therefore described discourse as suprasentential language in use, but he was not concerned with the 'use', only with the language. The emergence of semiotics and the French structuralist approach to the study of narrative were also important influences in the early years, as was the work of Hymes (1964) which studied speech in its social setting. Linguistic philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975) were also influential in the study of language as social action, reflected in speech-act theory and the formulation of conversational maxims, alongside the work of scholars such as Levinson (1983) and Leech (1983) in pragmatics (the study of meaning in context).

Discourse analysis in Britain has been greatly influenced by M.A.K. Halliday's functional approach to language (e.g. Halliday 1973), which bears relation to the Prague School of linguists. Halliday's framework emphasises the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing. Also important is the Birmingham School of discourse analysis as represented by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), who developed a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk, based on a hierarchy of discourse units. Related work has dealt with doctor-patient interaction, service encounters, interviews, debates, business negotiations, monologues and intonation in discourse. British research has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse (Cook 1989: 7).

Also relevant to the development of discourse analysis as a whole is the work of text grammarians, working mostly with written language. According to McCarthy (1991: 1), text grammarians see texts as language elements strung together in relationships with one another that can be defined. He mentions the contributions of linguists such as Van Dijk (1972), De Beaugrande (1980) and Halliday and Hasan (1976) in this regard. Like spoken discourse analysis, **text linguistics** focuses on discourse structure, but limits its enquiry to the properties of written discourse (i.e. texts), examining the different ways in which texts are structured and attempting to identify characteristic features of well-structured texts. An important aspect of text linguistic research is text connectivity or **coherence**, the analysis of what gives a text unity and homogeneity. Tthere are two basic approaches to the issue of text coherence within text linguistics: the 'text as structure' and the 'text as process' approaches. In the 'text as structure' approach, coherence is perceived as deriving from the surface structure features of the text. According to this view, discourse is coherent if there is referential or topic continuity, semantic congruence or argument overlap between entities in the discourse. The concept of **cohesion** (or local coherence) arose out of this approach, which was particularly dominant during the 1970s and early 1980s. Cohesion may be broadly defined as the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors and successors in a text (Hoey 1991: 3). The most widely known work in this regard is Halliday and Hasan (1976), which examines local ties in surface structure that link up sentences or propositions in discourse. Typical cohesive ties include textual phenomena such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctive and lexical relations.

Describing and explaining the surface features of discourse and their function is an important area of research but it alone is not sufficient, since a text can be cohesive without being coherent. Connectivity and unity do not simply derive from the sum of the structural parts; they may also derive from underlying semantic unity and from the inferences that are drawn from the text. There is also a strong element of subjectivity which governs these inferences - readers will each perceive the text differently, and not all of them will perceive the text as being coherent. Alternatively, readers who encounter texts that are not coherent unconsciously attempt to construct a coherent interpretation of them. Readers themselves are able to perceive and construct overt and underlying connectivity and unity in texts during the reading process. Text coherence cannot therefore be abstracted away from its readers and from the mental processes involved in producing and perceiving texts, and cannot be viewed only as a product, but must also be seen as a process (Brown and Yule in Pretorius 1993: 6). According to this view, coherence derives from the semantic and rhetorical relations underlying units of discourse. Although the explicit linguistic markers (e.g. the conjunctive elements of discourse) that signal the different semantic and rhetorical relations between discourse entities form an important part of this approach, attention is also given to implicit relations, since coherence, being a cognitive construct, also derives from the inferences that readers make in the absence of explicit signals. Important studies in this regard include Grimes (1975), Brostoff (1981), Bamberg (1983, 1984), Fahnestock (1983) and Hubbard (1989, 1993).

Discourse analysis which analyses the relations between linguistic and non-linguistic activity, is an approach which has increasingly gained popularity over the last two decades. It has been suggested that signs have values (meanings), but that they also have social implications. This point of view has been strongly adopted in fields such as semiotics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis (Caldas-Coulthard 1993). Hallidayan **systemic functional linguistics** is one theory which adopts this approach, attempting to relate text structure in spoken or written texts to communicative function. Christie (in Halliday & Hasan 1989: vii) defines systemic functional linguistics as follows:

> Such a linguistic theory is itself also a social theory, for it proposes firstly, that it is in the nature of human behaviour to build reality and/or experience through complex semiotic processes, and secondly, that the principal semiotic system available to humans is their language. In this sense, to study language is to explore some of the most important and pervasive of the processes by which human beings build their world.

Halliday and Hasan (1989: vi) have sought to establish a principled model of language which, "sees language primarily as a 'social semiotic', and as a resource for meaning, centrally involved in the processes by which human beings negotiate, construct and change the nature of social experience". According to Halliday (Halliday & Hasan 1989: 4), the term 'social semiotic' refers to the fact that language is seen as the study of sign systems rather than simply the study of signs à la Saussure. In other words, where Saussure employed a rather atomistic notion of the sign as existing primarily as an isolated entity before coming to be related to other signs, Halliday wishes to see language as one among a number of social systems of meaning that, taken all together, constitute human culture. Texts are therefore seen both as objects in their own right and as instances of social meaning in a particular context of situation. In Halliday and Hasan's (1989) view, although a text looks as though it is made of words and sentences, it is really made of meanings which are coded in words and structures. Thus, a text is seen as a semantic unit:

> Because of its nature as a semantic entity, a text, more than other linguistic units, has to be considered from two perspectives at once, both as a product and as a process... The text is a product in the sense that it is an output, something that can be recorded and studied, having a certain construction that can be represented in systematic terms. It is a process in the sense of a continuous process of semantic choice, a movement through the network of meaning potential, with each set of choices constituting the environment for

a further set. (Halliday & Hasan 1989: 10).

In Halliday's view, the context of situation, the context in which the text unfolds, is encapsulated in the text, “not in a kind of piecemeal fashion, nor at the other extreme in any mechanical way, but through a systemic relationship between the social environment on the one hand, and the functional organisation of language on the other. If we treat both text and context as semiotic phenomena, as 'modes of meaning’, so to speak, we can move from one to the other in a revealing way. (Halliday in Halliday & Hasan 1989: 11, 12).

Halliday and Hasan (1989: 49) have identified five periods in the cycle of text and context:

1. the text, as a metafunctional construct: a complex of ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings;
2. the context of situation: the configuration of field, tenor and mode features that specify the register of the text;
3. the context of culture: the institutional and ideological background that give value to the text and constrain its interpretation;
4. the 'intertextual' context: relations with other texts, and assumptions that are carried over therefrom;
5. the 'intratextual' context: coherence within the text, including the linguistic cohesion that embodies the internal semantic relationships.

In the preface to his 1985 systemic description of English grammar, Halliday (1985: xxix-xxx) lists twenty-one possible applications of systemic theory, which include theoretical concerns (e.g. "to understand the nature and functions of language"), historical concerns ("to understand how languages evolve through time"), developmental concerns ("to understand how a child develops language, and how language may have evolved in the human species") and educational concerns ("to help people learn their mother tongue... foreign languages"). What all of these very varied applications have in common, however, is using authentic texts to examine how people use language with each other within various cultural and social contexts. Consequently, the most generalisable application of systemic linguistics is "to understand the quality of texts: why a text means what it does, and why it is valued as it is" (Halliday 1985: xxx).

