HANDBOOK OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

VOLUME 5

EDITED BY
YVES GAMBIER
LUC VAN DOORSLAER

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Copyright 2021. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 2/10/2023 12:21 PM via
AN: 3036490 ; Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer.; Handbook of Translation Studies : Volume 5
Account: ns335141

Handbook of Translation Studies

Handbook of Translation Studies

The *HTS* aims at disseminating knowledge about translation and interpreting to a relatively broad audience: not only students who often adamantly prefer user-friendliness, researchers and lecturers in Translation Studies, Translation & Interpreting professionals; but also scholars, experts and professionals from other disciplines (among which linguistics, sociology, history, psychology).

Moreover, the *HTS* is the first handbook with this scope in Translation Studies that has *both a print edition and an online version*. The *HTS* is variously searchable: by article, by author, by subject. Another benefit is the interconnection with the selection and organization principles of the online *Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB)*. Many items in the reference lists are hyperlinked to the *TSB*, where the user can find an abstract of a publication.

All articles are written by specialists in the different subfields and are peer-reviewed.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see *benjamins.com/catalog/hts*

Editors

Yves Gambier
University of Turku
& Kaunas University of Technology

Luc van Doorslaer
University of Tartu & KU Leuven

Editorial Assistant

Dominique Van Schoor
KU Leuven, campus Antwerp

International Advisory Board

Cecilia Alvstad
Høgskolen i Østfold

Claudia V. Angelelli
Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh

Jan-Louis Kruger
Macquarie University, Sydney

Minhua Liu
Hong Kong Baptist University

Jeremy Munday
University of Leeds

Jacobus A. Naudé
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein

Franz Pöchhacker
University of Vienna

Roberto A. Valdeón
University of Oviedo

Judy Wakabayashi
Kent State University

Michaela Wolf
University of Graz

Handbook of Translation Studies

Volume 5

Edited by

Yves Gambier
University of Turku & Kaunas University of Technology

Luc van Doorslaer
University of Tartu & KU Leuven

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI z39.48-1984.

DOI 10.1075/hts.5

Cataloging-in-Publication Data available from Library of Congress:
LCCN 2010028104

ISBN 978 90 272 0887 3 (HB)
ISBN 978 90 272 5980 6 (E-BOOK)

© 2021 – John Benjamins B.V.
No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Company · www.benjamins.com

Table of contents

Introductory note by the editors 1

Alternative labels for "translation" 3
Luc van Doorslaer

Anthropology and translation 11
Antonio Lavieri

Audio description 17
Anna Matamala

Complexity in translation studies 23
Kobus Marais

Corpus-based interpreting studies 31
Mariachiara Russo

Digital humanities and translation studies 37
Lynne Bowker

Ecology of translation 45
Michael Cronin

Emotions and translation 53
Séverine Hubscher-Davidson

Empathy 59
Matthias Apfelthaler

Ergonomics and translation workplaces 67
Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow

Ethics in translation and for translators 73
Dorothy Kenny

Eye tracking 79
Jan-Louis Kruger

Food and translation 87
Renée Desjardins

Genetic translation studies 93
Anthony Cordingley

Healthcare interpreting 99
Letizia Cirillo

Indigenous peoples and translation 105
Valerie Henitiuk and Marc-Antoine Mahieu

Indirect translation 113
Hanna Pięta

International business and translation 121
Rebecca Piekkari and Susanne Tietze

Intersemiotic translation 127
Elin Sütiste

Intralingual translation 135
Karen Korning Zethsen

Lingua franca 143
Lance Hewson

Multimodality in interpreting 151
Franz Pöchhacker

Museums and translation 159
Robert Neather

NGOs and translation 165
Wine Tesseur

Non-professional translators and interpreters 171
Rachele Antonini

Post-editing 177
Sharon O'Brien

Publishing in Translation Studies 185
Roberto A. Valdeón

Religious texts and oral tradition 191
Jacobus A. Naudé

Risk in translation 199
Kayo Matsushita

Situated cognition 207
Ricardo Muñoz Martín

Tourism translation 213
M. Zain Sulaiman and Rita Wilson

Transcreation 221
David Katan

Translating popular fiction 227
Federico Zanettin

Translating social sciences 233
Yves Gambier

Translator studies 241
Andrew Chesterman

World literature and translation 247
César Domínguez

Cumulative index 254

Introductory note by the editors

Up to now, the *Handbook of Translation Studies* (HTS) consisted of four volumes, all published between 2010 and 2013. The full content of those four volumes, a total of 174 entries, is also available online at **www.benjamins.com/online/hts**. The advantage of the online version is that the authors can update their entries. Further, the flexibility of the online version enables the accommodation of the many requests for making the entries available in languages other than English. In collaboration with many universities and translator networks in different language areas, at the moment of writing, the online HTS offers some 400 translations of entries in several languages, thereby illustrating the continuing need – interestingly paradoxical – for multilingualism in translation studies (TS).

During that first stage of HTS, many specialists in the discipline had contributed to the project, and it has been well-received worldwide. However, since research in TS continues to grow and expand, we have recently decided to add a fifth volume. Indeed, TS, used as an umbrella term also covering related practices such as interpreting, adaptation, localization, etc., has undergone important new developments in recent years: digital technologies, data-centrism, mobility, and distance working or telework are impacting the translation industry and translators' practices and, also as a consequence, the discipline studying all those objects. In addition, the psycho-cognitive dimension of the translating process adds new approaches to the understanding of intercultural and multimedia communication. As a result, concepts, e-tools, and methods are also adjusted and transformed.

This fifth volume offers 36 brand new entries – covering recent innovative, challenging studies in TS. The system of cross-references and the index allow the readers to connect to the entries in the four previous volumes: ① refers to vol. 1, ② to vol. 2, etc. Furthermore, it is important to stress that the HTS project is an initiative with many collaborators involved: first of all, the authors of the entries. However, in particular, we would like to thank the members of the HTS International Advisory Board, the HTS assistant Dominique van Schoor for her invaluable work through the years, and Irmak Uğur for her attentive formal editing and proofreading.

Let us conclude by mentioning that further innovative plans are under development for the HTS project. However, at this moment, we hope that the readers will welcome HTS vol. 5 as a useful adjunct illustrating the rapid progress of the discipline of TS.

The HTS editors
Yves Gambier
Luc van Doorslaer

Alternative labels for "translation"

Luc van Doorslaer
University of Tartu | KU Leuven | Stellenbosch University

1. The complex reality of an apparently simple subject

The developing views on translation as an object of study in TS are clearly described by Halverson in her entry on translation[1] in the first volume of this *Handbook* (Halverson 2010): from the objectivist approaches during the earlier stages of translation research to the non-objectivist and the relativist views. This evolution towards a growing problematization of the translation concept reflects the available amount of research and knowledge. The insight that translation reality shows a complex image of different forms and appearances of translation processes and products, up to cultural transfer[1], has undermined too straightforward objectivist approaches.

Nevertheless, in popular definitions and daily usages of "translation" outside of the discipline, the necessary criterion (or prescription) of equivalence-based interlingual transfer is largely dominant. Although sameness and equivalence[3] as central concepts in TS discourse have been gradually replaced by a focus on difference and transformation, the understanding of translation in the world beyond TS still largely relies on expectations of faithfulness in language transfer. Broader and more complex conceptualizations of translation have for instance hardly entered adjacent disciplines, as "the dominant view on translation [and translation studies] in other disciplines is that of a language-based practice which designs methods for translation on a normative basis" (van Doorslaer 2018: 228).

Secondly, besides the traditional use of the term in other disciplines, it is fairly dominant in the world of translation practice, also because equivalencing is the starting point for different forms of Machine translation[1]. Additionally, translators' professional associations often confirm the illusion of a stable sense and meaning that can be neutrally transferred in translation. Zwischenberger explains this as a partly marketing-driven attempt of such associations to present translators as "innocent" and "trustworthy professionals steered by fidelity, accuracy, and neutrality" (2019: 265) to their clients. On the other hand, confirming such a traditional explanatory framework of translation practice "is particularly damaging to the discipline because it perpetuates perceptions of "translation proper" and consequently also of TS as outdated" (Zwischenberger 2019: 266).

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.alt1
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

Thirdly, despite the clear tendency in TS over the past decades to broaden the object of research, there are also currents in the discipline adhering to the exact opposite position. They generally defend that TS should stick to its original core business of interlingual translation (practice) and exclude other text-modifying practices such as intralingual[5] or intersemiotic[5] translation – the two other "types" of translations already mentioned by Jakobson (1959). Those currents warn against the broadening tendencies as running the risk of undermining the specificity of the discipline. That specificity is then attached exactly to the concept of equivalence: "[…] something like the concept of equivalencing needs to be defended against the now commonplace references to the old notion of equivalence as dubious or passé. […] Under the influence of literary and cultural studies, there has been too much emphasis in recent years on the non-equivalencing [p. 20] work of translators" (Mossop 2016: 19–20).

These tensions between the newer tendency to broaden the object field of translation (as in a lot of TS research over the past decades) on the one hand, and the traditional idea of limiting it to an equivalence-based interlingual practice (as in most other disciplines, in translation practice, and in parts of contemporary TS) on the other, offer fertile ground for the creation of alternative designations. Translation-related text-modifying practices (such as interpreting[1], adaptation[1], and localization[1]) all belong to the object of study of TS according to the former tendency – as such, "translation" can be considered an umbrella term covering these practices. The narrower interpretation of the latter, however, deprives the translation concept of qualities such as change, difference, and transformation. Consequently, it almost inevitably leads to the need for alternative terms. Some may see this as a purely descriptive need for distinguishing between different practices. Others will also point to the consequences for the reputation of "translation" when narrowed down to the traditional understanding and to one specific practice only. "The word *translation* seems to suffer from a bad reputation. It is often replaced by or competes with other terms, such as *localization, adaptation, versioning, transediting, language mediation,* and *transcreation*" (Gambier 2016: 888). In that sense, the introduction of alternative terms can also be considered from a strategic or rhetorical perspective: an existing concept is narrowed down in order to be able to innovate and to suggest a widening alternative term.

2. Examples of alternative labels

Some of the activities that the alternative terms refer to have developed into an industry branch or a research field of their own. This is without any doubt the case for *localization*, an important economic activity focusing on internationalizing software for a specific region or language – also including game localization, for instance.

Making a text locale-specific and adapting it to the different circumstances of a target audience may seem an obvious translational practice for most researchers in TS. This is however not the case for many practitioners in the localization industry, according to whom translation is only a limited part of the process: "localization activities include translation […] and a wide range of additional activities" (Schäler 2010: 209). When adopting a limited linguistic and equivalence-based view on translation, this creates the opportunity for introducing new terms and, in this specific industry case, for claiming a large part of a new economic activity. Pym described this tension as "industry discourses on localization [that] manipulate a very restrictive concept of translation, keeping aspects like cultural adaptation for themselves" (2004: 51).

Despite being restricted to film, theater, music, and the media, *adaptation* has become an important activity. More than for localization, it has resulted in the establishment of a related field of research called adaptation studies (AS). Because adaptation omits, adds and rewrites while still referring to the original author, the borderlines with a translation concept that has integrated change and transformation have become very blurred. The differences between the studied objects in translation and adaptation studies are usually gradual, not essential. "Just as there is no such thing as a literal translation, there can be no literal adaptation. […] This newer sense of translation comes closer to defining adaptation as well" (Hutcheon 2006: 16). Although the common grounds have extended, TS and AS are not interchangeable, as can be derived from their partly autonomous institutionalization[3]. Most of the time they organize separate conferences, have their own publication outlets, with only a very partial overlap. Because AS concentrates on more specific object fields, there exists "the belief that as TS has been established longer, and has a broader focus of interest, it might swallow up AS" (van Doorslaer & Raw 2016: 194). For supporters of interdisciplinary exchange, there can be hardly a more suitable adjacent discipline for TS than AS.

Alternative labels do not necessarily have to refer to existing industry branches or academic fields. In some practice-related areas, they were coined for stressing a combination of (interlingual) translation with a field-specific activity. Probably the most famous example is that of *transediting*, suggested by Stetting as "a new term for coping with the grey area between editing and translating" (1989: 371). It has been used in a productive way in research on news translation (see Journalism and translation[1]), as many writing and rewriting activities in newsrooms are a combination of editing and (interlingual or intralingual, sometimes intermedial or intersemiotic) translating. It is obvious that the broader and more recent concept of translation allows for this type of transformation and covers the editing part as well. Here again, making use of "transediting" implies a traditional and narrower understanding of translation, and as such "a step back" (Schäffner 2012: 880) for understanding the term in TS. "If transediting is used as a substitute to and/or in opposition to the term translation, there is the danger that translation continues to be understood in a narrower sense of a purely word-for-word transfer process" (Schäffner 2012: 881).

