, Venuti elaborates on how the signs in the foreign text implying that a text can never be fully

[12] I acknowledge that any interpretation is bound to involve speculation and that absolute objectivity on the part of the reader or critic is an illusion. I employ the term "speculation" here in Eagleton's sense, signifying that the interpretation is constructed under the false assumption of a direct correlation between the intentions or mental states of the author or translator and the text they produce. The desire to avoid such speculation appears to be the fundamental reason why most literary critics, structuralists and poststructuralists alike, as well as translation theorists like Gideon Toury, emphasize the text as a major object of study.

[13] The passage in French is as follows: "Or un corps verbal ne se laisse pas traduire ou transporter dans une autre langue. Il est cela même que la traduction laisse tomber. Laisser tomber le corps, telle est même l'énergie essentielle de la traduction. Quand elle réinstitue un corps, elle est poésie. En ce sens, le corps du signifiant constituant l'idiome pour toute scène de rêve, le rêve est intraduisible" (Derrida 1967, 312; in Venuti 2013, 34). Alan Bass's translation of the passage is as follows: "The materiality of a word cannot be translated or carried over into another language. Materiality is precisely that which translation relinquishes. To relinquish materiality: such is the driving force of translation. And when that materiality is reinstated, translation becomes poetry. In this sense, since the materiality of the signifier constitutes the idiom of every dream scene, dreams are untranslatable" (Bass 1978, 210).

translatable evoke a sense of incompleteness in the translator and how the translator's unconscious endeavors to compensate for this incompleteness.[14]

Although Venuti emphasizes the significance of reconstructing the translator's unconscious throughout his study, his treatment of this example aligns more closely with the approach that seeks to trace the unconscious of the text, or in the context of translation, what I prefer to refer to as the unconscious of translation. There are two reasons for this: The first reason is that Venuti focuses solely on the textual properties of the passage in French and its translation and derives his interpretation from the textual evidence. Initially, he identifies an inconsistency in the translated text, prompting a further examination of the foreign text to uncover what the translation suppresses or fails to convey. Subsequently, he employs the fundamental principles of psychoanalytic theory to construct an interpretation regarding this suppression. His methodology here also signifies the starting point for critics in their analysis, underlining that the divergence between the foreign and translated texts especially reveals itself "at certain 'symptomatic' points of ambiguity, evasion or overemphasis" in the translated text (Eagleton 1996, 155). Secondly and more importantly, while he devotes unnecessary effort to establish Bass's competence as a translator and disprove any ignorance on his part, which is an indication that he is tempted to draw a parallel between the life of the actual translator and his work, Venuti's primary focus is not solely on Bass's unconscious. Instead, through a translation error that he attributes to Bass's unconscious, Venuti highlights a repressed desire that might be shared by all translators—a desire for exact equivalence in translation. In summary, Venuti employs psychoanalytic theory to examine how meaning is generated in the translated text and centers on a desire inherent to the act of translation. By doing so, he provides a compelling demonstration of poststructuralist psychoanalytical translation criticism, and unlike many studies in the field of translation studies that often remain confined to conceptual discussions, he successfully bridges the gap between theory and practice.

6. Concluding Remarks

The findings derived from the analyses presented above reveal an interesting contradiction. While showcasing an inspiring example of tracing the unconscious of

[14] For inspiring studies that specifically address the translator's desire for translatability within the framework of psychoanalytic theory and problematize it around the issue of fidelity, see Basile 2005 and Öner Bulut 2018.

translation, which emphasizes how translation creates meaning, Venuti's article is confronted with the challenge of maintaining a consistent methodology. Indeed, as shown in the first example, in his quest to unveil the political dimension of the translator's unconscious, he inadvertently neglects the literary elements in the translated text and disregards its integrity. Furthermore, he ventures beyond the confines of the text itself, into the details of the translator's life, a path that inevitably leads to speculative interpretations. These problems, in my view, stem from the emphasis he places on the translator's unconscious, which stands in contradiction with the principles of the text-centered approach in psychoanalytical literary criticism as outlined in the third section of this study.

An additional analysis of the discourse used in Venuti's article (2013) yields another striking result: On the one hand, Venuti explicitly aligns himself with poststructuralist theorists, employing their theories and terminology as the foundation for his critical approach. On the other hand, he employs terms like "test" (44), "describe" (34), "explain" (34), "reconstruct" (33), "working hypotheses" (56), and "empirical evidence" (56) to express his objectives and suggestions within the article. It is worth noting that these terms are associated with the descriptive approach that Venuti initially critiques, fundamentally grounded in structuralist thought. Hence, one might regard these terms as manifestations of Venuti's unconscious, of his repressed desires rooted in structuralism in general and descriptivism in particular. Alternatively, drawing inspiration from Felman, it is possible to interpret Venuti's usage of such terms as enacting the discourse of the descriptive paradigm through repetition. These observations may partially account for the oscillation between poststructuralist and more traditional perspectives within the article, shedding light on Venuti's employment of an eclectic methodology. They also provide insights into why Venuti is inclined to draw clear distinctions "between different aspects of the translator's unconscious, between the translatorly and the personal, the cultural and the political," as if it were possible to separate one from the other, as if "the translatorly" does not inherently encompass "the personal, the cultural and the political" (33).