Thus, systemic linguistics attempts to capture the subtle relationships between the different functions of language and the forms language takes to express those functions. A second, related goal is the classification of both social meaning and linguistic forms in functional terms, since "we have to proceed from the outside inwards, interpreting language by reference to its place in the social processes" (Halliday in Geslin 1996: 15). A third very important goal is "to construct a grammar for purposes of text analysis: one that would make it possible to say sensible and useful things about any text, spoken or written, in modern English." (Halliday 1985: xv).

Any work on gender and text analysis has to take into account contemporary feminist work in sociolinguistics, the major figures being Deborah Cameron and Jennifer Coates (Cameron 1985; Cameron 1990; Coates 1986; Coates and Cameron 1988). Both these linguists assume that there are features in language which can be explained only by reference to gender. Coates has analysed discourse differences in women's and men's conversational styles, the identifying features of all-female group discussions and how these discussions differ from those in mixed or male-only groups. Another important focus is on differences - real or imagined - in pronunciation, syntax and lexis between men and women (Lakoff 1975; Spender 1980; Cameron 1990).

Systemic functional linguistics is useful in its broadest sense in informing the theories of text as process used in this thesis; in other words, in considering texts in relation to the cultural and social context in which they are negotiated. But it does not focus specifically on one aspect which is crucial to feminism, that of ideology. A branch of systemic linguistics, **critical discourse analysis**, concentrates on this dimension, seeking to analyse how ideology intersects with patterns of language use.

Critical discourse analysis shares the aims of discourse analysis and systemic functional linguistics, which include an understanding of the text within its social and cultural context and the production of explanatory categories for the description of textual characteristics. However, it also seeks to provide a critical dimension in its theoretical and descriptive accounts of text. In critical discourse analysis, emphasis has been placed on how language reveals the ways in which people behave and make others behave (Caldas-Coulthard 1993). It is based on the motivated relation of signifier and signified as an essential foundation and legitimation of critical reading. Critical discourse analysis therefore presupposes a study of the relations between discourse, power, dominance and social inequality (always taking into account the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships). In other words, analysts take an explicit sociopolitical stance in focussing on the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance (which is defined as "the exercise of social power by elite institutions or groups, that results in social equality, including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial and gender inequality" (van Dijk 1993: 249)).

In an article entitled "Principles of critical discourse analysis" (1993), van Dijk provides a broad historical overview to critical perspectives in the study of language, discourse and communication, explaining that these perspectives span numerous disciplines and, depending on the orientation involved, may be traced back either to Aristotle, the philosophers of the Enlightenment or to Marx and more recently to members of the Frankfurt School (Adorno, Benjamin and others) and its direct or indirect heirs in and after the 1960s, among whom Habermas plays a primary role. Another line of influence and development, also more or less (neo)marxist, goes back to Gramsci and his followers in France and the UK. Likewise, first in France and later also in the UK and USA, we can trace the influence of the work of Althusser (1971), Foucault (1971 et seq.), Pêcheux (1982), Derrida (1973, 1976), Lacan (1977) and Kristeva (1981), theories which inform a range of theoretical positions termed **poststructuralist** (e.g. the deconstructive criticism practised by American literary critics, the radical-feminist rewriting of the meanings of gender and language in the work of French feminist writers and the detailed historical analysis of discourse and power in the work of Foucault). Finally, van Dijk emphasises the exemplary role of feminist scholarship in the critical approach to language and communication (Kramarae, 1981; Thorne & Henley 1975).

Although often dealing with 'language', 'text', or 'discourse' in many (usually rather philosophical ways), most of this work does not explicitly and systematically deal with discourse structures. However, in the 1980s, a more socially and politically aware stylistics began to develop, largely under the influence of a University of East Anglia team of linguists who published two seminal volumes in 1979: *Language as Ideology* (Kress & Hodge 1979) and *Language & Control* (Fowler et al 1979) (The final chapter of *Language & Control* is entitled 'Critical Linguistics', and this term has been used to describe the goals and methodology of both volumes). In both volumes, the debt to Halliday's systemic-functional model lies in the general orientation towards language rather than in a specific analytical method. The writers start from the premise that "the grammar of a language is its theory of reality" (Kress & Hodge 1979: 7), and argue that linguistic structures are neither neutral nor arbitrary: they are selected according to the communicative purposes that they serve. Language is seen as a reality-creating social practice: language forms determine, rather than simply reflect, reality for members of a community. Hence, as these researchers see it, the aim of text analysis is to see through the language to the positions and intentions which determine linguistic form, while at the same time understanding how the linguistic forms themselves shape our perceptions (Geslin 1996: 39). According to Thompson (1984: 98-9):

> in recent years, discourse analysts have paid increasing attention to the ways in which language is used in specific social contexts and thereby serves as a medium of power and control. It is this increasingly sociological turn which has rendered discourse analysis relevant to, though by no means integrated with, some of the principal tasks in the study of ideology.

Other contributions in critical linguistics and social semiotics are Chilton (1985), Fairclough (1989) and Hodge and Kress (1988); Kress and Hodge, 1979) (although these approaches usually did not aim to provide sophisticated sociopolitical analyses). Van Dijk (1993: 251) also mentions work in German and Austrian sociolinguistics which takes the same critical approach, although from a different perspective, for instance language use in relation to immigrant workers, language barriers, fascism and anti-semitism (see for instance Wodak et al 1985). In the 1980s, Van Dijk himself investigated the structures and processes of news in the press within a sociocognitive perspective, and especially the production of ethnic prejudice and racism in discourse and communication, e.g. in everyday conversations, textbooks, the press and parliamentary debates. His work in the 1990s, which falls within an explicit critical paradigm, increasingly generalised his previous research to a more general analysis of the role of discourse in the reproduction of power and dominance in society.

Another branch of scholars who examine the relationship between linguistic structure and socially constructed reality, but from the point of view of the fictional reality represented in literary texts, are those who follow the tenets of **literary pragmatics**. These scholars focus on *questions about the nature of literature and the process of making sense of literary texts from* the point of view of a theoretical discipline related to or based on insights from linguistic theory (Pilkington 1991: 45). Sell and Verdonk (1994: 232) define literary pragmatics as follows:

> Literary pragmatics is not primarily concerned with linguistic interaction between the characters portrayed in literary texts, but between the real writers or speakers of literary texts and their real readers or hearers. Basically the aim is to relate the writing and reading of literary texts to the linguistic and sociocultural contexts in which those processes have taken place.

