

The Psychoanalytic Concept of *Transference*: Its Applications in Literary and Translation Studies. Transferential Models of Reading

Le concept psychanalytique du “transfert”: applications dans le domaine de la critique littéraire et de la traduction. Modèles transférentiels de la lecture

Conceptul psihanalitic de *transfer*: aplicații în sfera criticii literare și a traducerii. Modele transferențiale ale lecturii

Lorelei CARAMAN-PAȘCA

Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iași, Facultatea de Litere

B-dul Carol I, Nr. 11, 700506, Iași, ROMÂNIA

E-mail: lorelei.legend@gmail.com

Abstract

Drawing from various understandings of the concept of “transference” in psychoanalysis, this paper seeks to provide a critical overview of its adaptations and uses in the field of literary and translation studies. Focusing on some of the transferential models of reading and translation, it aims to show both how psychoanalysis and literature may inform one another, as well as how the critical reading or the literary translation may be viewed, not as a passive act, but as a two-way relationship characterized by intricate dynamics. In this new perspective, reading therefore becomes a space of the unconscious, while the unconscious becomes a space of reading.

Resumé

Partant des différentes acceptions du concept de “transfert” dans la psychanalyse, cet article se propose d’offrir une perspective critique sur le mode dans lequel cette notion peut être appliquée dans le domaine de la critique littéraire et de la traductologie. En présentant les divers modèles transférentiels de la lecture et de la traduction, on analyse, d’une part, la façon dont la psychanalyse et la littérature peuvent se rapporter l’une à l’autre et, d’autre part, la façon dont la lecture critique ou la traduction littéraire peuvent être envisagées, non pas comme un acte passif, mais plutôt comme une relation réciproque caractérisé par une dynamique complexe. Dans cette nouvelle acception, la lecture devient ainsi un espace de l’inconscient, tandis que l’inconscient devient un espace de la lecture.

Rezumat

Pornind de la diferitele accepțiuni ale conceptului de “transfer” în psihanaliză, această lucrare își propune să ofere o perspectivă critică asupra modului în care noțiunea poate fi aplicată în sfera criticii literare și a traductologiei. Prin prezentarea diverselor modele transferențiale ale lecturii și ale traducerii, se urmărește evidențierea, pe de o parte, a felului în care psihanaliza și literatura se pot raporta una la cealaltă și, pe de altă parte, aducerea în discuție a modului în care lectura critică sau traducerea literară pot fi văzute, nu ca un act pasiv, ci mai degrabă ca o relație reciprocă, caracterizată printr-o dinamică complexă. În această nouă accepțiune, lectura devine, prin urmare, un spațiu al inconștientului, iar inconștientul devine un spațiu al lecturii.

Keywords: *transference, psychoanalysis, literature, translation, critical reading*

Mots clefs: *transfert, psychanalyse, littérature, traduction, lecture critique*

Cuvinte cheie: *transfer, psihanaliză, literatură, traducere, lectură critică*

Introduction

In the last few decades, critics and theoreticians have become more and more interested in the dynamics of the relationship between the critic/translator and the literary text. Searching for a model which could account for the complex interactions involved in the process of translation or critical reading, they turned to the psychoanalytic concept of transference. Through the concept of transference and counter-transference, the psychoanalytic experience is regarded as the materialization of the points of intersection between analyst and analysand, or otherwise said, as a series of dynamic interchanges within the analytic dyad. Yet critical analysis and literary translation presuppose a similar intersection: that between, on the one hand, the unconscious forces present in the text and, on the other hand, the workings of the critic's or the translator's own unconscious. What therefore takes place is a perpetual negotiation of identities on the meeting ground between two "unconscious-es". The designation of various transferential models permits the formulation of a new perspective on the reciprocal nature of the relation of reading or translation. In consequence, the following paper explores the uses, appropriations and adaptations of the concept of transference in the sphere of literary and translation studies. As such, it will first address the history, evolution and expansions of the concept in the field of psychoanalysis, before moving to a theoretical overview of some transference-based models developed in the field of literary and translation studies. The aim of the paper is a twofold one: first, it seeks to show how psychoanalysis can fruitfully merge with the study of literature, how these two distinct disciplines can inform each other, and second, it sets out to offer a perspective on the process of reading, not as a passive act, but rather as a dynamic, mutually-influenced space of interaction.

