



Heriot-Watt University  
Research Gateway

## Translating time and space in the memorial museum

### Citation for published version:

Liao, M-H 2016, 'Translating time and space in the memorial museum', *Translation Spaces*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 181-199. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.5.2.02lia>

### Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1075/ts.5.2.02lia](https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.5.2.02lia)

### Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

### Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

### Published In:

Translation Spaces

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [open.access@hw.ac.uk](mailto:open.access@hw.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Translating time and space in the memorial museum**

Min-Hsiu Liao

Department of Languages and Intercultural Studies

Heriot-Watt University

2.18 Henry Prais Building, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, EH14 4AS, UK

m.liao@hw.ac.uk

## **Translating time and space in the memorial museum**

Translation has long been conceptualized in metaphors of space, whereas its temporal aspect is relatively underexplored. However, recently scholars have argued that translation does not only carry *across* but also carries *forward*, i.e., texts survive through time. The aim of this study is to examine how time and space are manipulated in translation, with a particular focus on how the two dimensions interact with each other. To achieve this aim, a memorial museum has been chosen for investigation. A museum, as a site to display dislocated objects from the past, constructs a unique temporal-spatial dramaturgy. This study argues that shifts of temporal-spatial frames in museum translations have a significant impact on how a nation's past, present and future are perceived by target readers.

**Keywords:** museum translation, temporality, space, narratives, framing strategies, national identity

### ***Translation across time and space***

Translation has long been conceptualized in spatial terms, through metaphors such as “space in between” (Snell-Hornby 2001), “border-crossing” (Miller 1991) or “the third space” (Wolf 2000). This may be because the English word *translation* comes from the Latin *translatio*, which means to carry across or to move things through space (Tymoczko 2003, 189).

Compared with the metaphor of space, the temporal aspects of translation are relatively underexplored. Translation studies addressing the issue of time tend to focus on micro-linguistic analysis, such as time deixis (e.g., Richardson 1998; Mason and Şerban 2003; Goethals and De Wilde 2009). Translation scholars have recently, however, begun to pay more attention to the wider temporal framework in translated texts (e.g., Baker 2006; Hijorth

2014; Liu 2014). Hijorth (2014, 135) argues that translation does not only ‘carry across’ from one location to another, but can also “‘carry forward’—the survival, or living on, of a text in and through *time*” (original emphasis). This view of surviving and living on is also similarly elaborated in Scott’s discussion of myth as a form of translation which “functions to bridge one spatiotemporal context to another and to grant continued and renewed significance to a time-tested cultural narrative” (Scott 2004, 58).

This view of translation as *carrying forward* is particularly relevant to the translation of historical texts. How should stories that were valued in the past be retold and made relevant to text receivers today? To answer this question, the spatial dimension of texts also needs to be brought into discussion. In her exploration of temporality in literature and museums, Walklate (2012, 62) notes that temporality needs to be discussed in relation to location, because “who and what are positioned where and when are crucial in the form and manipulation of temporal features.”

The aim of this study is to examine how time and space are altered in translation, with a particular focus on how the two dimensions interact with each other. To achieve this aim, museum texts (guidebooks) used at a history museum have been chosen for investigation. The Chinese guidebook and its English translation used at the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum have been collected for the purpose of data analysis.<sup>1</sup> The temporal-spatial configuration of the historical incident commemorated in the source and target texts will be analysed, and a study will be made of how the national and international visitors are positioned in relation to the museum exhibition.

### ***Temporal-spatial dramaturgy of museums***

---

<sup>1</sup> The text examples are taken from the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum’s 2011 guidebooks: *The Permanent Exhibition of Taipei 228 Memorial Museum (Chinese Version)* and *The Permanent Exhibition of Taipei 228 Memorial Museum (English Version)*.

A museum, as a site to display dislocated objects from the past, constructs a unique temporal-spatial dramaturgy. It is asserted that all museums “strive to overcome both temporal and spatial distance, rendering present that which is absent because it occurred long ago or is located far away” (Bennett 2004, 22).

In terms of temporality, we can see the displayed objects as links between the past (where it is from) and the present (where the visitors are). This link between the past and the present is not natural, but arbitrary. Which objects from the past are displayed in a museum involves a series of decisions from the outset, and these are often based on how the present *wants* to see the past. Preziosi (2012, 84) further elaborates this point: every artefact represents an “absent past” and “at the same time *pre-figures* our present, which in turns fulfils, completes, or ‘proves’ what the past imagines as its future” (original emphasis). Therefore, an analysis of the temporal framework of exhibits, exhibit content and museum texts should reveal the position or stance of the exhibiting institution relative to what is exhibited.