This approach originated with the work of Enkvist (1973), a stylistician who attempted to bridge the language-literature divide by developing a text linguistics which sees entire processes of production and reception as specific to particular sociocultural, situational and interactional circumstances (Sell 1991: xii). Drawing on theories of communication and literature such as Pratt's (1977) application of Grice's Cooperative Principle to literature, Bakhtin's (1981) sociological poetics and Fowler's account of literature as social discourse *(Fowler 1981), literary pragmatics* therefore sees the writing and reading of literary texts as interactional communication processes, inextricably linked with the particular social contexts within which they take place. According to Sell (1991: xiv), literary pragmatics is *not basically a type of literary scholarship which borrows theories and techniques from a separate* discipline of linguistics, and it is *not* basically a type of linguistic scholarship which uses literary texts as examples:

> It is, or aspires to be, at one *and the same time, both literary and linguistic. It* centres on what we have come to call literary texts, but it does not fundamentally distinguish the communication between literary writers and their readers from any other type of communication (Sell 1991: xiv).

Representatives of this field include Fowler (1981), Engler (1982, 1990), Birch & O'Toole (1987), van Peer (1988), Pettersson (1990), Stephens and Waterhouse (1990), Brönniman-Egger (1991), Sell (1991), Sell and Verdonk (1994) (Not all the representatives of this field call themselves literary pragmaticists).

Thus it is evident that discourse analysis has grown into a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline which finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use (McCarthy 1991: 2). This broad overview of some of the main players interested in discourse and brief definitions of what constitutes discourse will now be followed by a discussion of the types of discourse discussed in this thesis, namely feminist discourse and translation discourse, and the text-linguistic framework underpinning comparative analyses of feminist texts and their translations.

I have used the term 'discourse' deliberately in defining both feminism and translation to indicate the awareness that these domains are underpinned by ideological and cultural tensions. Feminists in particular aim to expose the collusion between ideology and cultural practices, as the following definition demonstrates:

> [Feminist discourse is] a type of writing consciously structured toward a major paradigmatic opposition between the woman and her vision of the world versus patriarchy, often including a textual polemic with the patriarchal word, together with a critique of language as a set of constraining structures imposed by patriarchy (Diaz-Diocaretz 1985: 4).

Similarly, translation by its very nature takes place not only across languages, but also across cultures and ideologies. Because it traverses the boundaries between cultures, by its very nature translation also represents the possibility of violating an established social order by introducing new ideas and new ideologies into the target culture. Although many translation theorists present their work as objective, it is important to remember that theories of translation (and not only translation practice) are attached to and dependent on a general theory of discourse which frames them. In other words, both translation theory and translation proper can be seen as *practice*, subject to differing circumstances of production and reception.

Furthermore, discourse goes beyond text: it covers, to a large extent, the abstract structure as related to the material conditions which are at the basis of the articulation of meaning. The term discourse therefore not only refers to (literary) feminist writing and (literary) translation practice, but to the 'real' (written but non-literary) discourse of feminists, their attitudes to society, etc. and to discourse about translation, 'theories' of translation. Thus, in this thesis, both feminist discourse and translation discourse are heterogeneous, being comprised of both 'real' and literary' discourse. In other words, a distinction is made between fictive writing which attempts to create a text world (literary discourse, whether it be feminist literary discourse or literary translation practice) and writing which attempts to explain a text world (theories about feminism or about translation).

2.3 Discourse and text: theoretical framework

As stated in the introduction to this thesis, my approach is an interdisciplinary one which aims to use discourse as a bridging point between feminism and translation. As can be seen from the preceding overview of the various branches of discourse analysis, there are a variety of ways to approach the question of discourse. The chief reason for using discourse analysis to examine feminist texts and feminist translations is that it is a way in which to examine more than mere texts; it is a method according to which it is possible to examine the ideological and cultural conditions of text (and translation) production. Because feminist translation is a process which is clearly influenced by the original feminist texts and the theories expounded in them and because feminist translators in turn claim to have influenced translation theory, it is important to be able to examine not only the theory and practice of feminist translation, but also the circumstances surrounding the production of this phenomenon.

In order to be able to study discourse (language in social action) as well as text (the written structure of language), it is important to be able to apply an analytical framework which allows the study not only of written text but also of the reasons underlying its production. Aspects of polysystem theory, critical discourse analysis and literary pragmatics provide the framework for discourse as process, and text linguistics provides the framework for my analysis of text as structure. I have followed Fairclough (1996: 55) in trying to develop a view of discourse analysis which goes some way to bridging the diverse disciplinary and theoretical interests in this field, by bringing together a broadly Foucaultian conception of discourses as differently positioned ways of signifying domains of practice and knowledge with the systemic linguistic view of discourse as process wherein texts are products. In the following sections, I discuss these theories in more detail and explain their relevance to the present study.

2.3.1 Theoretical background for the analysis of discourse

2.3.1.1 Aspects of polysystem theory and norms

Polysystem theory was developed initially by Itamar Even-Zohar (1971, 1978, 1979) in the 1970s and later expanded by Gideon Toury (1980, 1995), Shelly Yahalom (1981), and other scholars at the Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics at Tel Aviv university, on the basis of previous work by the Russian Formalists. Elements of the theory are also drawn from ideas presented by members of the Prague School of Structuralism and East European and Soviet comparatists and semioticians (such as Ďurišin (1974), Bakhtin (1981) and Lotman (1975)). The theory itself and the praxis inspired by it are compatible with, and often parallel to, those contemporary sociological approaches to literature which systematically study 'literary life' or 'the field of literature' (le champ littéraire) as a partially autonomous institution (eg Pierre Bourdieu's (1970) approach). Both the theory and its application are also open to ideas emanating from those involved in pragmatic reception studies (eg Karl Rosengren (1968), Gunter Berger(1985)).

Even-Zohar (1990: 11) defines 'polysystem' as:

> a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent.

Even-Zohar (1978, 1990) regards literature as a complex and dynamic system rather than a static collection of independent texts. According to this framework, all texts from a given literature, from canonical centre to distant periphery, enter into a permanent struggle for domination. Polysystem theory has developed a number of heuristic concepts such as 'model', 'repertoire', 'canonised' and 'non-canonised' texts, 'primary' and 'secondary' systems, 'periphery' and 'centre' to account for contact and interference among systems co-existing within a designated macrosystem. The notions of *canonised* versus *non-canonised* literature and *primary* versus *secondary* systems are particularly important for describing the tension between official and unofficial cultural strata. At any given time and place, literature can have more than one canon and centre, and the sub-systems can be classified as primary and secondary. Unlike the notion of canonisation versus non-canonisation, *primary versus secondary* is a historical-typological notion, referring to the degree (and type) of admissibility of new elements into a closed repertoire. A conservative system will have an established repertoire with predictable products, while an innovatory system draws on a new repertoire, and thus primary activity is presumed to be the activity which takes the initiative in creating new items and models for the repertoire, while the term secondary implies a derivatory, conservatory and simplificatory activity (Even-Zohar 1978).

In Even-Zohar's view, translated literature is only one of the elements in the struggle for domination, but it is an important one nevertheless - "no observer of the history of any literature can avoid recognising as an important fact the impact of translations and their role in the synchrony and diachrony of a certain literature" (Even-Zohar in Gentzler 1993: 116). Like any other literary activity, translation can therefore be seen as forming part of a plurality of interacting systems which are historically and functionally determined.