A case combining several features of the previous labels is that of *transcreation*[5]. When explained as "creative translation", it implies that other translations are by definition non-creative. Again, the added or "new" part of the term tries to express a focus by using this implied opposition effect. However, the focus does not express an essential difference, but rather a gradual one: with *more* room for difference and variance. Similar to Schäffner above for "transediting", critics of the term "transcreation" consider it a "useless new category assigned to the activity that they had been doing for years, i.e., translating" (Gaballo 2012: 95). Katan (2016) suggests using the term when expressing two opposing patterns in the translation market as they have developed recently. On the one hand there will be the "low-risk, low ambiguity translating and interpreting" (2016: 377) that can largely be covered by automated translation and by human translators focusing on "faithful" translation. On the other hand, transcreation would apply to more challenging, more risk-taking and more re-creative translation tasks functioning as intercultural communication and also considering "the impact of cultural distance" (2016: 378).

The four alternative labels dealt with here are certainly not the only ones, but they cover the range of main labeling procedures: from the relative autonomization of an industry branch or a separate (sub)discipline to a stronger focus on a specific practice in a professional field. Other labels are for instance revisioning, recontextualization, tradaptation, reworking or remediation.

3. Digitization stressing the blurred boundaries

Over the past decades, the concepts of book, text, writing, reading, as well as translating have changed drastically because of digitization, with considerable consequences for the relationship between certain of those activities. "As translation technologies and digital content have become almost ubiquitous, the difference between translation and localization has become clouded and somewhat difficult to define" (Schäler 2010: 210). In this new digital landscape, technologies, human and non-human agents, and media are more connected than ever before, meaning that it is also much more difficult to distinguish between them. Whereas traditional thinking about translation was based on the central position of stable sources (typical for the era of print), the digital age destabilizes the sources and makes them part of a process of constant textual change. This phenomenon is not new, since also in the pre-print age texts were constantly rewritten "and translation was frequently perceived as just another step in that chain of rewritings" (Pym 2004: 175). Such a historical perspective relativizes the search for (non-existing) clear-cut boundaries between translation and localization, or between translation and adaptation.

Moreover, this development at the beginning of the 21st century goes hand in hand with a plethora of medial and modal transformations, including a boom of transmedial production and reproduction. Because of that new normality, appreciation is growing for the value of offshoots, spinoffs, rewritings, co-writings, adaptations, recontextualizations, etc. Every author's product, including every translator's product, is a small element in a complex and interacting text production system that becomes increasingly multimodal[4] and transmedial.

4. Multilingual differences and future perspectives

Every disagreement or discussion about the content of the term "translation" also inevitably links to the related discussion about the object and scope of TS. In addition, there is the consideration that not all languages experience this discussion the same way. In English, the term "translation studies" (TS) was and is used in diverging ways – as a very specific term, dealing with research on written translation only on the one hand, and as an umbrella term on the other, not only covering translation proper, but also related text-modifying practices such as interpreting, adaptation, and localization. For that reason, in the discipline you find book titles such as the *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* or this *Handbook of Translation Studies*, even when these books include several entries on interpreting or adaptation as well. A language like German, for instance, approaches it differently. As a more technical term it uses a third concept, *Translation* (pronounced the German way), covering both *Übersetzen* (written translation) and *Dolmetschen* (oral translation). Particularly from a postcolonial angle, authors such as Tymoczko (2009) have pointed to concepts in non-European cultures that would evoke larger associations than translation, such as *tarjama* (Arabic) or *fanyi* (Chinese); for the latter term, however, this was disputed by Chang (2015).

Considering the fundamental change in the perception of a text and of textual processes in the digital age, it seems inevitable that TS will redefine and reconsider its relationship with (sub)disciplines dealing with other text-modifying practices. The discussion about the content and scope of "translation" will also depend on the exact nature of the common grounds between all these subfields and practices. Is it the transfer of information, or rather the transformation of information in a context of transmedial change? The attempts to replace translation by "expanded" concepts can then also be applied at a disciplinary level. Many things are on the move not only in text-modifying practices such as translation, but also in the scholarly approaches to this variety of phenomena.

References

Chang, Nam Fung. 2015. "Does 'translation' reflect a narrower concept than 'fanyi'? On the impact of Western theories on China and the concern about Eurocentrism." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 10 (2): 223–242. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.10.2.04cha

Gaballo, Viviana. 2012. "Exploring the boundaries of transcreation in specialized translation." *ESP Across Cultures* 9: 95–113.

Gambier, Yves. 2016. "Rapid and radical changes in translation and translation studies." *International Journal of Communication* 10: 887–906.

Halverson, Sandra. 2010. "Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, vol. 1*, ed. by Yves Gambier, and Luc van Doorslaer, 378–384. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.1.tra2

Hutcheon, Linda. 2006. *A theory of adaptation*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203957721

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *On Translation*, ed. by Reuben A. Brower, 144–151. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprinted in *The Translation Studies Reader* (2004), ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 138–143. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674731615.c18

Katan, David. 2016. "Translation at the cross-roads: Time for the transcreational turn?" *Perspectives* 24 (3): 365–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1016049

Mossop, Brian. 2016. "'Intralingual translation': a desirable concept?" *Across Languages and Cultures* 17 (1): 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2016.17.1.1

Pym, Anthony. 2004. *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation and Distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.49

Schäffner, Christina. 2012. "Rethinking Transediting." *Meta* 57 (4): 866–883. https://doi.org/10.7202/1021222ar

Schäler, Reinhard. 2010. "Localization and translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, *vol. 1*, ed. by Yves Gambier, and Luc van Doorslaer, 378–384. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.1.loc1

Stetting, Karen. 1989. "Transediting – A New Term for Coping with the Grey Area between Editing and Translating." In *Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Conference for English Studies*, ed. by Graham Caie, 371–382. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2009. "Why Translators Should Want to Internationalize Translation Studies." *The Translator* 15 (2): 401–421. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2009.10799287

van Doorslaer, Luc. 2018. "Bound to Expand. The Paradigm of Change in Translation Studies." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, ed. by Helle V. Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger, and Karen K. Zethsen, 220–230. Abingdon: Routledge.

van Doorslaer, Luc, and Laurence Raw. 2016. "Adaptation Studies and Translation Studies: Very Interactive yet Distinct." In *Border Crossings: Translation Studies and Other Disciplines*, ed. by Yves Gambier, and Luc van Doorslaer, 189–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.126.09van

Zwischenberger, Cornelia. 2019. "From inward to outward: the need for translation studies to become outward-going." *The Translator* 25 (3): 256–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2019.1654060

Further essential reading

Cattrysse, Patrick. 2014. *Descriptive Adaptation Studies: Epistemological and Methodological Issues*. Antwerpen: Garant.

Chan, Leo. 2012. “A survey of the ‘new’ discipline of adaptation studies: between translation and interculturalism.” *Perspectives* 20 (4): 411–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2012.726232

Gonne, Maud, Klaartje Merrigan, Reine Meylaerts, and Heleen van Gerwen (eds). 2020. *Transfer thinking in translation studies: playing with the black box of cultural transfer*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Littau, Karin. 2011. “First steps towards a media history of translation.” *Translation Studies* 4 (3): 261–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2011.589651

van Doorslaer, Luc. 2020. “Translation Studies: What’s in a name?” *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 7 (2): 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2020.1824761

Anthropology and translation

Antonio Lavieri
University of Palermo

1. Ways of translating cultures

Until recently, the role assigned to translation in ethno-anthropological studies has remained controversial and/or marginal. After the famous debate on British social anthropology at the turn of the 1960s (Asad 1986), the many and diverse approaches to translation – especially by the American linguistic anthropology and ethnopoetics – are still affected by epistemological, semantic, and ontological challenges: the impossibility to define language unequivocally (is it a concept, a text or a statement?), the inscrutability of reference (as in Willard Quine's terms) and the methodological oscillation between universalist, ethnographic and pragmatic models. Rodney Needham devoted his *Belief, Language and Experience* (1972) to the translatability of concepts, indicating the act of translation as a constitutive moment of anthropological knowledge, while Dennis Tedlock, a prominent figure in ethnopoetics, applied new translation strategies to Amerindian myths. Studying several versions of Zuni tales and the Mayan *Popul Vuh*, Tedlock remarked that in the transition from orality[2] to writing the suppression of oral markers irreversibly conditions the translation process. Thus, in his translation practice, he began using typographic devices that could incorporate the specificity of the oral dimension into the text; in a few instances, he even provided the recordings of oral performances along with the transcriptions (Tedlock 1983). More recently, Dell Hymes' ethnopoetic research has focused on the retranscription and critical retranslation[1] of some texts of the Amerindian tradition previously published by Edward Sapir and Melville Jacobs. Hymes has shown that the performances of oral traditions are deeply connected with the communicative competence understood as the ability to produce voice, and are thereby linked to the specific modalities in which reality is experienced, be they linguistic-poetic, cognitive, cultural, or emotional: "ethnopoetics involves not only translation but also transformation, transformation of modality, the presentation of something heard as something seen. The eye is an instrument of understanding" (Hymes 2003: 40).

Starting from Lévi-Strauss, who translated mythical tales from intermediate English or Portuguese versions, the ontological primacy that the established French

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.ant2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

anthropological scholarship attached to structure has led many scholars to identify invariant elements within different socio-cultural contents, to the extent of making structure an intrinsic property of reality. Consequently, the mythical tales were conceived as entangled in a game of transformations unaffected by the conditions of enunciation or by the actors participating in the discursive interaction. Over the last decades, the anthropological research has instead moved towards pragmatics, investigating the relationship between linguistic manifestations and the specific circumstances in which certain interlocutory acts are produced. In the 1930s, Bronislaw Malinowski (Malinowski 1935) was the first to advance a theory of language that he called "pragmatic": describing a series of performative statements (magic formulas, curses, prayers) as real linguistic acts, he began considering languages as actual ways of acting (see Ethnographic approaches[1]). Since then, learning the language of the informants became crucial to fieldwork. In taking this path, Anglo-American anthropology has led us in the opposite direction than French classic anthropology with its idealistic assumption. Discourse does not mirror reality: putting the ethnographic writing into discursive form always entails some semantic indeterminacy. Also, it expands the range of interpretations to the point of taking into account the production of utterances the transparency of which can never be fully guaranteed. Anthropologists studying exotic communities cannot aspire to any kind of absolute objectivity, but rather to some objectification procedures that, starting from discursive interaction, are based on a pragmatic and socio-indexical conception of meaning. The researchers will then focus on ritual acts understood as acts of symbolic communication with essential material components. Along with the vocal and verbal dimension, the choreographic, gestural, aesthetic, and visual ones contribute to the elaboration and translation of the "meaning-message-event". In this vein, the most current anthropological research emphasizes the constitutive dimension of translation in the representation and production of beliefs and knowledge, so to implying the cognitive mechanisms underlying the processes of symbolic signification of reality: "Translation is both how we constitute our objects and how we make claims about them" (Hanks and Severi 2015: 2).