Transference in Psychoanalysis: from Freud to Lacan

If the problem of transference only more recently took center stage in critical-literary and translation studies, in psychoanalysis, by contrast, it has always constituted a core issue of concern. Having undergone a number of modifications, alterations or expansions from one school of psychoanalysis to the other, the concept presents with its own convulsed history within the field. Historically however, it may be said that transference essentially begins with a failure. Freud's first formulations on this matter appear in the context of a failure of analysis in one of his more difficult cases: the famous case of Dora. Dora, an eighteen-year old girl who presents with symptoms of hysteria, announces, at one point during her treatment, her decision to stop her analysis with Freud. Searching, in retrospect, for the factors which contributed to this outcome, Freud develops his theory of transference. Realizing that Dora had been replacing him with the figure of her father, her stopping of the treatment therefore represented a form of "acting-out" against her father. From these first formulations, transference consequently emerges as a psychological process in which a figure from the past (often maternal or paternal) is superimposed upon the figure of the therapist. It is essentially both a failure of reading and a failure of translation: the past is mistranslated and misread by the unconscious as the present. To explain these phenomena, interestingly enough, Freud resorts to a literary metaphor. He refers to "transferences" as "new editions or facsimiles":

What are transferences? They are new editions or facsimiles of the tendencies and phantasies which are aroused and made conscious during the progress of the analysis; but they have this peculiarity, which is characteristic for their species, that they replace some earlier person by the person of the physician. To put it another way: a whole series of psychological experiences are revived, not as belonging to the past, but as applying to the person of the physician at the present moment [1 p. 119].

Critiquing Freud's insistence on the sexual aspects of transference, Carl Jung further expands this concept to accommodate for a spiritual and creative dimension as well. Noting that

transferential relationships also occur outside the clinical setting and are not limited to the figure of the analyst, the Jungian school opens up the notion of transference towards other humanistic fields and disciplines. For instance, Ann Belford Ulanov, a Jungian analyst, speaks of transference as “a phenomenon that occurs when one person becomes the carrier for an unconscious content activated in another person.” [2 p. 68] But the transferential relationship, she says, is not limited to a person-to-person, therapist-to-patient interaction; it can be triggered, she continues, by “a book, a piece of hearsay or a legend.” [2] The ramifications of Ulanov’s remarks also extend towards the field of literary theory. What is significant here is the idea that insofar as it “becomes the carrier for an unconscious content activated in another person,” literature constitutes itself as an object of the reader’s transference, just as the analyst becomes an object of the patient’s transference.

The Jungian school also brought another contribution to the issue in question in the form of the development of the idea of “counter-transference”. Until the 1940s, the concept of “counter-transference” featured only sparingly in Freudian-based psychoanalytic theories. Freud mentions it briefly in his 1910 paper *Future Prospects of Psycho-analysis*, where he defines it as “a result of the patient’s influence on his [the analyst’s] unconscious feelings.” The analyst, Freud says, must “recognize this counter-transference in himself and overcome it.” [1 p. 145] Jung, on the other hand, sees counter-transference as an inevitable component of the analytic process. He envisages the relation of transference as fundamentally reciprocal, stressing the fact that unconscious exchanges follow a two-way direction and may occur both from the patient to the therapist as well as from the therapist to the patient. To illustrate this, Jung draws on the alchemical concept of “coniunctio” or “mystic marriage”. The intensity of the analysand-to-analyst bond in transference is compared to the process of chemical combination expressed by *coniunctio*: “When two chemical substances combine, both are altered. This is precisely what happens in the transference.” [3 p.171] The unconscious content which the analysand “brings to bear” upon the analyst has an inevitable “inductive effect” upon the latter. It cannot leave him/her unaltered. This leads Jung to define the transferential relation as one of “mutual unconsciousness” [3 p.176].