It is true that when an object is relocated from the past to the present, museums impose different meanings on the objects. In the museum space, Vergo (1989, 2) maintains that “every juxtaposition or arrangement of an object or work of art, together with other objects or works of art, within the context of a temporary exhibition or museum display means placing a certain construction upon history.” The value of the objects and the intended message to the visitors is more often than not manifested through the verbal interpretations provided by the museum texts such as labels, text panels, leaflets, guidebooks, etc. Ferguson (1996, 180) explains that “a graphic example of an exhibition’s clear links to institutional representation and to representing in its political sense is the didactic panels or labels which accompany works of art.” This spatial dimension between objects, labels, and visitors, is another research focus of this study. Baxandall (1991, 38) refers to the space between

museum texts and objects as “intellectual space.” He maintains that intellectual space created by museums is not straightforward because museum texts do not *simply* describe the objects. Intellectual space is manipulated by museums for the purpose of exhibition. Schaffner (2006, 164) explains how interaction takes place in this intellectual place: “imagine the label as part of a three-way switch: from looking at the art, to reading the label, which points back to the art. In this ideal exchange, labels broker a large understanding of the bigger picture of the exhibition itself.”

A memorial museum has been selected to explore the research question in this study because this type of museum, in particular, aims to create a strong link between the past and present. There is more likely to be strong cognitive control over how the museum wants readers to interpret the objects, and the stories associated with the objects need to be managed with great sensitivity. Memorial museums are reminders of a shared traumatic past—whether because visitors have experienced it directly or indirectly, because they care about it, or even because they are still influenced by the aftermath of the event. Stories from the past travel through time and ‘survive,’ as argued by Hijorth (2014), and are retold within the edifices of museums—“it is within space that time consumes or devours living beings, thus giving reality to sacrifice, pleasure and pain” (Lefebvre 1991, 57). This again demonstrates that time and space interact with each other to achieve the purposes of the story—a narrative of the past—being told by a memorial museum.

How should these narratives be translated? How do they survive when a historical incident was culturally or geographically restricted, as, for example the narrative of a regional conflict? Regarding our research question on the construction of time and space in translation, we can ask more specifically: how does the translation guide the target reader to perceive the temporal framework of the incident, and how does the translation manage the ‘space’ between the visitor and the exhibition?

### *Framing strategies in translation of narratives*

The approach to narrative analysis used in this study is adopted from the set of framing strategies proposed by Baker (2006). Narratives, in Baker's view, are the way we use language to 'tell stories,' and constitute our worldview. Specifically, Baker defines narratives as "public and personal 'stories' that we subscribe to and that guide our behaviour. They are the stories we tell ourselves, not just those we explicitly tell other people, about the world(s) in which we live" (Baker 2006, 19). The theory of narratives acknowledges that there are many ways we can recount an event, and we may knowingly and constantly create different versions of stories for different purposes and in different situations. Bringing the theory of narratives into translation studies can reinforce the target-oriented view of translation, i.e., translation is not just striving to produce the linguistic equivalent of the source text—but also involves 'telling a new story' with its own narrative voice in the target context for new readers. In this global space, the same story may be translated and retold repeatedly in different languages, and every translated version "is injected with elements from other, broader narratives circulating within the new setting or from the personal narratives of the retellers" (Baker 2006, 22). When travelling through time, "the retelling of past narratives is also a means of control. It socializes individuals into an established social and political order and encourages them to interpret present events in terms of sanctioned narratives of the past" (Baker 2006, 21).

In the process of translation, translators may use different linguistic strategies to emphasize or, conversely, diminish particular aspects of the source texts. Baker refers to these strategies as "framing," i.e., "structures of anticipation, strategic moves that are consciously initiated in order to present a movement or a particular position within a certain

perspective” (Baker 2006, 106). Baker’s Different framing strategies will be briefly introduced below.

Temporal and spatial framing is clearly the one most closely related to the focus of this research; however the collective contribution of other framing strategies to constructing time and space will also be demonstrated. The explanations below are predominantly based on Baker (2006) but have been elaborated with reference to relevant museum and heritage studies.

*Temporal and spatial framing* is certainly the core strategy in this study, because it “involves selecting a particular text and embedding it in a temporal and spatial context that accentuates the narrative it depicts and encourages us to establish links between it and current narratives that touch our lives” (Baker 2006, 112). For this study it is useful to note that temporal and spatial framing could be used to create a link between the past narrative and the current museum visitor. This is an element central to the purposes for which a museum like the Tapei 228 Memorial Museum would display remnants of a traumatic past. These purposes involve “manifesting an imaginary world where the tragic past may be transformed into the desired present and/or future” (Howard 2003, 50-1).

At the micro-linguistic level, time and space can be most clearly indicated to text receivers via the uses of temporal and spatial deixis. Richardson (1998) points out that deictic shift is a challenging task in every translation, and in fact he defines translation as “the creation of a linguistic representation in the target language (TL) of the construction of meaning achieved *in a particular instance* of the source language” (emphasis added) (Richardson 1998, 125). Richardson broadly discusses the strategies for dealing with deictic shifts as a binary choice: either “the translator plays an active role in transposing the text, in making it amenable for the readers” or “the readers play the more active role and perform the necessary transformations at the moment when they encounter the text” (Richardson 1998,



127). In fact, this view is pertinent to the discussion of museum space. Museums can choose to re-create the original settings of the exhibited objects and invite readers to travel back to the past, referred to as an “in-situ approach” or, alternatively, they can provide a different interpretive frame for the visitors and transpose the objects from the past to the present, referred to as an “in-context approach” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 19-21). Thus, texts and visitors can be ‘induced’ to travel between times and spaces by means of exhibit presentations and museum texts (and their translations).