2. Fieldwork manuscripts

In the last decades, the question of translating and comparing cultures has played a major role in anthropological literature, although with an almost exclusive focus on metaphor[2] – as, for example, in the American textualist anthropology of James Clifford (Clifford & Marcus 1986) and Clifford Geertz (Geertz 1973). This has happened to the detriment of a detailed analysis of the specific ways in which the multilingual and interlingual practices of ethnographic writing affect the production and interpretation of data, knowledge and theories. Thanks to the increasing availability of ethnographic archives, a critical-genetic approach to the multilingual practices of meaning has recently come about. Founded in Paris in 2016, the research group *Genèses de l'altérité: écritures ethnographiques et imaginaires du traduire* (ITEM/CNRS) aims studying the interdisciplinary dimension, both methodological and epistemological, that TS share with the ethnographic writing and the anthropology of knowledge (Lavieri & Londei 2018). In this context, translation is placed at the heart of cognitive practices that orient and shape the relationship between description, interpretation, beliefs and knowledge. The anthropologist's monolingual writing is the product of a tight interplay between the polyphonic utterances of informers, mediators, translators and interpreters. The process of textualization of ethnographic writing is therefore imbued with orality, verbal exchanges, interlinear versions and metadiscursive comments directly related with specific translating and collaborative practices both at the terminological and conceptual level. The analysis of ethnographic journals and fieldnotes can provide information not only about the procedures of observation and data collection, but also about the specific way in which translations acts on the representation and interpretation of indigenous cultures. In their quest for the traces and the processes grounding the heuristic construction of socio-cultural Otherness, researchers can now have privileged access to the phenomena of linguistic over-determination of ethnographic experiences – heteroglossia, multilingualism[1], vocabulary borrowed from the local vernacular. In this perspective, and using Marcel Griaule's archival collection as point of departure, Éric Jolly has recently emphasized the strategic role of informers and interpreters in the rhetorics of credibilization and decredibilization concerning the information that they provide. In a context of linguistic contact and/or diglossia, the coexistence of oral cultures can lead an interpreter to identify a term as the equivalent of a notion completely foreign to the indigenous linguistic and socio-symbolic practices (see Indigenous peoples and translation[5]). This is the case, for instance, of the word *hake* – borrowed from the Arabic through Peul – which the interpreter Ambara Dolo told Denise Paulme to be the equivalent of the notion of "sin", or "bad deed" (Lavieri & Londei 2018: 19). In the epistemological solidarity between TS and social anthropology, the critical-genetic approach to the practices of translation used in fieldwork manuscripts constitutes a promising space for renewal not only for the thorny issue of the ethnographic invention of the Other, but also for the studies in cultural translation[3] and the various forms of appropriation and social use of symbolic products.

3. Perspectives on translation and cultural complexity

The translation practices within anthropological discourse directly concern the regime of truth and the handling of evidence in ethnographic writing. Has then cultural authenticity solely a discursive nature? Translating notions and concepts underlying the cultural and symbolic practices of indigenous thought and languages into Western categories and languages means to address the role of cultural relativism in the light of limited translatability: "limited translatability" […] means that an "asymmetrical" ontological relationship is the basis of the production of anthropological knowledge, and that this ontological relationship works in such a way that the knowledge is stamped with the presupposition of the limit to which the other can be engaged with in discourse (Borutti 2019: 455). In all its forms, translation appears to be "a process endogenous to social life" (Hanks and Severi 2015: 2), where the ethnographic and anthropological representation of knowledge has to focus not only on differences, but also on the analysis of the translation processes at play between languages, non-linguistic codes, communication contexts and different traditions. Accordingly, the most recent anthropological trends tend to see translation as a multidimensional phenomenon redefining the complexity of cultural knowledge well beyond the mere linguistic grammatization of meaning, even in language-based intracultural translations (such as those concerning the shift from the shaman's ritual language to the language commonly spoken in his community). In the most diverse cultural traditions one can always find non-linguistic forms of translation:

> Words are translated into images, music into words, and gestures into objects. Furthermore, even within a single culture, translation processes enable the passage from one *context* of communication to another. Virtually everywhere, such formal contexts of the expression of meaning as ritual action, play, and other forms of performance generate their specific "ontologies." Things, artifacts, and living beings may then crucially *change their nature* […]. In these cases, the interpretation of such formal contexts of cultural representation transforms translation into a way to translate "*worlds*".
> (Hanks & Severi 2015: 10)

As an epistemological device, translation is at the center of the most recent ethno-anthropological research, from anthropology of religion to anthropology of art up to the study of ethnomathematics. Courtney Handman, who focuses on some of the Guhu-Samane communities in Papua New Guinea, has shown how the connections between the original texts and their translations may be subject to variation at specific ritual moments. During performances involving the participants in a ritual, the translation of the New Testament into the local language makes it possible to comment on the type of Christian transformations experienced by the community (Handman 2015). Starting from an ethnographic research on the field carried out in a contemporary art studio in Botswana, Leïla Baracchini has studied the way in which translation practices redefine the aesthetic regime of an artwork, as they can touch upon the attribution of the artwork's title, or upon the shift from an image to a discourse about images, from orality to writing, from one language/culture to another, from non-art to art (Baracchini 2020). On her part, Aparecida Vilaça (2018), who has been working in Brazil with the Wari' of the Southwestern Amazon for more than thirty years, is interested in the indigenous mathematics, showing that the translation of Christian texts into the indigenous language has encouraged the juxtaposition of cognitive categories: for example, the word for "lonely" (*xika'pe*) is equivalent to the number "1". However, although equivalent, they are not substitutes for one another, so that the word meaning "lonely" serves as the bridge between the Whites' mathematics and the indigenous' moral ones thanks to the invisible presence of an operator – the Other – which can bring about a pair of elements. The empirical study of the cognitive[1] processes at work in various forms of translation makes it possible to leave aside the idealistic postulate of a universal grammar of human culture. The ontological problem, then, no longer refers to the different conceptions of the world expressed in different languages, but to the multiple non-systematic ways of constantly activating different forms of thought: "In this new perspective, social anthropology would be defined not only as the study of cultural differences, but also and simultaneously as a science of translation: the study of the empirical processes and theoretical principles of cultural translation" (Hanks & Severi 2015: 17).

References

Asad, Talal. 1986. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology." In *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, ed. by James Clifford and George E. Marcus, 141–164. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baracchini, Leïla. 2020. "Tableaux et titres: les enjeux de la traduction dans un atelier d'art au Botswana." *L'Homme* 233 (1): 45–74. https://doi.org/10.4000/lhomme.36596

Borutti, Silvana. 2019. "Relativism and Intercultural Translation." *Paradigmi* 2 (3): 449–466.

Clifford, James, and George Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520946286

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3–30. New York: Basic Books.

Handman, Courtney. 2015. *Critical Christianity. Translation and Denominational Conflict in Papua New Guinea*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Hanks, William F., and Carlo Severi. 2015. "Introduction." In *Translating worlds. The epistemological Space of Translation*, ed. by William F. Hanks and Carlo Severi, 1–20. Chicago: Hau Books. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199684892.003.0001

Hymes, Dell. 2003. *Now I Know Only So Far: Essays in Ethnopoetics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Lavieri, Antonio, and Danielle Londei. 2018. “Entre traductologie et anthropologie. La reconstruction pragmatique et interdisciplinaire du sens.” In *Traduire l’Autre. Pratiques interlinguistiques et écritures ethnographiques*, ed. by Antonio Lavieri and Danielle Londei, 9–26. Torino: L’Harmattan Italia.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1935. *Coral Gardens and their Magic. A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in Trobriand Islands. Vol. 2: The Language of Magic and Gardening*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Needham, Rodney. 1972. *Belief, Language and Experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tedlock, Dennis.1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812205305

Vilaça, Aparecida. 2018. “Le diable et la vie cachée des nombres. Traductions et transformations en Amazonie.” *L’Homme* 225 (1): 149–170.

Further essential reading

Duranti, Alessandro. 2001. *Linguistic Anthropology. A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Maranhão, Tullio, and Bernhard Streck (eds). 2003. *Translation and ethnography. The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Rubel, Paula, and Abraham Rosman (eds). 2003. *Translating cultures. Perspectives on translation and anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.

Sammons, Kay, and Joel Sherzer (eds). 2000. *Translating Native American Verbal Art. Ethnopoetics and Etnhography of Speaking*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Sturge, Kate. 2007. *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Audio description

Anna Matamala
Autonomous University of Barcelona

An audio description (AD) converts images into words: visual elements – and sounds which cannot be understood without the images – are transferred into AD units, i.e., aural linguistic elements which are inserted when there is no significant speech or relevant sound in the source content (the so-called "silent gaps").

The combination of the original soundtrack with the AD creates a new coherent whole that provides access to those who cannot properly see the visuals. This includes persons with sight loss, but also sighted persons who, for a wide variety of reasons, may not have access to the visuals or may want to enjoy them with AD.

AD can be provided for audiovisual and visual content such as films, TV programmes, opera, dance, musical and theatre performances, sports events, art works, natural and cultural heritage sites, live events, among many others. When subtitles are present in a content, AD is offered together with audio subtitling, an oral rendering of the written subtitles. In some cases, especially in the performing arts, AD can be preceded by an audio introduction and a touch tour. An audio introduction is a recorded or live presentation which generally offers a short synopsis and a description of the main characters and visual style of the play. Touch tours are tactile visits which allow to explore the stage and touch the props.

AD can be said to have originated informally when sighted persons explained friends and family with sight loss what was happening on an audiovisual content. Ancient film narrators – or *benshi* in Japan –, radio dramas, opera or film radio broadcasts, and even literary figures such as ekphrasis have been considered precursors of AD in the literature. However, the origins of AD as such are generally traced back to the United States in the 1970s, with Frazier's "television for the blind", a concept later transferred to a regular service at Arena Stage Theater in Washington by Margaret Pfanstiehl. The literature acknowledges that the first audio described film was broadcast in 1983 by the Japanese channel NTV.

AD can be viewed as an intersemiotic type of Audiovisual translation[1] or as an access service within the realm of Media accessibility[3]. The relationship between audiovisual translation and media accessibility is still open to discussion and boundaries are unclear. In fact, as Matamala (2019) puts it, AD can be approached both as

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.aud2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

an audiovisual transfer model within audiovisual translation and as an access service within what can be termed "audiovisual accessibility".

A broad overview of AD in terms of practice and research is found in the monographs by Fryer (2016) and Snyder (2014), and also in edited volumes by Maszerowska, Matamala and Orero (2014) and Matamala and Orero (2016). All these works have inspired the present entry.

1. AD categorisation and main features

The specific characteristics of the content to be audio described have an impact on the actual AD. The content can:

- range from films (horror, thriller, comedy, drama, etc.) to the performing arts (dance, theatre, circus, etc.), cultural and natural heritage, or live events, among others.
- be an original production or a translation produced through dubbing, voice-over[1], subtitling[1] or other transfer modes.
- be static (for example, a painting) or dynamic (for example, a circus performance).
- be recorded or live.
- be planned, semi-planned or improvised.

The process of AD can also differ in many aspects. The AD can be:

- delivered live or recorded.
- planned, semi-planned or improvised.
- created as part of production or postproduction processes.
- created or translated. In both cases, it can be created or translated by a human or by a machine, with a possible human revision afterwards (post-editing).
- delivered by a human, or by a synthetic voice through a text-to-speech system.
- open or closed, meaning it can be heard by anyone watching the content (open) or can only activated when the viewer selects it (closed).
- mixed at the broadcaster or server end or mixed at the user end.
- generally delivered in one language, but there are examples in live AD in which two languages understood by the audience are combined.

An interesting debate has been that of objectivity versus subjectivity. Most early guidelines emphasize that describers should describe what they see (WYSWYS, What You See is What You Say), avoiding any type of manipulation or interpretation as this could be considered patronizing. However, defining what one sees is not so straightforward. We do not all see the same, as our previous experiences and knowledge shape our understanding, and research with users proves that certain audiences are willing to accept more creative approaches (Mazur & Chmiel, 2012). In any case, the time available for each AD unit is generally limited, and describers need to find strategies to select the better approach when deciding (a) what to describe and (b) how to describe it.

Narratology has been considered to provide a sound theoretical framework in relation to what to describe, especially in filmic AD. Remael, Reviers and Vercauteren (2015) identify some central constituents and provide recommendations on how to analyse the source text and how to develop an AD taking into account two main narratological building blocks: characters (and their actions), and spatio-temporal settings.

- Characters – protagonist, antagonist, and supporting characters – and their actions and reactions move the story forward. Characters can be new or known, they can be authentic or fictional, real or unrealistic, and they can be related or unrelated. They can have a symbolic function or help to indicate a lapse of time.
- Spatio-temporal settings refer to the place and time where the action takes place. They can be global or specific, real or imagined, well-known or unfamiliar. They can be presented explicitly or implicitly. They can have a background function or a narrative/symbolic function.

By understanding how the story is constructed, the describer can reconstruct it in the AD. Other aspects that Remael, Reviers and Vercauteren identify as worth paying attention to are related to film techniques – namely film language, sound effects and music, text on screen–, and intertextual references.

Regarding how to describe it, language is considered a central aspect. Perego (2019) indicates that the adjectives that better describe the language of AD are "meticulous", "concise", "visually intense", and "usable". In other words, the language of AD is expected to be detailed, accurate and precise, fitting in a limited space and conveying clear images. Plain syntax and a logical organisation of information are advised, to facilitate end user processing.

2. The AD process

Four main stages can be identified in the AD process, although some adjustments may need to be made in contexts such as live improvised AD:

- Preparation: the source text is analysed and a documentation process starts, following the instructions received (brief).
- Creation process: a written script is produced and timed.