Not without its contradictions or ambiguities, the Lacanian take on the concept of transference is perhaps one of the most frequently employed by literary critics and theoreticians. Regarding the psychoanalytic experience as fundamentally dialectical in nature, Jacques Lacan therefore defines transference “in terms of pure dialectic” [4 p.178]. To demonstrate this, Lacan returns to Freud’s *A Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria* and he postulates that Dora’s case history is laid out by Freud in a “series of dialectical reversals.” [4 p.178] For him, this particular organization is not incidental as its role is to perpetuate the movement of analysis through a series of new developments of truth: “What is involved,” he says, “is a scansion of structures in which truth is transmuted for the subject” [4 p.178].

Dora “begins her indictment by opening up a file full of memories” [4 p. 178] and this constitutes an initial thesis. Her material is then confronted by the analyst whose “dialectical reversal” thus creates an antithesis. According to Lacan, Freud accomplishes this when he questions Dora’s own involvement in the situation [4 p.179]. This dialectical reversal sequentially produces a novel insight or a transmutation of truth. In Dora’s case, it is the realization of her own complicity in the web of relationships around her. This newly obtained insight corresponds to a “new development of truth” or to the synthesis. For Lacan, as long as the process keeps advancing along dialectical lines, analysis may progress smoothly. He therefore explains the failure of analysis in the case of Dora as a result of a disruption in these dialectical series of reversals. In *Beyond the Reality Principle, a Phenomenological Description of Psychoanalytic Experience*, Lacan describes two registers with which the analyst operates. One is represented by *interpretation* and the other by *transference*: the former operates on an intellectual level, whereas the latter shapes the affective level. Via interpretation, the analyst offers “intellectual elucidation,” while transference is used for “handling affect” [4 p. 68]. What appears as a striking detail in Lacan is not necessarily the contention on Freud’s bias in the case of Dora, but rather the unusual inverted stance he takes on the transference/counter-transference order in the analytic process. For him, transference constitutes,

not the patient's, but on the contrary, the analyst's creation: it is "the doing [*opération*]," he says, "of the analyst who interprets it." [4 p.178]

This standpoint raises a number of problematical questions. For if transference were "the price paid" for the analyst's biases, representing the unwanted consequence of his/her interpretational mistakes, how can it be employed, at the same time, as an analytical tool for handling the analysand's affect? Also, how does it posit itself in relation to the original Freudian notion of the therapeutic value of transference? Or of the element of spontaneity characterizing this process? Although not clearly stated, it may be nevertheless inferred that when Lacan describes transference as an error on the part of the analyst, he is, in fact, referring exclusively to negative transference. The negative form is indeed mentioned several times alongside this description of transference [4 pp.178, 252], although it is not visibly delineated from the positive one. Therefore a possible solution to this issue may be obtained by differentiating between transference as an analytical tool, as a register used for "handling affect," [4 p.68] and transference as an effect of counter-transference, which represents the "sum total of the analyst's biases" [4 p.184].

In *Lacan to the Letter: Reading "Écrits" Closely*, Bruce Fink points out that to interpret transference, something which Lacan advises against, means to position it on the imaginary axis [5 p.6]. In this position, the analysand perceives the analyst "as an individual with her own personality, however balanced or unbalanced." [5 p.8] The analyst's potential biases are heightened on account of the fact that the analysis takes place from one ego to the other, from the analysand's ego to the analyst's ego [5 p.5]. On the other hand, when transference takes place on the symbolic axis, the analyst occupies the position of the "Other", "an Other where the analysand presumes there to be knowledge of what makes him tick" [5 p.6]. In other words, on the imaginary axis, the analyst represents "an other", whereas on the symbolic axis, he/she stands for "Other". Insofar as the analyst occupies the position of Other in the transference relation, the analysand invests him with authority, or, otherwise said, he/she locates in him the source of a presumed knowledge. When this happens, the analyst becomes what Lacan designates as *le sujet supposé savoir* (*S.s.S.*), or "the subject supposed to know". What must be underlined here is the fact that the emphasis does not fall on knowledge itself, but on the existence of the *supposition* of knowledge. Whether the *S.s.S.*, in actual fact, does or does not know is insignificant. Therefore, the "subject supposed to know" must be considered exclusively in relation to the analysand, as his/her own creation. It is only within this particular placement, as object of the transference, that the analyst turns into the *sujet supposé savoir* [6 p.233].