*Selective appropriation* refers to patterns of omission or addition designed to emphasize highlight or diminish particular aspects of narrative in the source text. According to Baker (2006, 114), the translator’s intervention in appropriation is more obvious than temporal and spatial framing. Especially in the narrative of heritage, Ashworth reminds us “all heritage is a deliberate selection from the past in order to satisfy present needs and demands” (2008, 231). In an introduction to memorial museums, Williams (2012, 97) asserts that these museums should at least answer and respond to four main questions: Which groups suffered? Who was to blame? Are we/they still suffering? What needs to be done to right historical wrongs? However, museums do not always provide answers, and insufficient or unclear reflection on these questions can actually create problems in bridging the past and the present (Beattie 2010, 48). In this sense, perhaps what is omitted is actually more important than what is said. The same view has been supported in text-linguistic analysis: when text is regarded as a process of decision-making, “many occurrences are significant by virtue of the other alternatives which might have occurred instead” (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, 35). Our data analysis will pay particular attention to unchosen alternative language choices and the ‘questions left unanswered.’

*Labelling* is defined as “any discursive process that involves using a lexical item, term or phrase to identify a person, place, group, event or any other key element in a narrative”

(Baker 2006, 122). The way a particular identity is referred to can impact on, or constrain readers' interpretation. The choice of labelling often has historical roots and serves political interests. It is easy to illustrate this using some examples of current geopolitical name disputes, such as Derry versus Londonderry in Northern Ireland, or the translation of the names of disputed islands between China and Japan as either Diaoyu Islands or Senkaku Islands in the English media. In the context of this paper, it has been observed that the Taiwanese identity has often been constituted and reconstituted through the uses of different names for China (Chang and Holt 2015, 3). Thus, it is clear that naming is never a 'simple' lexical choice and consistent use of certain names contributes to the continuing temporal-spatial construction of a historical incident in readers' minds.

*Repositioning of participants* is related to the management of interactive dimensions in texts, through linguistic devices such as deixis, register and self- and other identification. McDowell (2008, 49) sees heritage as a political agency, which communicates "narratives of inclusion and exclusion." A consistent use of patterns of interactive linguistic features allows museum text writers to effect inclusion with terms such as *our people*, while *others* are excluded. In a museum exhibition, the features of repositioning are tied closely to how visitors are positioned in the "intellectual space" (Baxandall 1991) between objects and texts.

### ***A case study: The Taipei 228 Memorial Museum***

The case study in this paper is based on the museum texts of the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum. The Museum commemorates the 228 Incident (hereafter, the 'Incident'), an act of political suppression which occurred in Taiwan on the 28<sup>th</sup> of February 1947. Taiwan was ceded to Japan after Qing China lost the First Sino-Japanese war in 1895, and was returned to the Republic of China (ROC) at the end of the Second World War in 1945. The ROC government appointed Chen Yi as the Governor-General of Taiwan. The local Taiwanese

initially welcomed the ROC administration, but tight controls on political and economic matters soon led to discontent, which resulted in the Incident. The uprising encompassed the whole island and the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum estimates that approximately 28,000 people died or went missing during the Incident, although the exact figure is debatable. The Incident had become a taboo topic in the Taiwanese society until martial law was lifted in 1987. In 1995, the Taiwanese president made a formal apology for the Incident, and declared 28 February a national holiday in commemoration. In 1997 the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum was established on the site of the former radio station where the Incident occurred, and several other memorial museums were later founded across Taiwan.

The 228 Incident may be over, but its story has since been retold repeatedly in these museums and in the media. In Vaisman's (2013) words, "the time of war becomes the moment of origin and it is, from that moment that a new—yet undefined—linear temporality (and future) can emerge." By narrating this past incident, politicians and other stakeholders construct a Taiwanese identity (or identities), and project Taiwan's future. Exploring the role of the Incident in Taiwanese society, Fleischauer (2007, 375) makes the following comment: "by enhancing a sense of common suffering and imprinting a collective memory, 228 became both the source and the most important point of reference for the formation of Taiwanese identity." The link between the 228 Incident, the 228 memorial museums, and its Taiwanese visitors has been widely explored, and its significance has been established, but the global context of the exhibit display and narrative presentation of the 228 Incident in museums remains unexplored. How is the story of the 228 Incident translated into English—how is the Incident constructed and how are English visitors positioned relative to the positioning of Chinese visitors? We argue that these are important questions to be answered because after all, national identity is not only a construction of the people of a nation, but, perhaps more importantly, a reflection of how it is constructed by others.

The analysis in this study is based mainly on the official Chinese and English guidebooks for the museum published by the Taipei City Council. There are two reasons for relying on the guidebooks rather than on the museum labels in the exhibitions. The first is for the practical reason that there are insufficient English translations inside the museum. Second, museum scholars argue that “while objects and collections have permanence vested in their physicality, this construction of order can be and is reinterpreted and reordered as views of society and culture change. Books by contrast, present ‘fixed’ interpretation” (Hughes 2011). In this sense, this analysis will be more concerned with the intention of the museum—i.e., how it intends to project Taiwanese identity—and the guidebooks give us a better perspective on this issue.