- Voicing and recording: the script is voiced, either by the same describer or by a voice artist, and recorded. In recorded AD, this step is followed by technical procedures such as the sound mix.
- Quality control: a quality evaluation process, ideally including end users, is undertaken.

There are both local and international standards and recommendations that provide guidance on the process, such as *ISO/IEC TS 20071-21:2015 Information Technology – User interface component accessibility. Part 21: Guidance on audio description* or *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1.* Rai, Green and Leen (2010) also present a comparative study of different national standards and recommendations. The ADLAB guidelines (Remael, Reviers and Vercauteren, 2015) merit special attention: rather than advocating for a prescriptive approach, they suggest strategies to deal with different problems during the AD process.

3. Research

Research on AD began at the end of the 20th century outside the field of translation, when Gregory Frazier developed an MA dissertation (1975) on the topic. In audiovisual translation, AD has gained momentum with the turn of the century, and the Advanced Research Seminar on Audio Description (ARSAD), held at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona every two years, has become a conference of reference in the field.

From a theoretical point of view, cognitive (Holsanova), discursive (Braun) and narratological (Kruger, Vercauteren) models have been used to account for the processes involved in AD.

From a descriptive point of view, publications analyse AD in a plethora of genres and languages, sometimes providing an historical overview and a critical analysis of existing legislation. Special emphasis has been put on filmic AD, with investigations dealing with typical research topics in translation studies (TS) such as cultural references (see Realia[2]), humour[1], music[3], voices[4], but also more specific aspects such as how to describe characters, spaces, facial expressions, or written language.

Going beyond specific case studies, different corpora[1] have been built to better understand AD: TIWO (Television in Words) at University of Surrey, TRACCE, MOVD (MoMA Visual Descriptions) and MOAP (MoMa Audio Programme) at University of Granada, and VIW (Visuals Into Words) at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona are examples of such corpora.

Some European projects have included AD as an object of study. The Pear Tree Project (Mazur & Kruger 2012), developed within the European project DTV4ALL

(2008–2010), aimed better to understand film reception across Europe, trying to find cross-linguistic and cross-cultural commonalities and differences as a first step towards developing a common set of AD guidelines. This work evolved in part into the ADLAB project (2011–2014), which mapped practices and guidelines across Europe and finally produced reference guidelines in the field (Remael, Reviers & Vercauteren, 2015).

DTV4ALL, and its successor HBB4ALL (2013–2016), also tested different technical scenarios for the distribution and reception of AD. Whereas the former focused on digital television, the latter dealt with hybrid connected television. A step further has been taken in the ImAc project (2017–2020), in which AD in virtual environments has been developed and evaluated, in terms of technical delivery, sound treatment and scripting.

From a technological point of view, the application of language and translation technologies was researched by the ALST project (2013–2015): more specifically, ALST investigated whether speech recognition, machine translation (with postediting) and text-to-speech technologies could be integrated into the AD workflow. In addition, computer vision techniques are used to research the automatic generation of audio descriptions (see MeMAD project, 2018–2020). Other projects, such as Open Art in Poland, placed the emphasis on developing and testing apps to provide AD in museums.

The didactics of AD – and AD as an educational tool – have also been a relevant research topic, with special attention paid to the skills and competences audio describers need to acquire. A seminal project was ADLAB PRO (2016–2019), which assessed current AD training practices in Europe, defined the profile of the AD professional, and designed a course and developed educational resources which are now freely available on the internet. Along similar lines, the EASIT project (2018–2021) researches how AD can be merged with Easy-to-read or Plain Language to provide easy-to-understand audio descriptions to diverse users, and aims also to produce open access educational content.

Research in AD has also placed a strong focus on how end users receive different AD strategies (Chmiel & Mazur 2012). As an example, audio descriptions created by a human narrator have been compared to audio descriptions by a text-to-speech system. Similarly, audio descriptions created with a standard approach have been compared to more creative audio descriptions or to descriptions including cinematic language. And audio descriptions with diverging amounts of information have also been compared. These are just three illustrative examples of extensive reception research, which has gathered users' preferences, comprehension, recall or emotional response, to name a few measures, by using both subjective and objective methods. Persons with sight loss have been central in reception[4] research, but studies on AD with sighted viewers have also taken place, in order to better understand how sighted viewers watch movies and in order to identify additional uses of AD.

Overall, although AD research and practice is relatively recent compared to other modes, the intersemiotic transfer and multimodal interplay that take place in any AD have made it an attractive research topic that can be approached from a myriad of perspectives.

References

Chmiel, Agnieszka, and Iwona Mazur. 2012. "AD reception research: Some methodological considerations." In *Emerging topics in translation: audio description*, ed. by Elisa Perego, 57–80. Trieste: EUT.

Fryer, Louise 2016. *An introduction to audio description. A practical guide*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315707228

Maszerowska, Anna, Anna Matamala, and Pilar Orero (eds). 2015. *Audio description. New perspectives illustrated*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mazur, Iwona, and Jan-Louis Kruger (eds). 2012. Pear Stories and Audio Description: Language, perception and cognition across cultures. Special issue *Perspectives. Studies in Translatology* 20 (1).

Matamala, Anna. 2016. "The ALST project: technologies for audio description." In *Researching audio description. New approaches*, ed. by Anna Matamala and Pilar Orero, 269–284. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56917-2_14

Matamala, Anna, and Pilar Orero (eds). 2016. *Researching audio description. New approaches*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56917-2

Matamala, Anna. 2019. *Accessibilitat i traducció audiovisual* [Audiovisual translation and accessibility]. Vic: Eumo.

Mazur, Iwona, and Agnieszka Chmiel. 2012. "Audio description made to measure: Reflections on interpretation on AD based on the Pear Tree Project Data." In *Audiovisual translation and media accessibility at the crossroads*, ed. by Aline Remael, Pilar Orero, and Mary Carroll, 173–188. Amsterdam: Rodopi. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401207812_011

Perego, Elisa. 2019. "Audio description: evolving recommendations for usable, effective and enjoyable practices." In *Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*, ed. by Luis Pérez-González, 114–129. London: Routledge.

Rai, Sonali, Joan Greening, and Leen Petré. 2010. *A comparative study of audio description guidelines prevalent in different countries*. London: RNIB.

Remael, Aline, Nina Reviers, and Gert Vercauteren (eds). 2015. *Pictures painted in words. ADLAB audio description guidelines*. Trieste: EUT.

Snyder, Joel. 2014. *The visual made verbal. A comprehensive training manual and guide to the history and application of audio description*. Arlington: ACB.

Complexity in translation studies

Kobus Marais
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein

Because of the limitations inherent in human perception, memory and conceptualization, reality will always be more complex than human observation and thinking about it (McCabe 2014: 1). That said, the reductionist paradigm that has dominated Western scholarship over the last five centuries or so claims more than mere limited perceptual and conceptual abilities. It is based on the conviction that, underlying the complexity we observe, a few simple laws or principles account for all of reality or that reducing a problem to component parts allows one to deal with the problem (Morin 2008: 1). Mainly because of its acceptance of and technological success with Newtonian determinist mechanics, it assumes that all of reality is equally reducible to a few laws. In particular, the drive to be able to predict and control reality for human benefit informs the reductionist project.

Developments in physics, mathematics, computational sciences, biology, philosophy[1], semiotics[1] and epistemology, generally speaking, over the past 150 years have made it clear that, despite its validity in some contexts, reductionism cannot hold as an explanation for all of reality. In particular, reductionism fails when applied to living organisms, societies and cultures, which are complex adaptive systems that are open to their environment.

This entry offers a brief meta-theoretical conceptualisation of complexity after which it moves on to discuss some of the characteristics of complex adaptive systems. It moves to an overview of emergence, probably one of the more important concepts in complexity thinking, and ends with an overview of the status quo of complexity thinking in translation studies (TS).

1. Complexity thinking: a meta-theoretical position

One could think of complexity as a philosophical or ontological position, a theoretical-methodological position or an epistemological position. Philosophically, Morin (2008) holds that reality is complex and that human efforts towards reductionism entail a mutilation of reality. He argues that a complexity position is the only ethical relationship in which scholars can stand to reality. Cilliers' (1998) link between

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.comp4

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

complexity thinking and postmodernism is another clear example of complexity as a philosophical position.

In the natural sciences such as mathematics, physics, biology and computational science, complexity is a theory that tries to deal with the non-linearity of physical systems (Kauffman 1995). In this kind of thinking, there is still some reductionism because some scholars would hold that simple laws give rise to complex systems, which would mean that complex phenomena are reducible to the simple rules. This approach is quantitative and usually based on stochastic mathematical calculations – sometimes also found in the social sciences.

Complexity could also be seen as an epistemological position. It seems that some qualitative approaches to sociology as well as approaches in the humanities could be placed in this approach (Byrne & Callaghan 2014). In this case, complexity is neither a worked-out philosophy nor a theory-methodology but a way of thinking about reality and knowledge that is informed by the philosophical and the theoretical-methodological approaches. In my view, then, complexity thinking is not a binary opposite of reductionism but a meta-position that includes and subsumes reductionism. It does not claim that reductionism is problematic in all instances. Rather, it suggests that (a variety of levels of) reduction could be effective, to various extents, in some cases, and it could be ineffective, to various extents and at a variety of levels in other cases.

2. The characteristics of complex systems

Although not all complexity thinking is systems thinking (Cilliers 1998), complexity thinking has developed strongly in the field of complex adaptive systems. The term “adaptive” in the name refers to the fact that systems are regarded as historically emerging in an open relationship with an environment.

Probably the dominant feature of complex adaptive systems is that they are non-linear. Linearity means that the sum total of the parts of a system adds up to the sum total of the whole. Thus, if you have 20 bricks weighing one kilogram each, linear logic means that you can predict and calculate that 20 bricks will be weighing 20 kilograms. However, if you put 20 people together to create an artwork, no calculation or prediction is possible about the outcome. This is why complexity thinkers often say that the whole is more than the sum of the parts.

A second feature of complex adaptive systems is that they are sensitive to initial conditions. Initial conditions entail a description of the state of a system at the beginning of an observation cycle. Because they are non-linear, small changes in the initial conditions of two systems can lead to widely different outcomes. The weather is a good example of where two similar systems develop but small changes in the initial conditions result in one becoming a cyclone and one petering out to a mild breeze.

A third feature of complex adaptive systems, based on the first two, is that their predictability varies. With statistical means, some complex adaptive systems like the weather can still be predictable, although with probabilistic statistics. Other complex adaptive systems like societies are virtually unpredictable because of its non-linearity and sensitivity to initial conditions. This means that the notion of predictability, which is crucial in mechanics, is not simply or equally applicable in complex adaptive systems. One of the implications is that, in social and cultural studies, one cannot draw linear lines between cause and effect. Rather, effects sometimes become causes in an exponential kind of causality. This means that the ideals of predictability and control that are the hallmark of reductionist scholarship do not apply to complex adaptive systems.

A fourth feature of complex adaptive systems is that they are subject to the Second Law of Thermodynamics. This law describes the ubiquitous tendency of reality towards equilibrium. Wherever one has differences in, for example, energy, the tendency will be for the differences to be levelled out. The Second Law then means that time matters, i.e., that processes or tendencies are not simply reversible, as they would be under Newtonian law. This implies that even physical phenomena have a history. For example, if you see a video clip of five pool balls from five different positions rolling neatly into a circle, you will know that this video is played in reverse because reality tends towards disorder, not order. The implication of the Second Law, i.e., entropy, is that work needs to be done to counter this law. The only way in which living systems counter the Second Law is through the work of metabolism. This work is known as negative entropy or negentropy. It is, however, not only biological systems that have to work to counter entropy. Social and cultural systems (see Social systems and translation[4]) also have to perform work to create the order that goes with societal life (Marais 2019: 158–181).

A fifth feature is that complex adaptive systems self-organize. This means that there is no homunculus or control centre that organizes complex adaptive systems like the brain, the weather or the economy. The systems organize themselves through the interactions of their parts. Interested readers can consult Deacon (2013: 206–287) for an explanation of how homeodynamics, morphodynamics and teleodynamics work together in the emergence of self-organizing systems.