With the introduction of this concept, Lacan broadens the scope of transference beyond its analytical dimension. The function of investment with presumed knowledge is by no means confined to the analyst alone, but may be triggered by anyone or anything who becomes an object of transference for the analysand. In fact, the existence of the subject supposed to know, irrespective of context, is alone an indicator of the presence of transference: "As soon as the subject who is supposed to know exists somewhere...there is transference." [6 p.232] Thus the *S.s.S.* and transference co-exist in a mutually conditioned relation: as soon as there is *S.s.S.*, there is transference and the other way round: as soon as there is transference, there is an *S.s.S.* Yet why is the subject presumed to know? To answer this, Lacan introduces another dimension of the *sujet supposé savoir*: he/she is supposed to know "simply by virtue of being a subject of desire" [6 p.265]. In other words, there is a sequential relation between desire and knowledge. The Lacanian concept of desire must be however distinguished from the Freudian pleasure principle. Desire cannot be equated with pleasure [6 p.31]. As a subject of desire and as a subject supposed to know, the analyst must fulfill the analysand's transference demand; he must, Lacan says, "set out in search of unconscious desire" [6 p.235]. The transference meeting point between analyst and analysand can only take place "in relation of desire to desire" [6]. Lacan calls this "the desire of the analyst," a phrase whose double meaning may be understood both as "the analyst's desire" and "the desire for the analyst". Desire is thus, for Lacan, both the driving force behind transference and its effect [6 p.253].

From Freud's introduction of the concept to Jung's expansions or to Lacan's formulations, this wide-ranging psychoanalytic material on the subject of transference, as will be shortly seen, will supply the groundwork for the emergence of a new transference model in literary and translation studies; a model which may finally address issues concerning readers, reading, reading-effects, as well as the inter-relatedness of textual and psychological dynamics.

Towards a Transference Model in Literary and Translation Studies

The turn to the concept of *übertragung*, of "transference", as previously mentioned, allowed the exploration of new perspectives on the act of reading/interpretation as a dynamic space of interaction between the instances of the analytic/critical endeavor. Emanuel Berman, for instance, points out that "transference and interpretation are inseparable and form one cohesive experience" [7 p.10], while Elizabeth Wright argues that "the psychoanalytic concept of transference in its extended form has changed the way in which the production of meaning is conceived" [8 p.123]. Similarly, Peter Brooks comments that "transference and interpretation are in fact interdependent, and we cannot assign priority to one over the other" [9 p.345]. Furthermore, for Shoshana Felman, the notion of transference is at once the least explored and the most relevant concept offered by psychoanalysis to literary study [10 p.30]. Pamela Schirmeister equates the phenomena of transference with the discovery, in reading, of our own alienated thoughts in the other. She situates it in a parallel line with interpretation: "It is not solely a matter of our interpretation of the text but also of our transference to that text, our receptivity to it and its persuasive powers" [11 pp. 86-87].