According to Even-Zohar (1978: 124-5), the two basic initial norms in translation will often correspond to two specific sets of systemic conditions. When translated texts perform a *primary* or innovating function, aiming to bring about a change in the dominating centre of a literary (sub)system, they can generally be classified as *adequate* (source-oriented) translations:

> [A]s translational activity participates, when it assumes a primary position, in the process of creating new models, the translator's main concern is not to look for ready-made models in his home stock, into which the original texts could be transferable; instead he is prepared to violate the home conventions. Under such conditions the chances that a translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy (in other words a reproduction of the dominant textual relations of the original) are greater than otherwise. (Even-Zohar 1978: 124-5)

Alternatively, translated texts may perform a *secondary* (conservative) function with regard to the dominant centre of the literary (sub-)system. When translated literature occupies a secondary position, it behaves totally otherwise:

> Since it is then the translator's main effort to concentrate upon finding the best ready-made models for the foreign text, the result often turns out to be a non-adequate translation. (Even-Zohar 1978: 125)

In other words, in this situation the translator will tend to produce an *acceptable* translation, which adapts the translation to the conventions of the target system.

The view of literature as a conglomerate of systems, as well as the growing interest in transfer and interference across systems, has meant that questions regarding the equivalence between source and target texts have become secondary to examination of the target text as part of the target textual system. The most significant development in this regard is Gideon Toury's (1980) notion of norms. Toury (1980) observed that there was a systematic disparity between what is theoretically possible in translation and what one observes in specific sociocultural situations. In specific domains of translational activity and within certain sociocultural parameters, certain types of translation behaviour occur again and again, translators choosing to employ only a fraction of the broad range of translation strategies actually available. Translation norms, which represent an intermediate level between competence and performance, are a useful tool in explaining this phenomenon.

Toury (1995: 51) defines norms as "the general values or ideas shared by a certain community as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate", and classifies norms as falling somewhere between formulated rules and instances of idiosyncratic behaviour. In his view, not only are some norms more important than others, but they are dynamic: near-rules may easily fade and individual deviations may acquire the status of norm. Norms are products of a specific context and are hierarchically related to other norms that regulate human behaviour. Translation norms may co-exist with other norms within the same field of activity, but they may also be in competition with other norms, leading to conflict and a struggle for dominance. Translators may decide to transgress or ignore existing norms in producing a translation and this norm transgression may be imitated by others, eventually leading to the development of an alternative norm. What also often happens is that norms can be internalised to such an extent that it is claimed by those who adhere to it that the behaviour required by the norm corresponds to some natural or universal logic and is the only type of behaviour possible. Translation norms are regarded as independent of differences between source and target systems, and are not determined by the source text. The notion thus relates to the target orientedness of polysystem theory in that it represents the possibilities and constraints provided by the target community.

Toury identifies three levels of translation norms: *preliminary*, *initial* and *operational*. *Preliminary norms* relate to extra-textual issues, such as attitudes to translation within a given culture, and the choice of languages and texts to be translated, whereas *operational norms* are the constraints directing the decisions during the actual transfer process. The *initial norm* refers to the initial intended translation policy of the translator and serves as a general point of reference for specific operational decisions to be taken. According to Toury (1980: 54), the initial norm is a useful way in which to indicate the translator's basic choice between two polar alternatives, *adequacy* and *acceptability*. Either the translator subjects her/himself to the original text and the textual relations and the norms expressed by it and contained in it (producing a source-oriented or *adequate* translation), or to the linguistic and literary norms active in the TL and the target literary polysystem (producing an *acceptable* translation, so called because the translator strives to make the translation acceptable to the target readership). Initial norms need no be verbalised or even conscious, and they may even contradict explicit intentions. Then too, a particular translation need not be consistent in its adequacy or acceptability - these are theoretical poles, and actual translations are likely to be located somewhere in between these extremes. The assumption is that initial norms may be revealed through investigations of *operational norms*, i.e. textual features.

According to Delabastita (1993: 48):

> As a result of the introduction of the concept of norm, translation studies will henceforth have to account for *three* levels on which translational relationships between STs and TTs may be established (Toury 1980): (i) on the level of theoretical translation *competence* a whole range of *possible* relationships between a ST and many potential TTS can be envisaged; (ii) on the level of translation *norms* certain of these potential ST-TT relationships are postulated to constitute veritable translation equivalence, whereas others will *a priori* be dismissed as invalid translational solutions; (iii) on the empirical level of translation *performance*, the translation researcher may perceive which types of translational relationships are *actually* established by the translators.

Thus, translators, consciously or unconsciously, follow certain translation norms in carrying out a translation. These translation norms are clearly interrelated with other sets of norms within the target language, culture, and text system. Norms can be identified only by reference to a corpus of source and target texts, a close examination of which would lead to the recording of strategies of translation repeatedly opted for in preference to other available strategies. Thus, analysis becomes focussed not on an individual translation and its failure to measure up to the source text, but on a coherent corpus of translated texts.

Polysystem theory provides the ideal framework for a study which examines feminist translation in Canada, since instead of being limited to studying a static model of a text within a given historical period, it becomes possible to examine shifts in models in terms of relations within the period, and also relational shifts outside the given historical period - "Synchrony and diachrony are admitted as systemic factors, and one arrives at heterogeneity by viewing the system not as static synchrony, but as dynamic polychrony" (Even-Zohar 1986: 1: 465). Polysystem theory does however possess some shortcomings, the first being that theorists tend to concentrate mainly on the *literary* systems underpinning texts and translations and not on other types of systems. Clearly, the tenets of polysystem theory allow for the examination of all types of systems; this shortcoming can be attributed to the way in which individual theorists have applied polysystems theory to specific case studies.

Another shortcoming of polysystem theory is its over-simplification of the context in which translations occur. A translation is not embedded in unified, clearly identifiable target systems; it may be influenced by a portion of a system only. This point has also been voiced by Lambert (1995: 98), who points out that many critics assume that literary traditions in the "static and mainly eurocentric principle of national literatures" coincide exactly with linguistic traditions and that all linguistic traditions coincide with national boundaries. In fact, the situation is not nearly as clear-cut, with borderline cases being the rule rather than the exception.

Then, too, polysystem theory does not sufficiently explore the influence of competing ideologies within a system; nor is its framework for the description of the contact/ interference between literary systems sufficient for the examination of the struggle for domination of one sub-system over another.

Toury (1995), in line with other polysystem theorists, suggests that the translation critic should start from observational facts, in other words from the translated text itself. Toury states: "Translations are facts of target cultures; on occasion facts of a special status, sometimes even constituting identifiable (sub)systems of their own, but of the target culture in any event." (Toury 1995: 29) While this is true, it can also result in the production of a somewhat skewed picture of reality, since a purely observational approach does not allow for an examination of the ideological/ cultural tensions underpinning the text, nor of the marginal status of the translator. Then, too, more attention needs to be paid to the influence of meta-textual, non-literary writing, particularly where a writer/ translator has an avowed political aim. Toury's theory of norms also does not account for those translators who choose deliberately to deviate from the norms and constraints of the target culture.