In addition, complex adaptive systems theory usually holds the view that systems are hierarchical. The aim with this position is to overcome the reductionist binary of matter and mind by arguing that each new hierarchical level shares the features of the previous level but also displays emergent or novel characteristics that are specific to that level. Usually, the physical is regarded as the most basic system, followed by the chemical and the biological. The social and cultural emerged from the previous levels. The implication of this line of thinking is that lower levels can exist without higher levels, but higher levels assume the existence of lower levels. For example, if there are no physical bodies, one could not have a society.

Lastly, complex adaptive systems are said to exist at the edge of chaos. This means that they are neither fully in equilibrium nor fully chaotic. Rather, they show features of both, to varying degrees. This feature explains the dynamics in these systems.

3. Emergence

As hinted above, complexity thinking is trying to explain reality without recourse to reductionism (e.g., binary thinking such as the Cartesian matter-mind schism). It is therefore a meta-theoretical stance on the origins of novelty or change in reality. The term that is used to thinking about novelty and change is "emergence" (Bedau & Humphreys 2008). A property or properties of a system is said to be emergent if it could not have been predicted from knowledge of the parts of the system. Emergence thinking thus tries to explain how the relationships between the parts of a system give rise to the features of the system at system level.

Emergence has a long history and is a hotly debated topic. Broadly speaking, the main debate around emergence is whether emerge occurs bottom-up or top-down. Deacon's (2013) absential approach to emergence is a recent effort to deal with the problems of both of these. Bottom-up emergence argues that parts come first and that wholes emerge from the ways in which parts interact and are organized. Novelty thus does not reside in parts, but in organization. In this view, water is an emergent feature of the particular organization of hydrogen and oxygen molecules. Top-down emergence argues that wholes are first and the requirement of the whole organizes the parts, which explains the novelty. A typical example of top-down causation would be the ability of thoughts to change physical-chemical aspects of the brain, as in psychotherapy.

Criticism has been brought against both bottom-up and top-down causation to explain emergent features. The main criticism against bottom-up causation is that it violates the laws of physics that claim that similar physical substrata should result in similar objects at the level of the whole. The main argument against top-down causation is that it entails circular argumentation in that the whole emerged from the parts and is then claimed to change or constitute the parts.

In order to solve this problem, Deacon (2013) suggested a theory of emergence that considers the causal effect of constraints and unrealized possibilities in the emergence of systems. In Deacon's view, emergence occurs both through bottom-up and through top-down causation. However, top-down causation, for Deacon, is not caused by the whole but by the effect of constraints that operate on the system. At a particular point in the history of a system, it is possible for this system to develop in a certain number of ways. However, it never develops in all of those ways, but only in one of those ways. The way in which it develops is determined by the constraints that are operative on that system. Once it has taken a particular course of development, limited by constraints, the unrealized possibilities are having an effect on what can be realized. Put simply, what did not happen constrains what is happening. Thus, the fact that certain things could have happened but did not happen determines what can happen next. This kind of argument is well known in counterfactual logic, for example, had I watered the plant, it would not have died. It is thus something that did not happen that caused something else to happen.

4. Complexity thinking in translation studies

Robinson used many of the principles of complexity thinking in the 1990s already (Robinson 2001: 14), arguing for the complexity of the hermeneutical[1] process. He linked this complexity to the embodied cognition of the translator rather than what he regarded as an overemphasis on abstract systems thinking (see Situated cognition[5]). Scholars focussing on translator training, like Kiraly (2006) (see also Teaching translation/Training translators[3]), also use complexity thinking to consider the emergence of knowledge in translator education. Kiraly (2006) demonstrates the usefulness of complexity thinking by considering translation competence a “cluster”, stepping down from efforts to find a/the determining factor of competence. Furthermore, thinking in machine translation[1] shows influences from and uses of complexity thinking, e.g., Agrawal and Carpuat (2019). In knowledge translation, complexity thinking has also been used extensively (Kothari and Sibbald 2018). Thinking in terms of complex systems also links to a strong tradition of systems thinking in TS such as Even-Zohar (2006), and Hermans (1999). Work by Meylaerts et al. (2017) demonstrates the differences between a complex systems approach and earlier systems approaches, which is mainly that complex adaptive systems are open, sensitive to initial conditions and non-linear. The first monograph on the topic is Marais’ (2014) work. This was followed by a collected volume that tried to work out some of the methodological implications of complexity thinking for TS(Marais & Meylaerts 2019) and another monograph by Marais (2019).

The ways in which complexity thinking is utilized in TS vary from approaches in Bible translation (see Religious translation[1]) to actor-network analyses in news translation (see Journalism and translation[1]) to the use of complexity methodology in language-policy studies to rethinking the binaries in TS (source-target, foreignise-domesticate, etc). Adapting the quantitative methods from complexity thinking in the natural sciences into qualitative methods in the humanities is proving a difficult endeavour. It is also quite common to see complexity thinking being used without the notion of complexity necessarily being in the title of the book or a pertinent theme in the book, e.g., Cronin's (2017) work that is based on complex systems theory, ecology and notions of entropy and negentropy.

Of particular value for TS is the work that a number of sociologists have done, using complexity thinking. In particular, Byrne and Callaghan (2014) have explored the use of complexity in qualitative sociological research. One of the suggestions they make is to use ordinal-probability reasoning in which one argues, based on your interpretation of the data, that a particular cause would be a most likely, another one a second-most likely, etc. influence in a particular effect. McCabe (2014) applies complexity thinking to the study of social-ecological issues, suggesting a complex relationship between perception and conception in which neither is reduced to the other.

Scholars working in cognitive[1] TS, in particular those who engage in quantitative experimental research designs, also make use of findings from complexity thinking, if only in their use of probabilistic statistics (Garcia 2019). In addition, work is being done on modelling multilingual scenarios with the conceptual tools of complexity thinking (Civico 2019).

It should be clear that complexity thinking is not a ready-made set of simple tools for use in empirical research in TS. It is rather an epistemological-philosophical-methodological approach that informs this research and its methods. Its value lies in the way it could help researchers to appreciate and account for the complex influences in social-cultural emergence. Much work is, however, still needed to create a rigorous set of conceptual tools for studying the complexity of translation qualitatively.

References

Agrawal, Sweta, and Marine Carpuat. 2019. *Controlling Text Complexity in Neural Machine Translation*. Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Accessed November 12, 2020. arxiv.org/pdf/1911.00835.pdf. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1166

Bedau, Mark A., and Paul Humphreys. 2008. *Emergence: Contemporary Readings in Philosophy and Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262026215.001.0001

Byrne, David, and Callaghan, Gill. 2014. *Complexity Theory and the Social Sciences: The State of the Art*. London: Routledge.

Cilliers, Paul. 1998. *Complexity and Postmodernism: Understanding Complex Systems*. London: Routledge.

Civico, Marco. 2019. "The Complexity of Knowledge Sharing in Multilingual Corporations: Evidence from Agent-Based Simulations." *Empirica* 46 (6): 767–795. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10663-019-09435-8

Cronin, Michael. 2017. *Eco-translation: Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315689357

Deacon, Terrence W. 2013. *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter*. New York: WW Norman.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2006. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd ed., ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 199–204. London: Routledge.

Garcia, Adolfo M. 2019. *The Neurocognition of Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.147

Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Systemic and Descriptive Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kauffman, Stuart. 1995. *At Home in the Universe. The Search for the Laws of Self-Organisation and Complexity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kiraly, Don. 2006. "Beyond Social Constructivism: Complexity Theory and Translator Education." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 1 (1): 68–86. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.1.1.05kir

Kothari, Anita, and Sibbald, Shannon L. 2018. "Using Complexity to Simplify Knowledge Translation: Comment on 'Using Complexity and Network Concepts to Inform Healthcare Knowledge Translation'." *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 7 (6): 563–565. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.139

Marais, Kobus. 2014. *Translation Theory and Development Studies: A Complexity Theory Approach*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203768280

Marais, Kobus. 2019. *A (Bio)Semiotic Theory of Translation: The Emergence of Social-Cultural Reality*. London: Routledge.

Marais, Kobus, and Reine Meylaerts (eds). 2019. *Complexity Thinking in Translation Studies: Methodological Considerations*. London: Routledge.

McCabe, Vicki. 2014. *Coming to our Senses: Perceiving Complexity to Avoid Catastrophes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meylaerts, Reine, Maud Gonne, Tessa Lobbes, and Diana Sanz Roig. 2017. "Cultural mediators in Cultural History: What do we Learn from Studying Mediators' Complex Transfer Activities in Interwar Belgium." In *Doing Double Dutch: The International Circulation of Literature from the Low Countries*, ed. by Elke Brems, Orsolya Réthelyi, and Ton van Kalmthout, 67–91. Leuven: Leuven University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt21c4rzf.6

Morin, Edgar. 2008. *On Complexity*. Translated by Robin Postel and Sean M. Kelly. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Robinson, Douglas. 2001. *Who Translates: Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Further essential reading

Coveney, Peter, and Roger Highfield. 1995. *Frontiers Of Complexity: The Search for Order in a Chaotic World*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Mitchell, Melanie. 2009. *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Mark C. 2001. *The Moment of Complexity: Emerging Network Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Waldrop, Mitchell M. 1992. *Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos*. London: Viking.

Corpus-based interpreting studies

Mariachiara Russo
University of Bologna

The study of the performance of interpreters has always encouraged interpreting scholars to collect samples of authentic speakers' speeches (or source "texts" – STs, i.e., oral language transcripts) and interpreters' linguistic output (or target texts – TTs). In the early days, these text collections included only few interpreters and provided anecdotal evidence (Shlesinger 1998) of semantic shifts and textual operations. These were considered anecdotal not necessarily because they lacked methodological soundness, but because observations were limited to few cases and, therefore, could not be assumed to be representative or typical of a wider interpreter population. A case in point is the German into French corpus collected by Lederer (1981) consisting of 3-hour tape recordings of one speaker and two interpreters to illustrate the Interpretative Theory (as quoted in Setton 2011: 39). These collections varied in size, language combination and purpose, but until the introduction of Corpus Linguistics (CL) tools and methodologies, these were essentially plain ST-TT collections (typewritten, stored in computers or in more advanced digital devices), and manually analyzed.

The great potential of the corpus-based approach (see also Corpora[1]) for research into interpreting was first highlighted by Shlesinger (1998) who advocated the creation of parallel and comparable corpora relevant to interpreting and the use of existing monolingual corpora to test hypotheses about interpreting. This innovative approach would make available large amounts of interpreting data to supersede the anecdotal observations on which research on interpreting had until then been based. Furthermore, the availability of large machine-readable corpora would add a new dimension to Interpreting studies[1] because they would provide information about interpreted speech typical of the CL approach, namely word frequencies, grammatical constructions, discourse patterns, co-occurrences, lexical density, type-token ratios, etc. This approach would imply for research into interpreting what was envisaged for translation studies (TS), namely replacing the prescriptive approach with a descriptive one, developing theorizations and data-driven powerful generalisations.

Shlesinger's farsighted challenge was taken up by interpreting scholars whose collective publications appeared in Russo et al. (2018) and Bendazzoli et al. (2018) including selected papers from the first interpreting corpora event: "Corpus-based

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.cor2
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

Interpreting Studies. The State of the Art. First Forlì International Workshop. 7–8 May 2015" (https://eventi.dipintra.it/cis1/).

From the early notion of interpreting "corpus" to the present large machine-readable interpreting corpora, Corpus-based Interpreting Studies (CIS) have gone through several stages producing a wide-ranging variety of interpreting corpora.

1. Interpreting corpus typologies

Interpreting corpora are collections of texts, i.e., transcriptions of spoken/signed recordings of interpreter-mediated events, selected according to pre-defined criteria to be representative of a language variety, and stored in electronic format for consultation through a corpus query tool. Typically, corpora include also metadata (headers) providing text details (date, speaker's name, mode of delivery, speech length, number of words/minutes etc.). Interpreting corpora can be distinguished into the following typologies: *Parallel corpora* (which make up the vast majority) include transcripts of STs and corresponding TTs with or without text-to-sound/video alignment; *Comparable corpora* include STs and TTs which are considered as monolingual productions, i.e., English STs and English interpreted TTs; *Multimodal corpora* include several interpreting modalities or input/output channels (video, audio, transcripts); *Intermodal corpora* (i.e., STs and corresponding interpreted and translated TTs). Furthermore, interpreting corpora vary also according to their data typologies, as they can include the performance of professional conference interpreters, learners, sign language interpreters, community interpreters, etc. Examples of community interpreting corpora are the California Hope Corpus (Angelelli 2004) including 400 interpreter-mediated hospital encounters and the freely accessible ComInDat, the Community Interpreting Data Base (Angemeyer, Meyer and Schmidt 2012, http://www.yorku.ca/comindat/comindat.htm). ComInDat is an international corpus of interpreting data from a variety of settings and with a large number of language dyads. It was created to develop common standards for annotating multilingual data from interpreter-mediated interaction. Large corpora from legal settings are rare, a notable exception being the TIPp (Traducción e Interpretación en los procesos penales) corpus (Orozco-Jutorán 2018).