### ***Reconstruction of temporal-spatial dimension in translation***

In this section, translation shifts will be discussed under Baker’s four framing strategies, but the discussions will also show how different framing strategies collectively contribute to the construction of a different narrative in the translations.

#### *Temporal-spatial references*

Baker (2006, 112) observes that “the meaning(s) and interpretive potential of a text or utterance... are always decisively shaped by their spatial and temporal location.” The choice of temporal reference is probably more salient when a historical event is narrated.

In the current study, the 228 Incident occurred at a crucial historical moment, just after Japanese colonization, when the ROC government was initiated and the Taiwanese elite was trying to regain its voice. The temporal reference can reflect the narrative point of the text. Example 1 is an illustration of the consistent shift in the representation of dates in the translations. In the presentation of the examples, ST stands for the source text; the bracketed

passage immediately below is a literal translation of the source text by the authors for readers without knowledge of Chinese; and TT stands for the text as translated by the museum.

1. (ST) 1921 年(大正 10 年)1 月 30 日，由林獻堂、蔡惠如等 178 位臺灣知識分子，向日本帝國議會提出「設置臺灣議會」的請願。[On January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1921 (10<sup>th</sup> year of Taisho period), 178 members of the Taiwanese elite, including Lin Hsien-tang and Tsai Huei-ju, submitted to the Parliament of Imperial Japan the petition of “The Establishment of the Taiwan Council.”] (TT) On January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1921, 178 members of the Taiwanese elite led by Lin Hsien-tang and Tsai Huei-ju submitted the Petition of the Establishment of the Taiwan Council.

When accounting for events during the period of Japanese colonization, the Chinese text uses both the Western calendar (also called the Gregorian or Christian calendar) and the traditional Japanese calendar, where years were indicated by the length of an emperor’s reign. In the English translation only the Western calendar is maintained, which may be because the target readers are more familiar with the Western calendar. However, it is not impossible to provide the reference to the Japanese calendar to the English reader and make explicit the temporal reference to the Japanese colonization. The omission can be regarded as a framing strategy which, whether deliberately or not, embeds the source text and the target text in a different temporal framework, and consequently, evokes different worldviews. The omission of the reference to the Japanese calendar is further coupled with omissions of the reference to *the Parliament of Imperial Japan* in this example and other references to Japanese colonization throughout the text (such as in example 3). These consistent shifts in the English narrative minimize the Japanese presence in the 228 Incident and simplify the storyline to accentuate tension between the Taiwanese and the ROC government.

The inclusion of the Japanese calendar in the Chinese source text is also a decision worthy of discussion. The Japanese calendar does not have much meaning in terms of time reference for Taiwanese readers nowadays. The inclusion of the Japanese calendar can therefore be seen as an attempt by the museum to make visitors look back at the 228 Incident with Japanese historical influence and governance in mind.

The data shows a consistent shift in the narrative from the past to the present. This trend of a shift in temporality, however, cannot be discussed without examination of the space. It can be observed that the chronology in English is often disrupted with spatial references to the displayed objects in the museum; whereas the Chinese visitors are rarely made aware of the objects, as the focus is on the imagined past. An example of drawing readers from the narration of the past back to the site of the museum is in Chapter 5, *Outbreak of the Event* (see example 2). After a chronological narration of the event, the readers are drawn back to the here-and-now space of the museum, before continuing onto the rest of the story. This temporal-spatial interruption does not exist in the Chinese version.

2. (TT) With unemployment increasing, people began to sell cigarettes on the street. There were many restaurants in Taipingding, Dadocheng, which became a hotspot for merchants socializing at night; especially around Wanlihong Restaurant and Tianma Tea House, vendors gathered every evening around dusk, attracting cigarette buyers. Although tobacco was under a government monopoly, and it was illegal to sell untaxed cigarettes, struggling civilians had to take chances to make ends meet.

At the corner of the exhibition room, the wooden cases containing cigarettes of different brands were the most important possession of the vendor. Through these exhibits, we can imagine the struggle of those at the bottom of the society.

At dusk on February 27th, 1947, monopoly bureau inspectors found Lin Jianmai around Tianma Tea House selling smuggled cigarettes...

The underlined passage is an addition in the target text. The spatial reference “*at the corner of the exhibition room*” at the beginning of the second paragraph in the example clearly signals to the readers a change in the spatial reference point. The narrative point now returns to the museum exhibition room. The readers are reminded that the story is retold through the exhibition in the museum, and they are encouraged to “imagine,” as indicated in the second sentence of this added paragraph. The next paragraph begins with another temporal reference “*At dusk of February 27<sup>th</sup>, 1947...*” which leads readers back to the past again. This disruption in chronology through the manipulation of the temporal and spatial references in the English text can make mindful visitors feel that they are “pulled in and out of temporal proximity to things and events” (Walklate 2012, 162).

By contrast, the Chinese text does not attempt to draw readers back to the exhibition room and allows the narrative to take place in the past, with less intervention from the narration. This difference in spatial framing between the ST and TT may not be deliberate. Observation of the museum clearly shows that the textual explanations in the museum are not all translated into English. The English guidebook may therefore function both as detailed off-site reading matter and as an on-site explanation for the English readers—hence, the constant inclusion of the explanations of the displayed objects in the exhibition rooms. The Chinese readers have two separate narratives. One is an on-site guide in the form of the museum’s text panels, and the other is an off-site guide in the form of a guidebook.