A first transference-based model of reading and of the literary text may be derived from Peter Brooks' *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Brooks starts from one of Freud's observations in his 1914 paper *Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through*. There Freud describes transference as an "artificial illness" which creates an "intermediate region between illness and real life" [12 p.154]. In this view of transference as "intermediate region" of an "artificial illness" which reproduces the past, but can be modified by interventions in the present, Brooks envisages a possible counterpart for the literary text [13 p.235]. In a chapter called *Narrative Transaction and Transference*, he addresses Roland Barthes' assertion that storytelling is contractual in nature, that it "it asks for something in return for what it supplies" [13 p. 216]. Brooks, however, argues that the term "contract" is too "simple" and "static" to properly depict the "active, dynamic, shifting, and transformatory" nature of the exchange taking place in the process of reading narratives [13 p. 216]. He thereby proposes the use of the terms "transaction" or "transference" which he regards as synonyms for "metaphor" insofar as "all three terms image a process of substitution, cross-over, exchange" [13 p.223]. Brooks views the psychoanalytical depiction of transference as itself indicative of metaphor, as it represents, he says, a "substitutive medium for the analysand's infantile experiences" [13 p. 99].

As an "as-if medium", a "fictional" one corresponding to "artificial illness", the text articulates "the investments of desire on the part of both addresser and addressee, author and reader" [13 p.235]. This medium is transformed into a "place of rhetorical exchange or transaction" [13 p.235] which comes together in "the desire of the narrative". Brooks' concept of the "desire of the text" speaks of both the need to tell and the desire to read, to listen. It was noted before that Freud equated the transference process with a form of intrusion from the past. Like a "dead desire", the past is acted upon as if it were the present; it continues to live on under the guise of the projective object. The reading of texts, for Brooks, also involves a symbolic actualization of the past into the present: "the transference, like the text as read becomes the peculiar space of a deadly serious play, in which affect, repeated from the past, is acted out as if it were present" [13 pp.234-235]. Yet in addition to the reader's transference to the text, Brooks also describes a form of intra-textual transference. In his analysis of Balzac's *Le Colonel Chabert*, he sees the interaction between the main characters, Derville and Chabert, as a fundamentally transference one. Derville's position corresponds to the analyst who has to actualize a story from the past into the present by becoming "the present surrogate for past desire" [13 p.235]. For this reason, he explains how "Derville's

transaction might be better conceived as in the nature of transference, in the psychoanalytic sense” [13 p.225]. Chabert, on the other hand, with his desire for a “total resuscitation of a past that can come no more”, an otherwise “infantile scenario” [13 p.226], represents the analysand’s position.

The transference model of reading and textual analysis may be further integrated with a model of narrative beginnings and endings which Brooks derives from Freud’s *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. In the chapter called *Freud’s Masterplot*, he superimposes Freud’s dichotomy of Eros and Thanatos onto fictional plots, more specifically, onto the issue of narrative beginnings and endings. He posits that in literary texts, as in the analytical work, there is a “slim but real evidence of a compulsion to repeat” [13 p.99]. For Brooks, repetition is at the core of literary experience, in the form of the various tropes which take the reader back to the text, as, for instance, in the repetition by three characteristic of folktales or also in the narrative which itself constitutes a repetition of consummated events [13].

Another model centered on transference in relation to the reading of literary texts comes from Shoshana Felman’s interpretation of Henry James’ *The Turn of the Screw*. Through a methodological mixture of Lacanian psychoanalysis, deconstruction and elements of rhetoric, she endeavors to articulate a theory of reading-as-transference and transference as reading-effect. Felman commences by examining two opposing critical reactions to Henry James’ *The Turn of the Screw*: the first considers the reception of the Jamesian text, while the second discusses the critical reaction to Edmund Wilson’s psychoanalytical interpretation of the text. The latter, she observes, is divided into two camps: the psychoanalytic one and what she calls the “metaphysical, religious or moral camp” [14 p.98]. Yet, taking a closer look at the rhetoric of this critical debate, she finds the lexical motifs of the text repeated in the critics’ discourse [14 p. 98]. Like the return of the repressed, the text’s haunting presence appears to return upon the language of the critics. Accordingly, for her, a critical analysis ultimately unwittingly replicates or re-dramatizes the text *ad infinitum*. Readers and critics thus become “agents of the textual action” [14 p. 114]. Repeating what the text dramatizes, the critic “unwittingly *participates in it*” and the ensuing interpretation represents what Felman calls an “acting-out” of the text [14 p.101]. Like Dora who “acted out” her past instead of remembering it, here the critic acts-out an artificial past in the form of the story. “Whichever way the reader turns,” Felman says, “he can but be turned by the text, he can but *perform it by repeating it*” [14 p.101].