2. Main CIS topics and results

The European Parliament (EP) multilingual plenaries are a major source of corpora materials, as they provide freely accessible STs and simultaneously interpreted TTs. The first two large corpora from the EP settings were developed by Collados Aís et al. (2004) and Vuorikoski (2004) to investigate interpreting quality (see Quality in interpreting[3]). Collados Aís et al. developed the multilingual ECIS (Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea) corpus including 43 speeches and 73 interpretations to focus on non-verbal and prosodic features. Vuorikoski (2004) compiled a corpus of 120 original speeches in English, Finnish, German or Swedish, and their interpretations into these languages by 30 interpreters. Among her conclusions, the author highlighted that not always interpreters were aware of the role of speech acts and called for stressing pragmatics in interpreter education. The first freely accessible machine-readable interpreting corpus was developed in 2004, the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC). EPIC (https://corpora.dipintra.it) is a trilingual part-of-speech (POS)-tagged, lemmatised, indexed, parallel and comparable corpus of approx. 180.000 words of STs in English, Spanish and Italian and corresponding TTs in these three languages (Monti et al. 2005, Russo et al. 2012). The several investigations based on EPIC data shed light on several interpreting features, among which lexical density and lexical variety in STs vs TTs (Russo et al. 2006). The EPIC methodology and experience laid the foundations for other corpora developed at the University of Bologna (Bernardini & Russo 2018): the Directionality Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus DIRSI concerning the medical field, the multimodal corpus ANGLINTRAD on the processing of Anglicisms from Italian into Spanish and the intermodal multilingual European Parliament Translation and Interpreting EPTIC Corpus comparing text processing strategies in original, translated and interpreted texts, such as simplification (Bernardini et al. 2016). Belgian interpreting scholars developed the EPICG corpus, the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (at) Ghent. EPICG is a multilingual (at present, from French into Dutch and English), partly aligned (time-ST-TT) and POS-tagged corpus of about 250.000 words. EPICG studies concern, for instance, gender-based patterns in the use of hedges (Magnifico & Defrancq 2017).

Other corpus-based studies have provided evidence of recurrent features of simultaneous interpreters' linguistic output, like, for instance, "interpretese" (e.g., Shlesinger 2009).

Media sources were also tapped to develop interpreting corpora: CorIt (Italian Television Interpreting Corpus) is the world largest multilingual corpus of consecutive and simultaneous interpretations broadcast by Italian public and private TV networks. It was manually compiled by Straniero Sergio (2007) to study quality, individual interpreting styles and interpreting norms in media interpreting (MI). CorIt includes the performance of 1200 interpreters over 50-year time span. The objective of the data collection, which started in 1998, was to track the history of MI, especially talk shows and media events, and to highlight what makes MI different from both conference interpreting and other forms of dialogue interpreting. Several CorIt-based publications appeared: Straniero Sergio 2007 and, posthumously, Straniero Sergio and Falbo 2012, among others.

Corpora from other geographical areas offer the opportunity to highlight strategies and features of interpretation between languages that are culturally and structurally very far apart. In South Africa, Wallmach (2000) recorded 110 hours of simultaneous interpretations by 16 professional interpreters working in legal settings between English, Afrikaans, Zulu and Sepedi to investigate the effect of speed, complexity, lack of ST-TT equivalents and language-specific norms on interpreters' strategies. In Asia, where CIS are increasingly widespread, Japanese scholars developed CIAIR, the Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus of Nagoya University (http://slp.itc.nagoya-u.ac.jp/web/papers/2004/Oriental-COCOSDA2004_tohyama.pdf.) counting approx. 1 million words. It is an English-Japanese corpus that contains simulated lectures interpreted by professionals, but unfortunately it is not accessible. In China CIS started in 2007 (Hu 2016) and so far, three interpreting corpora are documented: the Chinese-English Interpreting Corpus of the Chinese Premier's annual press conferences (CEIPPC) of over 100,000 words, the Chinese-English Conference Interpreting Corpus (CECIC) and the freely accessible Chinese English Political Interpreting Corpus (CEPIC, https://digital.lib.hkbu.edu.hk), of approx. 6.5 million words. It consists of transcripts of speeches delivered by top political figures from Hong Kong, Beijing, Washington DC and London, as well as their translated/interpreted texts. Several studies were based on these corpora focusing, among other things, on strategies and norms (Wang 2012), normalization and explicitation in interpreted vs translated texts (Hu & Tao 2013).

The use of annotated corpora (especially POS-tagging) also allows for cross-language comparisons of interpreting features like, for instance, lexical density and lexical variety which are indications of linguistic variations between originals, simultaneous interpretations and translations. Dayter (2018) set out to investigate Translation universals[2] of simplification and explicitation by analyzing lexical density and lexical variety in her SIREN corpus of 235,040 words. It is a parallel, aligned, bidirectional corpus of original and simultaneously interpreted speeches in Russian and English. She contrasted her results with those obtained in the Spanish into English EPIC sub-corpus (Russo et al. 2006) and found several opposing tendencies linked to language directions and specificities.

Testing interpreting hypotheses and identifying powerful generalizations across different corpora and language pairs is the added value of the corpus-based approach which combines quantitative and qualitative studies. To improve data aggregation and comparability, interpreting corpora need to be compiled according to shared corpus designs and transcription conventions. Above all, datasets need to be freely accessible and easily transferable between researchers' platforms. Unfortunately, this is still not the case for most of the current interpreting corpora. Time has come for corpus-based research efforts to take this leap forward.

References

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486616

Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian, Bernd Meyer, and Thomas Schmidt. 2012. “Sharing community interpreting corpora: A pilot study.” In *Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis*, ed. by Thomas Schmidt, and Kai Wörner, 275–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.14.19ang

Bernardini, Silvia, and Mariachiara Russo. 2018. “Corpus Linguistics, Translation and Interpreting.” In *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics*, ed. by Kirsten Malmkjær, 342–356. London: Routledge.

Bernardini, Silvia, Adriano Ferraresi, and Maja Miličević. 2016. “From EPIC to EPTIC – Exploring simplification in interpreting and translation from an intermodal perspective.” *Target* 28 (1): 58–83. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.28.1.03ber

Collados Aís, Á., M. M. Fernández Sánchez, E. Iglesias Fernández, J. Pérez-Luzardo, E. M. Pradas Macías, E. Stévaux, M. J. Blasco Mayor, and A. Jiménez Ivars. 2004. “Presentación de Proyecto de Investigación sobre Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea (Bff2002-00579).” *Actas del IX Seminario Hispano-Ruso de Traducción e Interpretación*. Moscow: Universidad Estatal Lingüística de Moscú. MGLU: 3–15.

Dayter, Daria. 2018. “Describing lexical patterns in simultaneously interpreted discourse in a parallel aligned corpus of Russian-English interpreting (SIREN).” *Forum* 16 (2): 241–264. https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.17004.day

Hu, Kaibao, and Qing Tao. 2013. “The Chinese-English conference interpreting corpus: Uses and limitations.” *Meta* 58 (3): 626–642. https://doi.org/10.7202/1025055ar

Lederer, Marianne. 1981. *La traduction simultanée*. Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes.

Magnifico, Cédric, and Bart Defrancq. 2017. Hedges in Conference Interpreting. *Interpreting* 19 (1): 21–46. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.19.1.02mag

Monti, Cristina, Claudio Bendazzoli, Annalisa Sandrelli, and Mariachiara Russo. 2005. “Studying directionality in simultaneous interpreting through an electronic corpus: EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus).” *Meta*, 50 (4). https://doi.org/10.7202/019850ar

Orozco-Jutorán, Mariana. 2018. “The TIPp project: Developing technological resources based on the exploitation of oral corpora to improve court interpreting.” *Intralinea*. http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2316

Russo, Mariachiara, Claudio Bendazzoli, and Annalisa Sandrelli. 2006. “Looking for lexical patterns in a trilingual corpus of source and interpreted speeches: Extended analysis of EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus).” *Forum* 4 (1): 221–254. https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.4.1.10rus

Russo, Mariachiara, Claudio Bendazzoli, Annalisa Sandrelli, and Nicoletta Spinolo. 2012. “The European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC): Implementation and developments.” In *Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies*, ed. by Francesco Straniero Sergio and Caterina Falbo, 35–90. Bern: Peter Lang.

Shlesinger, Miriam. 1998. "Corpus-based interpreting studies as an offshoot of corpus-based translation studies." *Meta* 43 (4): 486–493. https://doi.org/10.7202/004136ar

Shlesinger, Miriam. 2009. "Towards a definition of Interpretese. An intermodal, corpus-based study." In *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research*, ed. by Gyde Hansen, Andrew Chesterman and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 237–253. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.80.18shl

Straniero Sergio, Francesco. 2007. *Talkshow Interpreting. La mediazione linguistica nella conversazione spettacolo*. Trieste: Edizioni Universitarie Trieste.

Straniero Sergio, Francesco and Caterina Falbo. 2012. *Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Vuorikoski, Anna-Riitta. 2004. *A Voice of its Citizens or a Modern Tower of Babel? The Quality of Interpreting as a Function of Political Rhetoric in the European Parliament*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Wallmach, Kim. 2000. "Examining simultaneous interpreting norms and strategies in a South African legislative context: A pilot corpus analysis." *Language Matters* 31 (1): 198–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228190008566165

Wang, Binhua. 2012. "A descriptive study of norms in interpreting: Based on the Chinese-English Consecutive Interpreting Corpus of Chinese Premier Press Conferences." *Meta* 57 (1): 198–212. https://doi.org/10.7202/1012749ar

Further essential reading

Bendazzoli, Claudio, Mariachiara Russo, and Bart Defrancq. 2018. *New findings in corpus-based interpreting studies. inTRAlinea*. http://www.intralinea.org/specials/cbis.

Hu, Kaibao 2016. *Introducing Corpus-based Translation Studies*. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48218-6

Russo, Mariachiara, Claudio Bendazzoli, and Bart Defrancq. 2018. *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6199-8

Setton, Robert. 2011. "Corpus-based Interpreting Studies (CIS): Overview and prospects." In *Corpus-Based Translation Studies. Research and Applications*, ed. by Alet Kruger, Kim Wallmach, and Jeremy Munday, 33–75. London: Continuum.

Digital humanities and translation studies

Lynne Bowker
University of Ottawa

A useful starting point for an entry on digital humanities (DH) and Translation studies[1] (TS) would naturally be a definition of DH, yet this has proved to be both elusive and hotly debated. DH is multifaceted, expanding quickly, and evolving constantly, meaning that a precise definition is difficult to pin down and risks becoming outdated. In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, Klein and Gold (2016: np) allude to this challenge, noting that

> Along with the digital archives, quantitative analyses, and tool-building projects that once characterized the field, DH now encompasses a wide range of methods and practices: visualizations of large image sets, 3D modeling of historical artifacts, "born digital" dissertations, hashtag activism and the analysis thereof, alternate reality games, mobile makerspaces, and more. In what has been called "big tent" DH, it can at times be difficult to determine with any specificity what, precisely, digital humanities work entails.

Many authors have therefore developed working definitions while acknowledging that a static explanation cannot explain or encompass fully the nuances of this evolving field. Recurring elements in such working definitions include the ideas that DH:

- occurs at the intersection of digital technologies and humanities disciplines (e.g., history, philosophy, linguistics, literature, cultural studies) and combines methodologies from these humanities disciplines with computational tools (e.g., hypertext/media, information retrieval, data/text mining, data visualization, statistics, digital mapping) and digital publishing;
- involves collaborative, transdisciplinary, and computationally engaged research;
- recognizes both digitized and digitally created materials;
- cultivates a bi-directional relationship between the digital and the humanities by both using technology in the pursuit of humanities research and subjecting technology to humanistic interrogation (sometimes simultaneously); and
- values the disruption of and reflection on traditional practices.