Regardless of the possible reasons for the additions in the English text, it displays a different spatial frame from that of the source text. It will be argued in the discussion of social-political context later that, compounded with other patterns of shifts, what is changed

is “more than the mere abstract ‘locating’ of an utterance.” Rather, these translation shifts can carry “implications about a diverse range of aspects of being human and about the identity of participants in an act of discourse” (Richardson 1998, 131).

### *Selective Appropriation*

Following from the analysis so far, a pattern of translation shifts seems to have emerged—the Chinese texts encourage the readers to travel back to the time of the event, whereas the English visitors rely more on the interpretation provided by the museum, i.e., the “in-context” approach (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 21) This trend can also be identified in selective omissions from passages referring to the Japanese colonization in Taiwan, as illustrated in example 3.

3. (ST) 二次大戰期間殖民地臺灣被捲入日本對外的戰爭中成為戰爭工具。1936年(昭和11年)小林躋造擔任臺灣總督，以「皇民化、工業化、南進基地化」作為其統治的原則。[During the Second World War, the colonial Taiwan was involved in the Japanese war with others as a war tool. In 1936 (the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Shōwa period) Kobayashi Seizō served as the Governor-General of Taiwan, and used “Japanization, industrialization, and making Taiwan as a basement for the southward expansion” as his principles of governance.]

As stated in the introduction above, the 228 Incident involved entangled voices from the Japanese legacy, the Chinese take-over and the Taiwanese elite, and it is in itself a complicated story. The consistent omission of the Japanese involvement in the English translation can result in a different temporal perspective from the Chinese source text. The narrative of the Japanese colonization provides contextual background for the outbreak of the



228 Incident—for example, Chen (2003) maintains that the colonial experience distinguished the Taiwanese from the immigrant Chinese, and this identity crisis was at the root of the Incident. The reference to events and activities during the Japanese colonization also presents the 228 Incident as a campaign in Taiwan's long fight for human rights and democracy, which had already started during the Japanese colonization—therefore, as a duration rather than a moment. By contrast, in English the 228 Incident is presented as a single incident of conflict between the ROC government and the Taiwanese people. Whether this contextual background in Japanese colonization is important and worth mentioning is dependent on how the museum aims to *pre-figure* the present (Preziosi 2012, 84), i.e., how the museum wants to guide visitors to perceive the significance of the 228 Incident in the context of the current social-political situation in Taiwan.

The most significant omission in this exhibition is in the last chapter of the guidebook *The International Human Rights Forest*. The English translation is, in fact, almost completely rewritten. The Chinese guidebook concludes the 228 Incident using an abstract and poetic style of writing—generalizing the specific Taiwanese experience and casting it as a universal human experience. The English translation omits the more abstract elements in the source text and concludes by specifically focusing on the implications of this event for Taiwanese society. Example 4 is a typical passage in the Chinese text, which is omitted in the English text.

4. (ST) 泥地裡種子發了芽。呼應整體展覽開場的民主主張，已然紮在土地裡的根，雖經風暴，慢慢地長出新芽。人權的普世價值，是和平的種籽。[Buds have grown out of mud. The seed of democracy which echoes the opening of the exhibition has rooted in the ground. Although there are storms, the buds have grown out slowly. The universal value of human rights is the seed of peace.]

This passage demonstrates a quite poetic style. The author uses strategies of simile such as ‘seeds growing out of mud’ to provide a comparison with the development of democracy and human rights, and uses ‘storms’ as a comparison with the violent political suppression. The final sentence highlights the exhibitor’s intention to present the Taiwanese movement as aligned to universal values that the entire world has been fighting for, rather than as something unique to Taiwan. Overall, in terms of the temporal duration, the 228 Incident is placed in continuity, from the past (*the seeds*) to the future (*the buds*). The Incident is also placed in a global space with relation to experiences in other countries.

By contrast, the English text is much briefer and more factual, as illustrated in example 5.

5. (TT) Here, you can observe the development of Taiwan’s democracy. The victims of the 228 Incident proposed local autonomy and free elections of municipal officials; these have all since been realized.

The most obvious feature in managing the intellectual space between readers and texts is the uses of personal pronouns you (visitors) and Taiwan (us). The verb *observe* further denotes the exclusive ‘outsider’ role of international visitors in relation to the Incident. The English text is informative rather than expressive, so creates a more detached interaction with the target readers. Moreover, a temporal shift can also be found: the source text pictures continuity (*seeds of peace continuing to grow*), but the target text reports a finished Incident (*these have all since been realized*). Finally, the place deictic *here* at the beginning of the sentence once again points the target readers to view this historical incident from the here-and-now narrative point of view, as was found in example 2.

## *Labelling*

Baker (2006) argues that naming and assigning titles are powerful ideological tools for framing and guiding responses to texts, and the choices for naming a group of people or a particular event also reflect the text producer's ideological stance. The 228 Incident is fundamentally an uprising against the governor appointed by the ROC and its administration by the people already resident in Taiwan before Taiwan was handed over to China after the Second World War. The naming of these two groups can have a direct impact on how this Incident is interpreted.