Like Brooks, Felman also discusses transference structures within the text, in addition the ones formed (by the reader, critic) “to” the text. Again, it may be observed that the intra-textual and respectively, the extra-textual forms of transference, co-exist in an interrelatedness comprised of what is caused by the text and what the text contains in itself. The relations between the narrator and Douglass in *The Turn of the Screw*, as well as those between Douglass and the governess, Felman claims, are governed by transference insofar as they represent “both transference fascinations” [14 p.130]. But the reader is caught up in the same transference web when he/she identifies in the storyteller or the author what Lacan designates as *le sujet supposé savoir*, “the subject presumed to know” [14 p. 134].

Moreover, Felman draws on the double significance of the term transference in psychoanalysis: transference as relational phenomena within analytic dyad and transference as a process by which psychic energies are moved between wakefulness and sleep. The latter understanding of the term may be conceived as a form of translation in which, in the state of wakefulness, dreams encode the “day’s residue”, the selective contents of the previous day, subsequently translating them in the state of wakefulness. Placing transference at the heart of the literary experience, Felman therefore postulates that “we enter the literary text only *through transference*” [10 p.30]. Reading, in Felman’s view, implies a repetition, a “performative enactment”, not of the meaning of the text, but of its rhetoric [10 p.31]. Through the rhetorical analysis of “the occurrences of transference in both the text, and its critical readings,” [10 p.30] what is finally obtained is an insight into all three fields of inquiry or methodology: rhetoric, literature and psychoanalysis.

For Jean Bellemin-Noel, insofar as it closely participates in the “inner scene of the other” [15], reading is transference by nature. Yet in the case of literary studies, the critic’s relation to the text is nevertheless a metaphorical one. This is why Bellemin-Noel describes literary transference as a species of “autotransference” or “intersubjective transference”. The literary text becomes “the place of encounter or the exchange of two autotransferential microsystems” [15]. If Bellemin-Noel focuses on the transference aspects of reading, that is, on transference-as-reading, Elizabeth Wright’s analysis of Roland Barthes’ *A Lover’s Discourse* distinguishes three levels of transference in which “writer and reader are jointly involved” [8 p. 126]. These different stages of transference, she argues, are equivalent to what happens in the analytical situation when the therapist and the patient are working through resistances [8 p. 126]. The first two phases, for Wright, involve the readers as analysands or as “innocent”, whereas the last phase involves them in their capacity of “knowing” subjects, that is, as analysts. According to Wright, it is only at this last stage that a proper reflection on the effects of the text may be produced [8 p. 126]. Through illustrations from Barthes’ text, Wright identifies the first level of transference with the Imaginary, the second level with the Symbolic and the final level with what she designates as “the level of the critic, who is both analyst and analysand” [8 pp. 126-128]. Because Barthes’ shows “how a text captures a reader”, the reader of “his” text is thus shown a way to escape transference [8 p. 128]. By making him aware of his own transference relationship and opening the possibility of turning an unconscious working of the text into a conscious attentiveness, the reader may “work through” his transference and ultimately surpass it.