To give a more concrete explanation, DH researcher Constance Crompton explains that in DH, researchers use computers to help further humanities knowledge because

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.dig1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

digital technology allows them to both ask and answer questions that they could not otherwise tackle:

> One individual can't read 5,000 books written during the 19th century, but we can use algorithms to look for patterns and trends to help us better understand cultural shifts and innovations that took place during that time period. We can also use digital visualizations to show connections between people that would be hard to express in written form. We can create digital exhibits that bring together rare and unusual items online, featuring items that could never be showcased next to each other in the real world. (Crompton, quoted in Greeley 2018: np)

This entry aims to present a variety of TS research falling under the DH umbrella. Each of this entry's four sections looks at a particular facet of DH as applied to TS research. While it is convenient to identify projects as belonging to a certain category, DH is characterized by its interdisciplinarity[3] and variety of methods, so some projects could comfortably find a home in more than one category. Nevertheless, for clarity and ease of presentation, we have organized the remainder of the entry into the following sections: translation technologies, big data, digital spaces, and data visualization.

1. Translation studies and translation technologies

An obvious cross-over point between TS and DH occurs in the space occupied by Translation tools[1]. We are not thinking here of relatively straightforward research into how such tools work, although this exists in abundance. Rather, as noted in the opening section, DH values disrupting and reflecting on traditional practices, as well as subjecting technology to humanistic interrogation. One notable way that translation has been disrupted in recent decades is through the introduction of Computer-aided translation[1] and Machine translation[1], and as such tools have become increasingly embedded in translation practice, this has prompted research into ways that technology is changing or affecting translation processes and products.

Of particular relevance to the intersection of TS and DH are those studies focusing on so-called human issues in translation technology. In the proceedings of workshops like *Human-informed Translation and Interpreting Technology* (HiT-IT 2019), as well as in volumes such as those edited by Kenny (2017) and Chan (2018), we find projects taking ethnographic approaches to studying translation tool use in situ; investigations of the user experience; questions about ethics and technology use; studies exploring the applicability of tools to literary translation; research into post-editing computer output; and considerations of quality assessment in the context of tool use. In each case, the TS research is enriched by viewing technology use through a DH lens, where theories and methods from other humanities disciplines (e.g., sociology, philosophy, literature) are brought to bear on the technologically oriented questions at hand.

2. Translation studies and "big data"

Regarding "big data", this refers to research that analyzes or systematically extracts information from data sets that are too large or complex to be processed using traditional means. This includes approaches such as corpus linguistics, text mining, bibliometrics[4], or prosopography.

A corpus is a large collection of authentic text in electronic form that has been gathered according to project-specific criteria. Corpora[1] often contain millions of words, meaning it would be time-consuming to process this information by reading it. Moreover, spotting patterns is difficult when examples are spread over a large volume of text. Therefore, corpora are processed using corpus analysis software, which excels at pattern matching and statistical calculations, and which displays data in ways that facilitate interpretation (e.g., key word in context (KWIC), distribution graphs).

Baker (1993) is acknowledged as having introduced corpus-based TS when she proposed a monolingual comparable corpus (i.e., two-part corpus with one half containing texts written in language A and the other containing texts translated into language A) as a means of identifying recurrent features of translation (e.g., simplification, explicitation, normalization, levelling out). Many researchers have built on Baker's seminal work (e.g., Olohan 2004), while others have explored the value of different types of corpora (e.g., bilingual parallel corpora) for revealing translation strategies (e.g., Kenny 2001), translators' style (e.g., Huang 2015), and translation pedagogy potential (e.g., Zanettin et al. 2003). Heylen et al. (2014) identify other ways that corpus-based "big data" are being used to advance research in TS, including using corpora as training data in statistical (and now also neural) machine translation, sharing translation memory databases as open data, and using corpora for text mining to improve automatic terminology recognition and extraction tools.

Meanwhile, another "big data" application in TS is bibliometrics, which is the science of measuring and analyzing scholarly communication (e.g., by counting publications or citations). Rovira-Esteva et al. (2015) count more than 110 active journals and over 60,000 publications in TS, providing a rich data pool for mapping the field from a bottom-up perspective. According to the authors, there are two main approaches: metabibliometric and bibliometric proper. A metabibliometric approach attempts to understand the ways in which researchers identify, collect, classify, disseminate and measure academic production within a discipline. Meanwhile, the bibliometric proper approach mainly focuses on providing synchronic or diachronic pictures of the state of the art based on empirical analyses of sectoral bibliographies[2] or regions. As Rovira-Esteva et al. (2015: 160) proclaim “In 2015 a scholar in TS cannot ever hope to cope with the more than 3000 new publications issued each year. We need maps, and we need to know how these maps are drawn in order to be helped instead of unconsciously steered by them”. This need grows with each passing year, and DH tools and methods offer promising possibilities for harnessing and making sense of this increasing volume of TS data.

Finally, Wakabayashi (2019a) identifies prosopography as a means of conducting historical research in TS. Rather than focusing on individual biographical data, prosopography aims to reveal patterns of relationships and activities through the study of collective biography. Using prosopographical methods, researchers collect and analyze statistically relevant quantities of biographical data about a well-defined group of individuals (e.g., translators from a certain period or region). Thus, prosopography involves a collective approach to investigating the common characteristics of a historical group of people for whom details of their individual biographies might be difficult to trace. Meanwhile, Wakabayashi (2019b) also describes a range of other digital approaches to Translation history[1], including distant reading as applied to large corpora, as well as techniques that fall into other categories presented in this entry (i.e., creation of digital resources such as oral history databases, and data visualization such as spatial analysis).

3. Translation and digital spaces

As noted in the introductory section, DH recognizes both digitized and digitally created materials. Social media[1] have quickly become a widespread form of digitally created media, and Desjardins (2017: 3) is one researcher who adopts a DH lens when broaching the question “Why is the study of the relationships between translation and online social media (OSM) relevant for today’s translators?” Part of the response is that “OSM is now a predominant ‘materiality’ … that underpins a significant percentage of our daily interactions, from writing, to reading, to translating, to even producing culture more broadly” (Desjardins 2017: 3). Using a variety of social media platforms (e.g., Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn), Desjardins analyzes challenges that OSM pose for translation, such as the translation of hashtags and the relevance of indexing, the visibility and remuneration of translators in the “like” economy, social media literacy and competency in translator training, tactile modalities in social media branding, and social media monitoring and content translation.

Focusing on another type of digital text, Tremblay-Gaudette (2021) recounts an experience as part of a team charged with translating *afternoon, a story*, Michael A.

Joyce's ground-breaking work of hyperfiction, which was written in 1986 and published using the hypertext authoring system Storyspace. In this hypertext novel, with its branching storylines, the plot may change if the reader chooses different paths. Tremblay-Gaudette explains that translating electronic literature entails many operations, which raises a number of questions with regard to translation, editing, and interface design. A drawback to creating electronic literature is that these works may become inaccessible when new software replaces earlier versions without considering retro-compatibility, which is what happened with *afternoon, a story*:

> When they first set out to translate *afternoon*, the team of translators espoused a disjointed approach, working on bits of the narrative, but not cohesively. [...] They had access to the work itself, but it amounted to circulating inside the body of the text from within, as would a red blood cell through the blood system. The task was hampered by this narrow view of the body; what was required was a complete picture of the body of the text. (Tremblay-Gaudette 2021: 48)

Accordingly, the team created a "narrative mapping" of the story, which visualized the work and its branches, in the form of a gigantic spreadsheet. Next the French version was created using Twine, software developed in 2009 that is now regularly used for creating/publishing hyperfiction. Using Twine's visual interface, it was possible to recreate the "narrative map" from the spreadsheet. Tremblay-Gaudette observes that the resulting translation may not appeal to average readers, but could be more interesting to an academic, artistic or literary audience because the Twine version reveals the layering that supports the work and provides a behind-the-scenes look at the author's complex organization of his multilinear work.

Tremblay-Gaudette also posits that future translations of *afternoon* might be at least partially Indirect translations[5] (i.e., translations of a translation) in order to circumvent the issue of technological obsolescence that could hinder future translators from accessing the original work. It may prove more straightforward for future translators to work from the French version in Twine, rather than from the original English version that is in an outdated technological format. The work of both Tremblay-Gaudette (2021) on hyperfiction and Desjardins (2017) on OSM demonstrate that the digital format of a text can influence the translation process and product in numerous ways, providing fertile grounds for TS research.

4. Translation studies and data visualization

As noted in this entry's initial paragraph, it can be difficult to categorize projects in the TS/DH sphere. While Tremblay-Gaudette's project dealt with a type of text produced in a digital space, it also contained elements of data visualization. Meanwhile, other TS research that may deal with both digital spaces and data visualization includes projects incorporating the study of networks.

One such investigation has been conducted by Tanasescu (2020), who examines pre-1989 Romanian translations of Canadian and American contemporary poetry in stand-alone collections and anthologies against a complexity theory background that attempts to take account of irregularities within what is otherwise commonly perceived as an orderly and predictable literary system. To do this, Tanasescu uses a computational social network analysis approach to study the corpus of translations that have been perceived largely as belonging to a heavily controlled cultural system. The analysis reveals that a substantial part of the corpus consists of translation projects that were initiated, carried out, published, and promoted by the translators themselves as a result of a series of interactions within the interpersonal and transnational networks of private individuals, rather than as the result of established institutional policies and publication agendas. As part of her study, Tanasescu also reflects on the value of conducting agent-oriented research in TS within the wider context of DH, which presents both a theoretical framework and a series of methodologies for describing translators as agents of change.

In another example, Tanasescu and Tanasescu (2018: 132) observe that one way that literary translators' work is changing in the digital space is owing to the increasing popularity of web-based literary platforms. As a result, literary translation is no longer viewed as a solitary undertaking, and translators are more involved in choosing and promoting the titles to be translated. Against the backdrop of a paradigm shift triggered by the digital and post-digital revolution, Tanasescu and Tanasescu (2018: 128–129) investigate "the issue of translation sociography in the ever pervasive and reticulated digital space". The researchers first turned to graph theory, which is a branch of network theory that has been previously used in DH to study social networks. However, they determined that this approach could not sufficiently capture the complexity of interactions and the multilayered nature of collaborations within translator networks in digital space, and they ultimately adopted a more complex network of networks (NoNs) model, which they found to be more appropriate for such social and literary phenomena. Taking the *Asymptote* journal (an online open access journal for world literature in translation) as a case study, Tanasescu and Tanasescu (2018: 146) apply the NoNs model and observe that it works not in spite of but rather by taking advantage of the multiplicity and heterogeneity of the networks involved: "it works with complexity, not against it". This study could not have been carried out manually; mathematical equations and a computational implementation of the model were necessary, thus this DH approach opened up a new way of looking at data about translators and their networks.

DH takes different forms for different TS researchers, but the space occupied by digital resources, along with the avenues of exploration opened by this diverse range of methods, look set to continue growing.

References

Baker, Mona. 1993. "Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications." In *Text and technology*, ed. by Mona Baker, Gill Francis, and Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 23–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.64.15bak

Chan, Sin-wai (ed.). 2018. *The Human Factor in Machine Translation*. London: Routledge.

Desjardins, Renée. 2017. *Translation and Social Media: In theory, in training and in professional practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-52255-9

Greeley, Robert. 2018, August 21. "What are Digital Humanities, anyway?" University of Ottawa Gazette. https://www.uottawa.ca/gazette/en/news/what-are-digital-humanities-anyway

Heylen, Kris, Stephen Bond, Dirk de Hertog, Hendrik Kockaert, Frieda Steurs, and Ivan Vulić. "TermWise: Leveraging Big Data for Terminological Support in Legal Translation." In *Proceedings of Terminology and Knowledge Engineering (TKE 2014)*. https://hal.inria.fr/TKE2014

Huang, Libo. 2015. *Style in Translation: A Corpus-based Perspective*. Berlin: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45566-1_2

HiT-IT. 2019. *Human-informed Translation and Interpreting Technology Workshop*. Proceedings available at: https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W19-8700/

Kenny, Dorothy. 2001. *Lexis and Creativity in Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kenny, Dorothy (ed.). 2017. *Human Issues in Translation Technology*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648934

Klein, Lauren F., and Matthew K. Gold. 2016. "Digital Humanities: The Expanded Field." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, ed. by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/51.

Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203640005

Rovira-Esteva, Sara, Pilar Orero, and Javier Franco Aixelá. 2015. "Bibliometric and bibliographical Research in Translation Studies." *Special issue of Perspectives* 23 (2): 159–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1026361

Tanasescu, Raluca. 2020. "Chaos out of Order. Translations of American and Canadian Contemporary Poetry into Romanian before 1989 from a Complexity Perspective." *Chronotopos* 2 (1): 64–94.