6. (ST) 此外，民眾也遷怒外省人，濫施報復。走避不及的外省民眾遭到圍毆，本省籍民眾則受到巡邏憲兵、軍隊的槍擊或毆打，全臺陷入大規模混亂狀態。

[Besides, the public took their anger out on wài shěng rén, and retaliated. Some wài shěng rén could not escape and were beaten by běn shěng rén. Běn shěng rén were shot or beaten by patrolling military police or troops. The entire Taiwan was in large-scale chaos.] (TT) In addition, the public took their anger out on non-Taiwanese civilians, and retaliated. Some non-Taiwanese civilians were beaten by Taiwanese people; some Taiwanese people were shot or beaten by armed forces. Taiwan was in chaos.

In the Chinese text, opposing participants of the event are named 本省人 (*běn shěng rén*) and 外省人 (*wài shěng rén*), literally translated as 'people from this province,' and 'people from outside of the province.' These terms have historically been used in Taiwan to refer to those who were already in Taiwan prior to 1945, and those who immigrated to Taiwan, particularly those who retreated to Taiwan with the ROC government following the loss of the war against the Communist Party on mainland China. The terms have historical roots and a

political context and have caused controversy in recent political debates in Taiwan. The choice to use 本省人 (*běn shěng rén*) and 外省人 (*wài shěng rén*) in the Chinese text can be understood in the historical and geographical sense of the terms when the Incident took place in 1947 and subsequently places an emphasis on the historical background of the conflict.

The English translation as ‘Taiwanese’ and ‘non-Taiwanese’ is arguably more ambiguous, or it could be said, ambitious, considering the current controversial political status of Taiwan. The contrast between Taiwanese and *non*-Taiwanese also seems to guide readers to interpret the event as an invasion or attack by outsiders. While the term Taiwanese can be understood in a geographical sense, there is potential for contemporary English readers to associate this with the current division between Taiwan (officially known as the *Republic of China*, or ROC) and mainland China (officially known as the *People’s Republic of China*, or PRC). This may be another illustration of how history can be retold to fulfil current interests and political agendas.

The stories of the 228 Incident have altered over time with the changing interpretation by interested parties of what constitutes Taiwanese identity. Fleischauer (2007) argues that the 228 Incident has entered a new stage of interpretation whereby the mainland Chinese/native Taiwanese division is now interpreted as the PRC/ROC division—“the 228 Incident as a weapon against the new foremost opponent of the Taiwan independence movement, namely the PRC and its military threat to Taiwan” (Fleischauer 2007, 392). It may not be the intention of the translator to raise all these connotations behind the names, but the naming frame is never simply a neutral lexical choice and contributes to spatial-temporal framing and therefore to provoking a specific interpretive stance on the part of the reader.

### *Repositioning of Participants*

Repositioning concerns how the “intellectual space” (Baxandall 1991) in the exhibition is managed, i.e., how Chinese readers and English readers are positioned in it in relation to the 228 Incident. Example 7 illustrates a shift of personal reference.

7. (ST) 近代史上的臺灣，自 1920 年代起，迄至 1947 年二二八事件，人民對抗統治者的歷程，是台灣人民追求民主與人權的具體寫照。 [In the modern history of Taiwan, from the 1920s to the 228 Incident in 1947, the process of people fighting against the rulers is a concrete portrayal of Taiwanese people's pursuit of democracy and human rights.] (TT) In the modern history of Taiwan, the fight against rules began in the 1920s, and ended in 1947 because of the 228 Incident. During this period of more than 20 years, our people sought democracy and human rights.

Example 7 is the opening sentence of the first chapter of the guidebook. As previously stated, McDowell (2008) saw heritage as narratives of exclusion and inclusion, and this very first English sentence creates an exclusive relationship as the target readers are seen not as part of *ours*, but as *others*. On the other hand, the Chinese text uses a non-deictic choice ‘Taiwanese people,’ which does not specify the exclusive or inclusive interpersonal relationship.

‘We’ is an important linguistic resource in the construction of national discourse, and is referred to as a national deictic (Petersoo 2007). Most studies on political discourse focus on the use of the *addressee-inclusive we* rather than the *addressee-exclusive we*. This is understood because political speeches usually aim to construct solidarity with addressees, but Pennycook (1994) reminds us that “‘we’ is always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive, a pronoun of solidarity and rejection, of inclusion and exclusion,” and “constructs a ‘we/you’ or a ‘we/they’ dichotomy” (Pennycook 1994, 175-176). In the English translation in example

5, the use of ‘our people’ simultaneously emphasizes the Taiwanese peoples’ solidarity in fighting for democracy and human rights, and excludes other visitors to the museum as merely observers of this process. This might be considered as an obligatory shift because, in reality, international visitors are not *one of us*. However, Richardson (1998) observes that this kind of shift is not always obligatory. For example, the spatial-temporal reference often remains with the source text writers in literary translation, while target readers are expected to “make the necessary imaginative leap” (Richardson 1998, 126) to understand the texts as the source text readers would. In other words, they could take up a *pseudo identity* as a Taiwanese reader. Therefore, the shift in repositioning is an optional shift made by the target text producers, whether consciously or not.