In my view, the term *discourse* is a good alternative for the term *system*. Using discourse instead of system allows for the examination of units smaller than the system; it also incorporates the idea of tension with the dominant, and makes the reader aware of the differential specificity of literary and cultural traditions. Analyses of discursive structures can then in turn be embedded in a broader social, political or cultural theory of the situations, contexts, institutions, groups and overall power relations that enable or result from such 'symbolic' structures. Certain aspects of critical discourse analysis are very useful in this regard.

2.3.1.2 Aspects of critical discourse analysis

Scholars working in critical linguistics recognise that what is at work in discourse - as in everything else, since discourse is taken to be the basis of cultural praxis - is always 'desire and power', but in order for the aims of desire and power to be realised, discourse must ignore its basis in them. As Foucault (Selden 1985: 100) says: "claims to objectivity made on behalf of specific discourses are always spurious; there are no absolutely "true" discourses, only more or less powerful ones". Discourses are resistant to internal criticism and self-scrutiny, since uttering viewpoints that seriously undermine them defines one as being outside them. The discourse itself defines what counts as acceptable criticism (Gee 1996: 132). In other words, a discourse defines itself in relation, or rather in opposition to other discourses, and at the same time, in order to establish its primacy, a discourse must deny the existence of these conflicting discourses. It must legitimate control or otherwise 'naturalise' the social order, and especially relations of inequality (Fairclough 1985). The discourse can then be called the dominant discourse. According to van Dijk (1993: 255), many more or less subtle forms of dominance become so persistent that they seem natural until they begin to be challenged, for instance, in the case of male dominance over women, white over black, rich over poor. When these forms of dominance become so prevalent that the dominated can be influenced to accept dominance and act in the interest of the powerful out of their own free will, one speaks of a *hegemony* (Gramsci 1971). In other words, power and dominance are organised and institutionalised. Social dominance of one group by another is not only enacted by individual members of the group, but may also be supported by legislature and the courts, enforced by the police and ideologically sustained and reproduced by the media or textbooks. This social, political and cultural organisation of dominance also implies a hierarchy of power: some members of dominant groups and organizations have a special role in planning, decision-making and control over the relations and processes of the enactment of power. What is interesting is that they also have privileged access to discourse: they are literally the ones who have the most to say.

The tenets of critical discourse analysis are clearly in keeping with the definition of feminism as a social, historical and cultural construct. For many feminists, women are particularly subject to the effects of ideology. There is a range of belief systems about women which do not fit with the reality of women's lives. These systems of belief are not simply imposed upon women, but women themselves may actively take part in them, appropriate them and/or resist them. Here it is important to note that Anglo-American feminist inquiry has historically concentrated on content analyses of texts and on relating representations of women to a generalised female self-identity and experience, rather than on analyses at the linguistic level of texts. Because content analysis inevitably reduces a theorist to a subjective evaluation of text ('Is this text sexist?') and therefore assumes a single meaning for the text, this approach is perhaps one of the greatest shortcomings of Anglo-American feminist criticism. Thus, as Mills (1995: 10) points out, those wishing to conduct a gendered linguistic analysis of text have therefore turned to French feminist literary and psychoanalytical theory in combination with the approaches formulated by critical linguists and critical discourse analysts. Like critical linguists, these feminists believe that no discourse can ever be neutral; no discourse or ideology can have one undisputed meaning which is recognised by all readers. Thus, instead of producing an unequivocal reading of a text, "instead of fidelity to the assumption that coherent theory is a desirable end in itself" (Harding in Mills 1995: 157), it is possible to offer a reading which explains the contradictory forces present in a text, which can then be interpreted in a variety of different ways according to the set of assumptions which the reader brings to bear on the interpretative process.

2.3.1.3 Aspects of literary pragmatics

Literary pragmaticists provide some further insight into the way in which 'real' and literary discourses should be analysed and the question of whether in fact a distinction should be made between the two types of discourse. In considering the difference between these types of discourses, between so-called 'real' discourses and the discourses found in literature, one has to examine to what extent literature can be said to be like, or unlike, other uses of language. Roger Sell (1994: 27) sums the situation up as follows:

> Scholars still inspired by the literary formalism of the Anglo-American New Critics have tended to argue that readers experience literature as a special, aesthetic heterocosm, with its own kind of logic and beauty. There has also been the strong Jakobsonian tradition of formalist work stemming from the Russian Formalists, which has seen the specialness of literature as differentially marked in detailed features of language and style. In recent decades, however, scholars representing a wide range of approaches - from deconstruction to discourse analysis, ideological critique and Bakhtinian sociolinguistic poetics - have suggested that literature is not so special after all. In various ways they have argued that it is deeply rooted in particular cultural configurations, and that its language basically works in the same way as any other language.

I am in broad agreement with the second position, whose followers argue that a literary work is a discourse like any other, an ideological exploitation of language which is socially constructed and should therefore be subjected to critical analysis in the same way as other discourses (eg Fowler 1986). Eagleton (in Widdowson 1994: 33) states, for instance:

> My own view is that it is most useful to see 'literature' as a name which people give from time to time for different reasons to certain kinds of writing within a whole field of what Michel Foucault has called 'discursive practices.'

In other words, literature is what a certain group of people at a certain time decide to treat as literature. However, there is something to be said for the first position, in other words for the appreciation that literature is somehow 'special', since this position allows for the suspension of reality on the part of the reader. One follower of the latter position is Henry Widdowson, a linguist and stylistician who does not deny his sympathy with the formalist tradition in criticism and stylistics (but who does not at the same time believe in the complete decontextualisation of literature). He argues that there is a function which is peculiar to poetry alone. In his view, all other types of discourse are designed to eliminate particulars and to abstract from the immediacy of individual experience in order to sustain more general sociocultural beliefs and values. They serve the cause of social stability and control by establishing conventional frames of reference (which do of course shift and change, but always at the same remove from the actuality of individual experience) (Widdowson 1994: 35). All such discourse is normative and socially sanctioned, and its interpretation depends less on the 'creation' of a context than on a real context's 'reconstitution'. The distinctiveness of literature, on the other hand, lies for Widdowson in its preoccupation, less with abstractions, than with particular contexts of its own 'creation'. By this means it represents types of possible experience which other discourses, of their very nature, seek to suppress. He is therefore convinced that literature is best seen as a **counter-discourse**, which explores the fugitive and unaccountable realities of a world that is not socially sanctioned, and in this resides its very considerable value (Sell 1994: 28).[3] For example, radical feminist writing could very easily

---

[3] Another person who believes strongly that literature is a special form of discourse is Siegfried Schmidt. His notion of what constitutes literary convention (which appears in his *Foundation for the Empirical Study of Literature*) is one which is not well known outside Continental Europe, and was particularly influential on the polysystem theory developed by the Israeli Itamar Even-Zohar (1978, 1990) (which in turn profoundly influenced translation studies). Schmidt (in Pilkington 1994: 95) hypothesises the existence of two conventions which are social and learned: the E (for aesthetic) convention and the P (for polyvalence) convention, which may be characterised as follows:
The aesthetic convention: 'releases the reader from the accepted mode of reality'; suspends the need to fix reference or determine practical usefulness; de-emphasises the fact convention
The polyvalence convention: 'allows the reader to attribute multiple meanings to a simple text; replaces the monovalence convention; 'text receivers have the freedom to produce different Kommunikate (representations of a text) from the same text in different times and situations (= weak version of the polyvalence convention hypothesis) or in the same reading process (= strong version of the polyvalence convention hypothesis).