Undoubtedly, Venuti's article encompasses a broader scope than what has been outlined and critiqued within the confines of this paper. Despite certain methodological issues, the article successfully incorporates the theoretical propositions of poststructuralist thought and utilizes them in translation criticism. In fact, it is a testament to Venuti's courage as one of the pioneering researchers who boldly explores the notion of the translator's

unconscious through concrete examples. In this regard, the article undeniably makes a substantial contribution to the field of translation criticism. Another significant contribution he offers to the discipline lies in his critical stance against the descriptive paradigm, which neglects the role of the unconscious in the process of meaning-making in translation. In his article, Venuti aptly argues that we must move beyond descriptive translation studies and a narrow fixation on the norms governing the translation process. However, this does not imply that, in our pursuit to incorporate the translator's role and her subjectivity, we should indulge in speculations within our psychoanalytical translation criticism practices. Rather, we must move beyond the translator's unconscious and cultivate a more inclusive comprehension of the intricate interplay among the foreign and translated texts, the translator, the act of translation itself, and the critic. To achieve this, I propose embracing an alternative approach—one that endeavors to trace the unconscious of translation, perceiving the translated text as a juncture where all these aforementioned elements converge or clash, where they interact and mutually transform each other.

The application of the basic tenets of psychoanalytic theory in translation criticism poses an important yet challenging inquiry. Developing a comprehensive methodology for psychoanalytical translation criticism, therefore, is beyond the scope of this study. Nonetheless, recognizing the need for ongoing exploration and refinement in methodology, I propose that we draw inspiration from contemporary literary critics as we strive to establish an effective approach for our critical efforts. I am certain that Venuti will concur with the following passage, which represents a modest endeavor to extend Eagleton's and Felman's insights into psychoanalytical translation criticism:

As with all writing, what the translated text does not say, and 'how' it does not say it, may be even more important than what it articulates; what seems 'absent,' 'marginal,' or 'ambivalent' in the translated text can provide us with a clue about the nature of the act of translation. As translation critics, we must embrace the notion that no translation can ever achieve complete identity with the foreign work. Thus, we should rather focus on exploring the aspects that translation inherently 'silences,' 'suppresses,' or 'obscures.' Our aim is not to unravel the enigma and unearth the ultimate truth hidden within the foreign text, or assuming the role of an analyst, to reconstruct a particular translator's unconscious by reaching back to her past experiences but rather to adopt a text-centered approach to comprehend the inherent necessity and rhetorical significance of 'textual ambiguity in translation.' Only such a critical

attempt can help us trace the nuanced workings of translation and gain a deeper understanding of its complex dynamics. Only such a critical attempt can tell us how translation produces and reproduces meaning(s), how it textually takes shape and effect, how it 'takes flight.'

References

Arrojo, Rosemary. 2012. "Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, and the Teaching of Translation." Translated by Ben Van Wyke. *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 7 (1): 96–110. doi:10.1075/tis.7.1.06arr.

Basile, Elena. 2005. "Responding to the Enigmatic Address of the Other: A Psychoanalytical Approach to the Translator's Labour." *New Voices in Translation Studies* 1 (1): 12–30. https://newvoices.arts.chula.ac.th/index.php/en/article/view/40.

Bass, Alan, trans. 1978. *Writing and Difference*. By Jacques Derrida. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berman, Antoine. 1992. *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. Translated by S. Heyvaert. New York: State University of New York Press.

Caraman-Pașca, Lorelei. 2013. "From the Text-as-Symptom to the Critic-as-Analysand: New Approaches in Psychoanalytic Criticism." *Analele Universităţii Ovidius din Constanţa. Seria Filologie* 24 (1): 86–93. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=291091.

Derrida, Jacques, Willis Domingo, James Hulbert, and Moshe Ron. 1975. "The Purveyor of Truth." *Yale French Studies*, no. 52, 31–113. doi:10.2307/2929747.

Eagleton, Terry. 1996. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eco, Umberto. 1994. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ellmann, Maud, ed. 1994. *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism*. London: Longman.

———. 2000. "Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis." In *Deconstructions: A User's Guide*, edited by Nicholas Royle, 211–237. London: Palgrave.

Felman, Shoshana. 1977. "Turning the Screw of Interpretation." *Yale French Studies*, no. 55/56, 94–207. doi:10.2307/2930436.

Fox, Christopher, ed. 1995. *Jonathan Swift Gulliver's Travels*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Frota, Maria Paula. 2007. "The Unconscious Inscribed in the Translated Text." *Doletiana: Revista de Traducció, Literatura i Art*, no. 1, 1–11. https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/doletiana/19883366n1/19883366n1a12.pdf.

Holmes, James S. (1972) 2000. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 172–185. London: Routledge.

Muller, John P., and William J. Richardson, eds. 1988. *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida & Psychoanalytic Reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Öner Bulut, Senem. 2018. "Sadakat-Merkezli Çeviri Söylemini Lacancı Psikanaliz Çerçevesinde Yeniden Düşünmek." [Re-thinking Faithfulness-Centered Translation Discourse through Lacanian Psychoanalysis.] In "1st International Rumeli Symposium [Language, Literature, Translation]," edited by Yakup Yılmaz and Fatih Başpınar. Special Issue, *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, no. 4, 266–273. doi:10.29000/rumelide.454277.

Pisanty, Valentina. 2015. "From the Model Reader to the Limits of Interpretation." In "Umberto Eco's Interpretative Semiotics: Interpretation, Encyclopedia, Translation," edited by Cinzia Bianchi and Clare Vassallo. Special Issue, *Semiotica*, no. 206, 37–61. doi:10.1515/sem-2015-0014.

Robinson, Douglas. 1996. *Translation and Taboo*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

———. 2001. *Who Translates?: Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Toury, Gideon. 1982. "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." *Dispositio* 7 (19/21): 23–39. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41491224.

———. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies — and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tristán, Meritxell Serrano. 2014. "Psychoanalysis and Translation: A Literature Review." *Letras*, no. 56, 55–88. doi:10.15359/rl.2-56.3.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2013. "The Difference That Translation Makes: The Translator's Unconscious." In *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*, 32–56. London: Routledge.

Wright, Elizabeth. 2003. *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice*. London: Routledge.