### ***Time and space in socio-political context***

Comparing the Chinese and the English framing strategies under the four categories, all strategies have been found to consistently and collectively construct different temporal-spatial dimensions in the source and the target texts.

In the Chinese text, the source text readers are invited to travel back to the time when the Incident took place through strategies of temporal reference and labelling as used by people at the time of the Incident, even though the terms may mean little or have acquired different meanings at the temporal point where the museum visitors are situated. In terms of temporal duration, the Chinese text presents the Incident in *continuity*, as a historical event stretching from the historical background to the future goal. The Incident symbolizes the long (and continuing) journey of the Taiwanese people’s fight for democracy and human rights. Regarding text-reader interaction, the Chinese text appeals to the readers through poetic style and uses non-deictic terms identifiable with ‘local readers’ such as *Taiwanese people*. The

228 Incident and Taiwan are also exhibited in a global space in relation to similar experiences in other countries.

In contrast, the English text frequently reminds target readers that they are situated in the space of the exhibition room, and the readers are often reminded that they are looking at *objects* through which the story of the Incident is being retold by the museum. In terms of continuity, the 228 Incident is framed as a stand-alone incident with an unclear historical context and no extension into the future—the conclusion indicates that the Incident has already ‘finished’ and been ‘justified.’ In terms of spatiality, there is a clear intellectual space created between the international visitors and the 228 Incident. The English readers are constantly reminded that they are viewing the memory of another—different—group of people, who are referred to with exclusive personal pronouns as *our people*.

When examining translation shifts, it is apparent that most of the translation shifts observed in this study are optional shifts, which means that these shifts are not obligatory in a linguistic-syntactic sense (Blum-Kulka 1986), and shift decisions are made consciously or unconsciously by the translators for other reasons. Since these shifts are not inevitable, we would like to further discuss the potential impact of these translator decisions in framing the social-historical context of Taiwanese society, particularly focusing on the construction of national identity and internationalization.

As Richardson (1998, 131) maintains, the deictic field is not only related to the immediate temporal-spatial context, but “an area of common purpose between speaker and hearer, between writer and reader.” Deictic shifts can be considered as a result of the different purposes of the source and target texts. As initially highlighted, the 228 Incident has been an important foundation of the construction of Taiwanese identity and has been used to legitimize different versions of the Taiwanese identity by the political parties. These perspectives can broadly be divided into the *Great China Perspective* and the *Independent*

*Taiwan Perspective*. Temporal framing is crucial to the construction of the two discourses. For pro-independence supporters, the 228 Incident is *not yet finished* and *not yet justified* (Wu 2005). They continue to demand additional responses from the government, and the 228 Incident to them is a lesson for the Taiwanese people—that when a *foreign regime* governs Taiwan, it inevitably leads to tragedy. In the historical context, the ROC government is seen as the foreign regime, and in the contemporary context this role is further projected onto the PRC government. This is the ultimate source of much resistance to the PRC. On the other hand, the *Great China Perspective* sees the 228 Incident as a civil war and considers the official apology by the Taiwanese president in 1995 and the compensation paid to victims or their families as a justification of the Incident. The current democratic society in Taiwan is seen as the realization of the goals for which the 228 victims fought. From this perspective the Incident is *both finished and justified*. In this context, it is clear that the Chinese and English temporal-spatial frames constructed in the texts of the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum have contributed to the construction of two different ideologies, particularly because the Chinese narratives present the Incident in temporal continuity and the English narratives give the impression that the Incident has been completed and justified.

Closely related to this construction of national identity is the issue of internationalization. The Chinese text has a strong ambition to display the 228 Incident in the global context of post-war democratization. This is particularly seen in the last exhibition room (and the last chapter of the guidebook) entitled *The International Human Rights Forest*. In this exhibition room, the 228 Incident is compared to events in other countries. What happens in international society provides significant support for those activists who argue that the Taiwanese government has not acted sufficiently to achieve transitional justice. On the other hand, the English text almost completely deletes these references to global context and simply concludes that Taiwan now enjoys peace and democracy. More importantly, visitors



who are members of the international community should be the target readers that the museum tries to reach out to, but they are actually ‘detached’ and separated from further informed reflection on the 228 Incident by the translation.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, museum translations in Taiwan are mostly outsourced to translation agents, so museums are not always aware of the translation shifts that occur. When it comes to translation practice, museum translators may still focus more on accuracy or fluency, while ignoring (or being quite unaware of) the subtle ideology embedded in narratives. Thus, consciously or unconsciously, the target texts they produce may diverge quite distinctly along dimensions such as the temporal-spatial frames explored in this study. The museum may be quite unaware of the divergence. One thing is certain; this kind of translation shifting is still largely under-researched.

Overall, this paper has demonstrated how temporal and spatial constructions are altered between source and target during translation via different framing strategies. It has argued that variation along these two dimensions can construct two different narratives—tell two different socio-cultural stories—concurrently. In the wider socio-political context, it is clear that a memorial museum’s shifts of temporal-spatial frames in translation can have a significant impact on how a nation’s past, present, and future is perceived by others.