According to Pilkington (1994: 98), Schmidt suggests that the E and P conventions might be seen as conventions of the Gricean and Searlean type, being "special-occasion conventions be described as a counter-discourse, since writers within this paradigm attempt to challenge and subvert conventional ideas about women, and about writing. They present a utopian world to the reader, by which means they hope to make that utopian world a reality.

Of course, although literature may be seen as a counter-discourse which flouts the conventions of naturally occurring discourses, it does have its own literary conventions, known as genre. These literary conventions may in turn be flouted to create certain effects on the reader, as is the case in feminist writing and postmodernist writing. Accordingly, in the next section I examine the concept of genre in discourse.

Since classical times it has been customary to think of literature as consisting of different kinds of works, and one function of a poetics from Aristotle onwards has been to try and classify them, from theoretical, structural and also historical perspectives (Also Frye 1957). The broadest and commonest division is that of genre, between poetry, prose and drama, which can then be subdivided into sub-genres, e.g lyric, epic, ode, ballad, sonnet in the case of poetry. Even these are broad types; the number of possible sub-genres is endless. But the significant point is that, whatever the level of abstraction, no literary work exists in isolation: it is related to other texts, belongs to an intertextual 'system' (Kristeva 1969)[4], and so cannot be understood except in relation to its place in that system. Hodge (1990: 27) makes

---

that require the suspension of conventions that operate for 'normal discourse.'" Pilkington then asks whether it is possible for special conventions to operate alone, if the conventional maxims are suspended: in other words, is it a completely distinct set of conventions (however defined) that guide the interpretation of literary effects? (In Pilkington's (1994: 98) view, this is highly unlikely, and he in fact argues that no reasonable case can be made for literary reading conventions to be code-like or maxim-like.)

Intertextuality, a notion common to both text linguistics and in literary theory, was first introduced into French criticism in the late 1960s by Kristeva (1969) in her discussion and elaboration of the ideas of Bakhtin, and his general dialogical principle in particular (Wales 1990: 259). Basically, it can be defined as utterances/texts in relation to other utterances/texts. Even within a single text there can be, as it were, a continual 'dialogue' between the text given and other texts/ utterances that exist outside it, literary and non-literary: either within that same period of composition, or in previous centuries. Kristeva argues, in fact, that no text is 'free' of other texts. For the reader, therefore, intertextuality functions as an important frame of reference which helps in the interpretation of a text (see Eco 1979). A text may be a transformation of another, but borrowing is a more obvious process, whether in the form of a phrase, a quotation or allusion, titles or structural models.

the point that genres and domains are fundamentally different kinds of object from texts.

> Texts have a material existence, but genres and domains do not exist in the same direct material form. They are a construct, a projection from specific rules and regularities, themselves produced and maintained by specific agents through specific practices that constrain or enable the production of meaning. As a consequence, genres and domains can seem peculiarly invisible and inaccessible to study. The kind of knowledge at issue is typically not in the text itself, but is implicit in the tendencies of many texts. In so far as genre and domain entail specific production and reception regimes which control interpretation of texts, it is these categories rather than individual texts which can seem decisive for the study of social meaning.

However arbitrary may appear to be the boundary between one genre and another, what distinguishes them, and what determines how genres are traditionally defined, is usually the set or cluster of structural and stylistic properties that have come to be associated with them.[5] As Todorov (in Bex 1994: 114) has argued: "In a society, the recurrence of certain discursive properties is institutionalised, and individual texts are produced and perceived in relation to the norm constituted by this codification." Thus, although the basic genre divisions themselves seem uncontentious, the construction of a system of genres is in fact not at all simple or unproblematic:

> A system of genres is the product of an act of classification, and classification is always a strategy of control. What is classified and controlled is not just texts. The classifications of texts are also classifications of people - readers and writers - and of what they write or read about and what they should think and mean. Clearly the concept of genre is crucial in understanding how literature is implicated in basic systems of control.(Hodge 1990: 21)

A broader definition of genre is provided by Swales (Bex 1994: 115), who suggests that particular genres arise because of the existence of discourse communities with shared communicative interests. He defines genre as 'a class of communicative events':

(a) with a shared public purpose
(b) that is recognised or recognisable by a speech community (societies give genre-names to types of events they see as distinctive and

---

5 Not that the 'rules' for a genre are always slavishly followed: practice may differ from precept, and literary innovation has always balanced conformity. The novel is the most difficult genre to characterise, and one precisely in which formal experimenting is equally characteristic. And there are so-called 'mixed genres', which blend one variety with another, e.g. mock-epic, tragi-comedy. (Wales 1990: 206-7).

recurring).

(c) that is (within varying degrees of freedom) structured and standardised (and thus imposes constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their positioning, form and intent).

In Bex's view (1994: 115) this definition is useful because it recognises three important features: firstly, that the existence of a particular genre signifies a purpose, and that the recognition of a text as belonging to a generic type is likely to influence the way in which that text is interpreted. The second is that genres belong to speech communities: i.e. the producers as well as consumers of texts. And the third is that particular genres exhibit describable (though variable) formal characteristics. Communicative purpose is the defining feature by which a genre such as academic discourse can be recognised - as opposed to the use of genre in literary criticism, where genres are distinguished by form.

Thus, if a genre is a model of writing, it also becomes a model of expectations for the reader. We frame a text within a genre from our general knowledge of reading, and so tolerate the death of the hero in a tragedy, but not in a comedy. Genre choice may therefore be legitimately regarded as one of the constraining features involved in interpreting a text. But what happens when our expectations are thwarted by a new twist to the normal or typical pattern? When we are confronted with examples of deviations from conventional genres? How exactly can the reader's experiences be analysed? And, in particular, how can one account for the reading of postmodernist or deconstructive texts, which aim explicitly to challenge conventional notions of genre?

The process and experience of reading as such is not available for discursive analysis. However, several literary pragmaticists argue that relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986) can be used to account for the way in which a reader interprets a text. The principle of relevance can be summarised as follows:

> The speaker's task is to make sure that the thought she intends to convey is consistent with the principle of relevance: otherwise, she runs the risk of not being properly understood. The hearer's task is to find the interpretation which is consistent with the principle of relevance; otherwise, he runs the risk of misunderstanding the utterance or not understanding it at all. (Sperber & Wilson in Pilkington 1991: 50).

A convincing view of language designed to account for indeterminacy, relevance theory attempts to explain how hearers interpret verbal communications which are, by definition, incomplete representations of speakers' thoughts and assumptions. Sperber & Wilson (1986: 158) assume that human communication is intended to be relevant. They take as axiomatic the view that every act of verbal communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance and secondly, that all verbal communication is an incomplete representation of a set of assumptions that the speaker wishes to make mutually manifest. Thus, Sperber & Wilson assume that utterances require extensive pragmatic inferencing before they can be interpreted successfully. The following example illustrates their theory of interpretation (Bex 1994: 109-113):

Jane: Is Peter around?
Andy: It's after five.