John Forrester places transference phenomena within a theory of reading as seduction. Forrester reverses the stance of the text as sexual object of the reader by postulating that “it is the reader who is the sexual object of the text” [16 p.264]. Similarly, in *The Pleasure of the Text*, Roland Barthes remarks: “the text you write must prove to me that *it desires me*” [17 p.5]. Lacan’s “desire of the analyst”, in Forrester and Barthes, becomes, it may be said, the “desire of the text”. In this view, the transference relationship forms between the text as seducer and the reader as “seducee”. Other critics such as James Mellard or Seán Hand turn to the concept of transference to illustrate the intertextual nature of both literary works and their reading. In his paper *Missing you: intertextuality, transference and the language of love*, relying on a predominantly Lacanian concept of transference, Hand identifies at the center of the transference/intertextual process a lack, or an object “which is continually *missed*” [18 p.89]. It is this missed object which provides the motor, the driving force, behind the interpretative endeavor. Through this generalized view of intertextuality, the notion of transference moves from its metaphorical understanding to its metonymic aspects [18 p.89]. This extended version of transference is employed to follow the analyst’s “own dissolution of knowledge”, but also to explore the intertextual scope of both the relation between book and reader and the relation of work to work [18 p.82]. Also built on a Lacanian understanding of transference is James Mellard’s transference model of intertextuality. Mellard starts from Bellemin-Noel’s concept of the “textual unconscious” and devises an intertextual approach to the critic-text transference relation. For him, it is particularly the psychoanalytic commentary which is, *par excellence*, deeply embedded in this transference structure [19 p. 5]. Mellard sees interpretation as a fundamentally intertextual activity as it involves a “relation of texts to texts”, an activity which he ascribes to the Imaginary register [19 pp.5,41].

As earlier discussed, the phenomena of transference may itself be viewed as a form of mistranslation: the figure from the past is erroneously translated, by the unconscious, as a figure of the present. Shoshana Felman, referring to the other psychoanalytic sense of the word “transference” as the transferring of states from wakefulness to sleep, sees it as a form of translation in itself. In the state of wakefulness, the dream must undergo a process of translation from the unconscious to the conscious mind. Therefore, a relation between translation and transference may already be established. In *Translation Studies and Psychoanalytic Transference*, Susan Ingram takes this relationship further by exploring the various understandings of the psychoanalytic concept of transference and their potential significance for theories of translation. In her view, translation may

be regarded as a form of critical reading involving an interaction between a reader and a text. Although he or she is not a critic, the translator's presence nevertheless becomes immixed in the text. Ingram emphasizes the reciprocal exchange involved in the process of transference by stressing that it is not only the text which is changed by the translator, but it is also the translator who is changed by the text. A question which naturally arises from this, however, is the following: if translation may be considered as a psychoanalytic process, what position does the translator occupy? Is he/she rather an analyst or an analysand? Drawing an analogy between the translator as patient and the case of Dora, Ingram suggests that, in some respects, the translator "functions more as patient than doctor" [20]. At the same time, she also concludes that the translation process "will necessarily reveal both the unconscious of the translator and of the original" [20], a fact which renders "immaterial" whether the translator acts as an analyst or as an analysand.

Conclusions

Observing the different contributions to the concept of transference from various schools of psychoanalysis, be it Freudian, Jungian or Lacanian, it soon becomes apparent that there is no single, unified theory on this particular matter. This multiplicity of approaches, however, will prove to constitute an advantage for the literary critic or the theorist who chooses to turn to psychoanalysis. As shown earlier, the application of the concept transference in the field of literary and translation studies has yielded an impressive number of diverse models of textual approach. What these transferential models finally offer is of significance in at least two fundamental areas. The first concerns the relationship between literature and psychoanalysis. As was seen, one of the novelties of this specific approach is the consideration of this relationship, not as a unidirectional one, but as a mutually-informed, even symbiotic one. More specifically, what transpires is the fact that it is not only literary issues which may be viewed as psychical processes, but it is also psychical processes which might be viewed in literary terms. If the reader/critic/translator-text relationship can be viewed as transferential, transference itself, on the other hand, can be discussed or explained through literature. As previously mentioned, Freud himself employed a literary metaphor in explaining the phenomenon. Peter Brooks, as earlier discussed, sees transference as the equivalent of metaphor, while Shoshana Felman refers to it as a form of translation. Therefore, one area of research which may be subsequently opened refers to how the perspective on psychical components in literature may be reversed towards a literary perspective on psychical processes discussed by psychoanalysis. Within literary and translation studies, a second area of significance concerns the perspective on reading. With the emergence of a transferential model, the process of reading no longer appears as a conscious, clear-cut act performed by a subject to an object. Rather, it becomes a complex relationship characterized by multiple exchanges at the level of the unconscious. The critical reading, as discussed above, may represent the result of a transferential relation to the text. To conclude, what the above analysis shows is how reading may be viewed as a space of the unconscious and how the unconscious, in turn, may be viewed as a space of reading.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the European Social Fund in Romania, under the responsibility of the Managing Authority for the Sectorial Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013 [grant POSDRU/107/1.5/S/78342]