## ***References***

- Ashworth, Gregory. 2008. “The Memorialization of Violence and Tragedy.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham, and Peter Howard, 231-244. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- Baxandall, Michael. 1991. “Exhibiting Intention: Some Preconditions of the Visual Display of Culturally Purposeful Objects.” In *Exhibiting cultures: the Poetics and Politics of*

- Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp, and Steven D. Lavine, 33-41. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Beattie, Andrew. 2010. "Between Histories and Memories: Torgau's Memorial Museum for Germany's Short Twentieth Century." *Museum and Society* 8 (1): 37-55.
- Bennett, Tony. 2004. *Past beyond Memory: Evolution, Museum, Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, edited by Juliane House, and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 17-35. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Chang, Hui-Ching, and Richard Holt. 2015. *Language, Politics, and Identity in Taiwan: Naming China*. London: Routledge.
- Chen, Chia-Li. 2003. "Interpreting History: Adults' Learning in the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum." *Museological Review* 9: 16-29. Accessed May 18, 2016.  
<https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/documents/museologicalreview/MR-9-2003.pdf>
- De Beaugrande, Robert, and Wolfgang Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London: Longman.
- Ferguson, Bruce W. 1996. "Exhibition Rhetorics: Material Speech and Utter Sense." In *Thinking about Exhibitions*, edited by Bruce W. Ferguson, Reesa Greenberg, and Sandy Nairne, 175-90. London: Routledge.
- Fleischauer, Stefan. 2007. "The 228 Incident and the Taiwan Independence Movement's Construction of a Taiwanese Identity." *China Information* 21 (3): 373-401.

- Goethals, Patrick, and July De Wilde. 2009. "Deictic Center Shifts in Literary Translation: The Spanish Translation of Nooteboom's *Het Volgende Verhaal*." *Meta* 54 (4): 770-794.
- Hijorth, Ben. 2014. "We are Standing in/the Nick of Time: the Temporality of Translation in Anne Carson's *Antigonick*." *Performance Research* 19 (3): 135-139.
- Howard, Scott. 2003. "Landscapes of Memorialisation." In *Studying Cultural Landscapes*, edited by Iain Robertson, and Penny Richards, 47-70. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Hughes, Sarah. 2011. "The British Museum in Print: From National to Universal Museum." In *National Museums: New Studies from Around the World*, edited by Simon Knell, Peter Aronsson, and Arne Bugge Amundsen, 193-204. London: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Liu, Lydia. 2014. "The Eventfulness of Translation Temporality, Difference, and Competing Universals." *Translation: A Transdisciplinary Journal* 4: 147-170.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1998. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Mason, Ian, and Adrian Șerban. 2003. "Deixis as an Interactive Feature in Literary Translations from Romanian into English." *Target* 15 (2): 269-294.
- McDowell, Sara. 2008. "Heritage, Memory and Identity." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham, and Peter Howard, 37-53. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Miller, J. Hills. 1991. "Border Crossing: Translating Theory." *EurAmerica/Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica*, 21 (4): 27-51.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 1994. "The Politics of Pronoun." *ELT Journal* 48 (2): 173-178.

- Petersoo, Pille. 2007. "What Does 'We' Mean? National Deixis in the Media." *Journal of Language and Politics* 6 (3): 419-436.
- Preziosi, Donald. 2012. "Narrativity and the Museological Myths of Nationality." In *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, edited by Bettina Messias Carbonell, 82-91. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Richardson, Bill. 1998. "Deictic Features and the Translator." In *The Pragmatics of Translation*, edited by Leo Hickey, 124-142. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Schaffner, Ingrid. 2006. "Wall Text." In *What Makes a Great Exhibition*, edited by Paula Marincola, 154-167. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Exhibition Initiative.
- Scott, Jill. 2004. "Translating Myth: The Task of Speaking Time and Space." In *Translation and Culture*, edited by Katherine M. Faull, 58-72. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2001. "The Space 'In Between': What is a Hybrid Text?" *Across Languages and Cultures*, 2 (2): 207-216.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2003. "Ideology and the Position of the Translator." In *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology—Ideology in Translation Studies*, edited by María Calzada Pérez, 181-202. London: Routledge.
- Walklate, Jenny. 2012. *Timescapes: The Production of Temporality in Literature and Museums*. PhD Thesis, University of Leicester.
- Williams, Paul. 2012. "The Memorial Museum Identity Complex: Victimhood, Culpability, and Responsibility." In *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, 2nd edition, edited by Bettina Messias Carbonell, 97-115. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2000. "The Third Space in Postcolonial Translation." In *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, edited by Sherry Simon, and Paul St-Pierre, 127-146. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Wu, Nai-Te. 2005. "Transition without Justice or Justice without History: Transitional Justice in Taiwan." *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 1 (1): 77-102. Accessed May 18, 2016.

<http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/ios/people/personal/wnd/TransitionWithoutJusticeOrJusticeWithoutHistory.pdf>

Vaisman, Noa. 2013. "Translation: Temporality and Memory." *Fieldsights - Field Notes, Cultural Anthropology Online*, September 11. Accessed May 18, 2016.

<http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/378-translation-temporality-and-memory>

Vergo, Peter. 1989. "Introduction." In *The New Museology*, edited by Peter Vergo, 1-5.

London: Reaktion Books.