In order to make sense of this exchange, the participants would clearly have to identify the referents and deal with the semantic ambiguity of *around*. More interestingly, Jane would have to establish a context in which Andy's reply achieves optimal relevance. She would then be able to understand the propositional form explicated by Andy's utterance, but this would still not provide her with a satisfactory answer to her question. However, her knowledge that 5 o'clock is regarded as the end of the working day would allow her to access some of the implicatures of Andy's statement, the first of which would be:
5 o'clock is when employees like Peter leave work
followed by the implicated conclusion:
Peter is no longer here.

This conclusion is likely to be the strongest assumption to be inferred from Andy's reply, and it therefore achieves relevance for Jane. However, since Andy did not simply respond with:
He's gone home,
Jane realises that Andy wished to communicate something more. Some possible assumptions might be: Andy regards Peter as a clock watcher; Andy thinks Peter is lazy; Andy is jealous

of Peter; Andy wishes to ingratiate himself by staying at work after 5 o'clock, etc. Some of these assumptions might be strongly implicated by the intonation of the utterance, for instance, whereas others might be more weakly implicated. However, the range of assumptions that are made strongly manifest to Jane are precisely those which she regards as having the strongest contextual effects and therefore the most relevance to herself at that time.

From this Bex (1994: 111-2) concludes that readers are not free to interpret works as they wish, but are constrained by various factors, some of which are inherent in the context of text production (such as genre) and some of which are inherent in the formal properties of the language (such as syntactic form, which is an important determining factor in the interpretation of sentences). He points out that there are other properties of language which, although not strictly formal, serve to constrain interpretations equally powerfully. For instance, conversation analysis suggests that questions are typically followed by answers even though the answers may be deferred. Thus in the above example, the posing of a question establishes a context such that Jane is obliged to treat the response as an answer. Had Andy responded with a string of nonsense, Jane would still have attempted to establish its relevance as an answer, or failing that, its relevance as a refusal to give an answer. If this should still prove impossible, she would rightly conclude that Andy was violating the rules of conversation.

Enkvist (1994: 53) also believes that relevance theory can be used in the interpretation of literary texts:

> Once we agree that interpreting a text involves building a context, a scenario, a text world, a state-of-affairs around it, relevance theory tells us something about the principles we use to restrict the text world and to choose the most relevant from among several possible text worlds.

He contends that relevance theory can even be used to interpret poststructuralist and deconstructive texts. In his view, the only difference between these texts and more conventional texts is that in poststructuralist texts there has been a tendency to give the reader's imagination free rein: "Irrespective of which side of the barricades I choose, I still see no real contrast between my suggestions of contextualisation as interpretation, and the poststructuralists' loss of definite single meanings in the jungle of potential ones" (Enkvist

1994: 53). In his view, those who find many meanings, including contradictions and denials, in a text have in fact built many text worlds, which may be coherent in themselves but still contradict and deny each other, around the same text. So, the difference between traditionalists and deconstructionists turns out to be one of relevance thresholds. Those who find many meanings have lower relevance thresholds: they regard such matters as relevant that readers bent on single, or fewer, meanings, would exclude.

But what about writers or speakers? How can relevance theory account for their text production? According to Bex (1994: 112), although Sperber and Wilson do not discuss how speakers construct utterances in any great detail, they do state that similar processes apply, possibly in reverse order:

> Conversely, a communicator cannot directly present an audience with an assumption. All a speaker can do is present a stimulus, hoping that its perception by members of the audience will lead to a modification of their cognitive environment and trigger some cognitive processes (Sperber & Wilson in Bex 1994: 112).

This idea is echoed, though in rather different terms, by the feminist writer H.D.:

> My sign-posts are not yours, but if I blaze my own trail, it may help to give you confidence and urge you to get out of the murky, dead, old, thousand-times explored old world, the dead world of overworked emotions and thoughts. (Griffin 1994: 12).

In selecting a specific stimulus, speakers (or writers) pay attention not only to such formal features of the language as syntax and semantics, but also to discourse features. Bex (1994: 113) believes that Andy, if he is acting in good faith, may well wish to convey all the assumptions that Jane has computed, but he will also want his utterance to be considered as an answer to the question. Bex follows Bakhtin (in Bex 1994: 113) in arguing that the construction of utterances involves the selection of specific grammatical forms associated with the discursive practices that are taking place. This position is not dissimilar to that of Hallidayan linguistics, which claims that particular textual functions are realised ultimately by specific choices at the lexicogrammatical level. From this perspective, speakers choose their utterances deliberately to fulfil particular functions.

For example, consider the first paragraph from Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing* (1979):

> I can't believe I'm on the road again, twisting along past the lake where the white birches are dying, the disease is spreading up from the south, and I notice they now have sea-planes for hire. But this is still near the city-limits: we didn't go through, it's swelled enough to have a bypass, that's success.

This extract is not easy to understand, since it is difficult to make connections and to find the relevance relations between one statement and another. Although each clause is superficially related to the next by a comma or by 'and', the logical relations between the clauses are not self-evident - what is the link between the narrator's concern about the spread of a disease affecting birches and the fact that there are sea-planes for hire? 'But' doesn't seem to indicate a contrast, either. This passage might perhaps cause the reader to think the narrator is deranged and the lack of connection between clauses is a signpost to the reader of that fact, or perhaps this passage is introducing problems which will be resolved further on. But what is most likely is that the reader will assume that the author is attempting to show how visual images are tracing a path across the narrator's awareness in a stream-of-consciousness manner (Mills 1995: 36). According to Mackenzie (Bex 1994: 125):

> when we are confronted by texts that might be variously classified as experimental or postmodernist or metafictional, texts that at first seem to resist all our interpretative procedures, we might assume that our assumptions are being intentionally challenged by the text's *author*.

Bex (1994: 125) qualifies this by saying that although readers are being challenged, they are being challenged within the limits of a recognisable genre, and that such challenges would make no sense if they had to be faced without some assumptions as to how a particular genre might work. All texts - spoken or written - construct a favoured position from which they are to be received (Fairclough 1989, 1992; Hodge and Kress 1988). In this sense, all texts are also about solidarity, that is, the construction of the 'right' sorts of listeners and readers, ones sufficiently like the social identity the speaker or writer has adopted for the construction of that particular text. Of course, we can choose to be 'resistant' hearers or readers, reading against the grain of the text and disavowing solidarity with the (implied) speaker and/or writer and his/her text.