References

- [1] Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud vol. XI*. [trans.] James Strachey. London : Random House, 1910. ISBN 978-0-09-942664-6.
- [2] Ulanov, Ann Belford. *Transference/Countertransference: A Jungian Perspective*. [ed.] Murray Stein. *Jungian Analysis*. 1st Edition. Boulder : Shambhala Publications, 1982, 4, pp. 68-86.

- [3] Jung, Carl Gustav. *The Collected Works of C.G Jung*. [ed.] Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler. [trans.] R.F.C Hull. New York : Bollingen Series XX, Pantheon Books, 1954. Vol. XVI.
- [4] Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits, The First Complete Edition in English. 1966*. [trans.] Bruce Fink. Paperback edition. New York : W.W Norton & Company, 2007. 978-0393329254.
- [5] Fink, Bruce. *Lacan to the Letter: Reading Écrits Closely*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- [6] Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. 1973*. [trans.] Alan Sheridan. New York : W.W Norton & Company, 1998. Vol. vol.XI. 0-393-31775-7.
- [7] Berman, Emanuel. Introduction. [book auth.] Emanuel Berman ed. *Essential Papers on Literature and Psychoanalysis*. New York : New York University Press, 1993, pp. 19-24.
- [8] Wright, Elizabeth. *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice*. [ed.] Terence Hawkes. New York and London : Routledge, 1984. p. 122. 0-415-04582-7.
- [9] *The Idea of a Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism*. Brooks, Peter. 2, s.l. : The University of Chicago Press, Winter 1987, Critical Inquiry, Vol. 13, pp. 334-348.
- [10] Felman, Shoshana. *Writing and Madness (Literature/Philosophy/Psychoanalysis).1978*. [ed.] Werner Hamacher. [trans.] Martha Noel Evans, Shoshana Felman and Barbara Johnson. Palo Alto : Stanford University Press, 2003.
- [11] Schirmeister, Pamela J. Reading Transference. *Less Legible Meanings: between Poetry and Philosophy in the Work of Emerson*. California : Stanford University Press, 1999, pp. 86-119.
- [12] Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud vol.XII*. [trans.] James Strachey. London : Random House, 2001. Vol. XII.
- [13] Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. 1st Paperback Edition. Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1992.
- [14] *Turning the Screw of Interpretation*. Felman, Shoshana. 55/56 Literature and Psychoanalysis. The Question of Reading: Otherwise, s.l. : Yale University Press, 1977, Yale French Studies, pp. 94-207.
- [15] *Foundations and problems of "textanalysis"*. Bellemin-Noel, Jean. 3, Baltimore : John Hopkins University Press, 1999, American Imago, Vol. 56, pp. 221-235. ISSN 0065860X.
- [16] Forrester, John. *The Seductions of Psychoanalysis: Freud, Lacan, and Derrida*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [17] Barthes, Roland. *The Pleasure of the Text*. [trans.] Richard Miller. New York : Hill and Wang, 1975.
- [18] Hand, Seán. Missing you: intertextuality, transference and the language of love. [book auth.] Michael Worton and Judith Still. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practice*. Manchester : Manchester University Press, 1991, pp. 79-92.
- [19] Mellard, James M. *Using Lacan, Reading Fiction*. Illinois : The University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- [20] *Translation Studies and Psychoanalytic Transference*. **Ingram, Susan**. [ed.] Annick Chapdelaine. 1, Montreal : McGill University, 2001, TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction, Vol. 14, pp. 95-115. DOI: 10.7202/000530ar, .