Clearly, therefore, the interpretation and processing of text relies on the reader's input, on the associations existing in the mind of the reader. A text becomes meaningful discourse only at the time when it is being read, that is, when the reader starts to build up interpersonal and socio-cultural contexts by imagining plausible circumstances and motives which could have given rise to the discourse gradually taking shape. This notion that identity - whether personal or artistic - is not essential, but socially constructed (by the audience) is exemplified in the following quote by Gertrude Stein:

> When you are writing before there is an audience anything written is as important as any other thing and you cherish anything and everything that you have written. After the audience begins, naturally they create something, that is they create you, and so not everything is so important, something is more important than another thing, which is not true when you were you that is when you were not you as your little dog knows you. (Stein in Griffin 1994: 1)

Thus, there are several aspects of critical discourse analysis and literary pragmatics which may be of use in this study. The notion of discourse as propounded in critical discourse analysis has a number of applications in the present study. Firstly, it clearly underpins my definitions of feminism and translation. Both feminist and translation discourse are seen as social, cultural and historical constructs. Secondly, this notion of discourse is a particularly useful tool in promoting reflection on the power play between dominant and peripheral discursive systems in the fields of translation and of feminism. This aspect forms the focus of chapter 3, which aims to provide insight into the choice of certain viewpoints and theories over others in both translation and feminism, which in turn led to the phenomenon of feminist translation in Canada. Thirdly, this view of discourse allows for a description of the underlying ideological assumptions in all texts, and is therefore useful in explaining why feminist translators' metatextual commentary coincides/ contradicts with feminist translation practice as well as providing insight into the paradigm within which readers understand feminist translation and the possible implications of feminist translation for translation studies as a whole.

The view of literature not as an isolated set of 'special' texts but as discourse influenced and generated by society which can be analysed by means of rigorous methods of text analysis as propounded by literary pragmaticists, is also particularly valuable and is implied in my definitions of feminist discourse and translation discourse. Literary pragmatics enables discussion of the linguistic interaction between the real writers or speakers of literary texts and their real readers or hearers. Thus the writing and reading of literary texts can be related to the linguistic and sociocultural contexts in which those processes have taken place. What is clearly also important is the notion that postmodernist texts, which challenge conventional notions of genre and language, can be understood in terms of relevance relations. Thus, while feminist discourse, in deconstructing patriarchy, may seem to transgress traditional boundaries of genre, language and meaning, readers do still have a schema within which to categorise this type of discourse. Readers of feminist texts are being challenged, but within the limits of a recognisable genre with its own distinctive rules, which include the refusal to reduce a text to one single meaning, and the espousal of the 'free play' of meanings. But, as Enkvist (1994: 53) puts it, the difference between these rules and more traditional rules is simply that of relevance thresholds. Finding many textual meanings in a text simply means having a lower relevance threshold than the conventional reader; constructing many text worlds around a text and accepting as relevant what readers bent on single, or fewer, meanings, would exclude.

Although critical discourse analysis and literary pragmatics are useful in informing my discussion of discourse as process, they are less helpful for comparative text analysis. This is because of the narrow focus of analysis on the part of many critical linguists in particular - the lack of an integrated model of language use to underpin stylistic analyses, coupled with the analysis of short fragments of texts from one angle only (e.g. transitivity), while perhaps necessary for the authors' purposes, may produce unbalanced and narrow interpretations. As Geslin (1996: 47) remarks:

> Eclecticism might provide varied angles from which to consider the processes of meaning making, but the price to be paid is the superficial bittiness apparent in many of the critical linguistics analyses.

Thus, discourse analysis of a different type, namely text linguistics, (which is a branch of systemic functional linguistics) will be used in this study to examine written discourse and text connectivity in a defined corpus of four feminist texts written by Brossard and their feminist translations. Text connectivity is an aspect which clearly merits examination in texts and translations which fall within the deconstructive/ feminist paradigm, as I shall briefly explain. As mentioned in my introductory chapter, in feminist texts such as those written by Nicole

Brossard, textual meaning as we know it is deconstructed, and the only 'meaning' residing in a text is reflected by wordplay, by lexical connections. The same applies to feminist translations of these texts, where the feminist translator aims to create a 'different' chain of signifiers via translation as well as to translate for form, for the 'signifier', instead of translating for meaning, for the 'signified', as is usual in translation. (These statements are motivated in detail in Chapter 3). This approach makes it impossible to carry out a conventional comparative analysis of the meaning transfer between source and target texts, and the value of conducting a comparative text analysis based on the **repetition of surface relations in text**, so vital to feminist texts written within a deconstructive paradigm, immediately becomes apparent.

2.3.2 Theoretical background for the analysis of text: text linguistics

In the present section, I provide the theoretical text-linguistic framework underlying my comparative text analyses, the analytical framework for which is described in Chapter 4 (Text as structure) and applied in Chapter 5 (Text analysis). As mentioned earlier, text linguistics can be divided into two main approaches: 'text as structure' (cohesion) and 'text as process' (coherence), the former analysing the surface structure of texts, the latter the semantic and rhetorical relations underlying discourse. The text-linguistic focus here is on text as structure, or *cohesion*, with particular attention being paid to the concepts of *repetition links*. This section is not an exhaustive literature review of the various approaches to the study of cohesion in text linguistics, but rather a directed discussion which aims to use cohesion as a tool, in order to show how cohesion relates to textual organisation and, ultimately, how it relates to the textual organisation of feminist/ deconstructive texts.

2.3.2.1 Defining text linguistic terms

2.3.2.1.1 Defining cohesion

The concept of cohesion may be broadly defined as the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors and successors in a text (Hoey 1991: 3). Jackson (in Carstens 1997: 110) states:

> Cohesion refers to the ways in which sentences of a text are *grammatically* and *lexically linked*. A bond is formed between one sentence and another because the interpretation of a sentence either depends on or is informed by some item

in a previous - usually the previous - sentence.

Cohesion serves a number of important functions, the most important of which is its contribution to the well-formedness of texts. Fowler (1986: 69) states in this regard that it is textual cohesion which distinguishes a well-formed text from a random list of sentences. A text has a certain internal structure; sentences must be linked together in some way. Cohesion involves the explicit linking of sentences, not just the linking of ideas, and thus it also makes textual connections explicit to a listener or reader. In order to better communicate ideas, writers must consider how best to make the text comprehensible; they must consider cohesion.

One of the key questions asked with regard to cohesion is: What is the nature of a cohesive relationship? Is it syntactic or semantic? Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 8) answer is unequivocal:

> Cohesion is a *semantic relation* beween an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it. This other element is also to be found in the text; but its location in the text is no way determined by the grammatical structure. The two elements, the *presupposing* and the *presupposed*, may be structurally related to each other, or they may not; it makes no difference to the meaning of the cohesive relation.

Werth (in Carstens 1997: 112) confirms this:

> Cohesion is usually regarded as *a semantic process of interconnecting sentences* in a text, and sure enough, the effects of cohesion appear in the linguistic forms of sentences. The linguistic forms involved included pronouns, definite noun phrases, ellipsis and emphasis. However, when we come to examine such accounts closely, we find that they are crucially *conditioned by the requirements of semantic connectivity.*

Thus, cohesion is a *semantic* relation which is realised *syntactically* in the surface text through the lexico-grammatical system - in other words, syntactic means are used to express semantic relations between elements in a text.

2.3.2.1.2 The relationship between cohesion and coherence

According to De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 13), whereas cohesion describes