Tanasescu, Raluca, and Chris Tanasescu. 2018. "Translator Networks of Networks in Digital Space: The Case of *Asymptote Journal*." In *Complexity Thinking in Translation Studies: Methodological Considerations*, ed. by Kobus Marais, and Reine Meylaerts, 128–151. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203702017-7

Tremblay-Gaudette, Gabriel. 2021. "You Can't Go Home Again: Moving *afternoon* Forward Through Translation." In *When Translation Goes Digital*, ed. by Renée Desjardins, Claire Larsonneur, and Philippe Lacour, 43–57. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51761-8_4

Wakabayashi, Judy. 2019a. "History of Translation." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley Online Library. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0512.pub2 . https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0512.pub2

Wakabayashi, Judy. 2019b. "Digital approaches to translation history." *Translation & Interpreting* 11 (2): 132–145. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.111202.2019.a11

Zanettin, Federico, Silvia Bernardini, and Dominic Stewart (eds). 2003. *Corpora in Translator Education*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Further essential reading

Desjardins, Renée, Claire Larsonneur, and Philippe Lacour (eds). 2021. *When Translation Goes Digital*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51761-8

Sinner, Carsten, Christine Paasch-Kaiser, and Johannes Härtel (eds). 2020. *Translation in the Digital Age*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ecology of translation

Michael Cronin
Trinity College Dublin

Translation throughout history has both facilitated and resulted from human activity. From the emergence of sedentary cultures to the development of trade and the spread of ideas, translation is inextricably bound up with the fortunes of human settlements. Translation owes its distinctness to difference. Communication is possible (though not always easy) between speakers of the same language. It is not possible between speakers of different languages where the languages are mutually unintelligible. Translation is necessary for communication to take place. All translation is communication but not all communication is translation. When, as a result of climate change, the very survival of human beings as a species is called into question, it is inevitable that translation as a highly complex activity practised by the species for millennia will be affected. If as David Wallace-Wells claims at the beginning of *The Uninhabitable Earth: A Story of the Future*, “It [climate catastrophe]is worse, much worse than you think” (2019: 3), then it is not surprising that translation scholars have begun to think about translation in the context of these radically changing circumstances.

One of the consequences of climate change has been a persistent critique of human exceptionalism, the notion that through the authorisation of scripture or the victories of science, humans were the masters and possessors of nature. What the climate crisis has revealed are the sharp limits to human agency as the planet begins to shut down the life support systems for a species that is fast making its own home uninhabitable. This implies the need to move to a post-anthropocentric identity. For Rosi Braidotti this involves the de-centring of *anthropos*, “the representative of a hierarchical, hegemonic and generally violent species whose centrality is now challenged by a combination of scientific advances and global economic concerns” (Braidotti 2013: 65). From this perspective, no one life form is privileged over any other. Relationality and ontological equality are the basis for a notion of the post-human which implies, “the open-ended, inter-relational, multi-sexed and trans-species flows of becoming through interactions with multiple others” (ibid.: 89). In practical terms, this means that any notion of subjectivity must now include the non-human. The subject is to be thought of as “a transversal entity encompassing the human, our genetic neighbours the animals and the earth as a whole, and to do so

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.eco1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

within an understandable language" (ibid.: 82). Translation studies (TS) which has traditionally been regarded as part of the humanities, is now beginning to situate itself in a post-human framework. In the light of this what forms has the convergence of translation and ecology begun to take and what are the areas of enquiry opened up by this new paradigm?

The term "translation ecology" was first used by Cronin to analyse the function of translation in determining how Minority language[2] speakers control the conditions of production and reception of literary translation (Cronin 2003: 165–172). The term originated in work by scholars on the notion of biocultural diversity, establishing a connection between environmental sustainability and cultural resilience. The concept of translation ecology was adopted by Chinese scholars who brought it in a different direction and developed the notion of eco-translatology. They were primarily concerned with using the established scientific discipline of ecology to study the contexts and practices of literary translators. The leading eco-translatology scholar has been Hu Gengshen who has mainly focused on ecosystemic notions of selection and adaptation (Hu 2015). Xiaohua Jiang has outlined the fundamental principles of eco-translatology bringing together translational ecology and natural ecology:

a. In natural ecology, the eco-environment interacts with each organism. Similarly, in translational ecology, the "eco-environment" of translation interacts with each factor relating to translation.
b. The interactions among organisms and between environment and organisms eventually achieve harmony and balance in nature. Similarly, the interactions between a translator and the factors concerned should finally achieve harmony and balance in translation.
c. In nature, there is a mutually beneficial relationship among different organisms. In translation, purposeful translational activities will improve certain factors relating to translation, which will result in mutual benefits among translation factors.
d. The "survival of the fittest" principle is suitable for both nature and translation.
e. Both nature and translation follow in a way the same modus operandi, namely, adaptation, selection, and survival or extinction. (Jiang 2015: 136)

Eco-translatology derives from the Darwinian adaptation-selection principle to argue for the survival or extinction of the translation of a literary work. The extinction (disappearance) or survival of a work is related to the interaction between a number of factors (languages, cultures, literary traditions, publishers, audiences, translators) that are present in the "eco-environment" of translation. The conceptual apparatus of scientific ecology is employed to understand why certain translations of particular works appear to flourish while others are soon forgotten about or are ignored.

Clive Scott, a literary translator and theorist, coined the term "eco-translation" and used it to describe the psycho-physiological involvement of the translator in the text to be translated. What constitutes the textuality of the text is the linguistic environment inhabited by the reader; and there is the immediate environment of the act of reading itself. The translator has to be aware of the different elements present in both environments. The attempt to translate is made difficult by the ecosystemic complexity of the elements interacting in these environments (paratext, typography, emotion, history, intertextuality) and language's own obstructiveness (polysemy, diachronic change), and demands the mobilization of an extensive array of expressive resources. (Scott 2018)

Cronin (2017) uses Scott's notion of eco-translation but in a wholly different context. His understanding of eco-translation is primarily drawn from political ecology. Political ecology is generally defined as the study of the social, cultural, political and economic factors affecting the interaction of humans with other humans, other organisms and the physical environment (Robbins 2004). Situating eco-translation within political ecology means taking into consideration all forms of translation thinking and practice which are implicated in the challenges of anthropogenic climate change (Cronin 2017: 4). This approach to eco-translation while open to all forms of ecological engagement with translation is not primarily concerned with the methodological praxis of environmental science or the working out of intra-textual dynamics in translation. The focus is on how translation as a socially constituted practice both contributes to and is impacted by climate change. Two areas of enquiry will help illustrate the kinds of questions raised for translation practitioners and scholars by this understanding of the eco-translation paradigm, technology and interspecies communication.

The practice and dissemination of translation in the contemporary world is intimately bound up with the use of the virtual technologies. There is nothing virtual or virtuous, however, about the ecological impact of the virtual. It is damagingly real. Telephones, servers, computers, all contain metals that are difficult to extract and difficult to recycle. In the average desktop tower computer and cathode tube monitor, the following valuable and hazardous metals can be found: Aluminium, Antimony (hazardous), Arsenic (hazardous), Bismuth, Cadmium (hazardous), Chromium, Copper, Ferrite, Gold, Indium, Lead (hazardous), Nickel, Platinum, Steel, Silver, Tin and Zinc. Transmission equipment, aerials, transoceanic cables expand in number and energy consumption to meet the exponential needs of information-hungry applications. Fibre optic cables may have reduced the mining for copper but they contain boron and rare metals such as Germanium which increase the refraction index and help to retain the light within the fibre. Between 30% and 50% of the world production of Germanium is used in the manufacture of fibre optic cables (Bihouix 2014: 223–224). The toxicity of ICT is particularly to be found in the externalisation of pollution which is a recurrent feature of the global economic system, the tendency to move highly polluting activities to parts of the planet where there are laxer forms of environmental regulation or more authoritarian forms of governance. The shift from fixed to nomadic or ubiquitous computing with the ascendancy of smartphones and laptops means energy demands increase apace. The most energy-efficient way of connecting to a network is through a wired connection, whether Digital Subscriber Line (DSL), cable or fibre. WiFi uses somewhat more energy. Connection through a wireless cellular network tower, however, leads to a dramatic rise in energy consumption. In the case of 3G, energy use compared to a wired connection is 15 times greater and in the case of 4G, 23 times greater. The rolling out of a 5G network will lead to further multiples of increase in energy usage. This is the other "black box" of translation in a globalised world (see Globalization and translation[1]), not so much what goes on in the translator's head, as what happens when their fingers touch the screen or hit the keyboard, the long tail of resource extractivism.

In the case of translation and climate change, it is not only a question of the tools that are used but what they are used for. The coupling of ICT and the liberalisation of markets in the 1980s and1990s led to the exponential rise in the localisation[1] industry. It is the central contention of this industry that in a multilingual world sales of goods and services can be significantly increased through the use of translation. The industry is thriving because the demand for translation, continues to grow worldwide (Globalization and Localization Association 2020). Indeed, this growth is both a driver of and is facilitated by expanding ICT capacity on the planet. The very rationale for translation investment is bound up with an ideal of endlessly expanding markets for goods and services. The problem is that this culture of infinite growth is no longer sustainable. From an eco-translation perspective then, there is a need to critically evaluate the resource implications of current uses of technology and advance alternative scenarios for the development of sustainable technology practices at the level of tool and tool use. A supply-side perspective might involve, for example, the redesigning of ICT devices to radically reduce the consumption of scarce or hazardous materials or producing devices that optimise their capacity for recycling so putting an end to recycling practices which endanger the lives of men, women and children in developing countries. Modular manufacturing practices could be adopted to allow for easier repairs and the re-usage of different component parts or compatibility could be increased or made mandatory not just in the area of chargers but for screens, batteries, processors and ports. From a demand-side perspective, there may be a need to begin to think about the limits to translation growth. Translation is resource hungry so the need to think about translation as a scarce resource in the light of the ecological mantra – reduce, reuse, recycle – means the inevitable involvement of political choice. Do we favour the use of translation to sell another camera or skin cream or to further the provision of health education or instruction in agroecology? What is clear is that in a globalised world on the brink of climate chaos, TS cannot remain neutral in the emerging debates around resource use. This neutrality is all the less tenable in that translation remains core to the functioning of the global economy. There are no meaningful volumes of foreign sales without the intervention of the translation industry. As the world moves into the coming "globotics" revolution with the convergence of globalization and artificial intelligence (Baldwin 2019), forms of translation, both human and automated, will be central to the operations of remote intelligence (RI), the deployment of skilled foreign workers at a distance. TS needs to respond to these developments in terms of thinking through and acting on the ecological consequences of translation labour and translation data extractivism (Cronin 2020).

In the context of the current climate crisis, tackling the problem of human exceptionalism and its damaging consequences means expanding on our knowledge of climate vulnerability as shared with non-human species. According to Elizabeth Kolbert we are now living through the sixth mass extinction of species on planet earth, much of this as the result of human activity (Kolbert 2014). The National Academy of Sciences in the United States has estimated that since the dawn of civilisation humanity has caused the loss of 83% of wild mammals, 80% of marine mammals, 50% of plants and 15% of fish. This is despite the fact that humans represent just 0.01% of all living beings (Boag 2019: 38–39). Understanding of the practice of translation needs to be widened by reclaiming and mediating non-human ways of communicating and processing information across disciplines, species, and relevant actors. The purpose of a politically situated eco-translation paradigm is to explore processes of mediation between humans and non-humans and establish new ways of responding to the global crisis of survival. One way of viewing current mass species extinction is to see it as a crisis of communication between humans and non-humans. Humans have failed to take seriously the fundamental challenge of communication with non-humans which is, in essence, a translation problem, how to communicate across difference? In other words, if the need for translation is rooted in mutual unintelligibility, the need to negotiate what appears to be insurmountable divergence, then TS rather than say, communication studies, is best placed to explore the formidable fault-lines of difference (ontological and epistemic) between the human and non-human. Translation throughout its history has been fundamentally engaged in understanding difference so how is this knowledge to be built on in relationship with non-human others as a way of mediating our survival? Resilience to climate and environmental catastrophe from the point of view of eco-translation involves promoting a new understanding of the translator. This is the translator as one who has to be "multilingual" in the sense of translating different systems of transmitting information between humans and non-humans as a key element in the development of strategies for collective survival. In the case of interspecies communication eco-translation brings together work in zoo-, eco- and biosemiotics (Maran et al. 2011), animal welfare, comparative psychology and ethology (De Waal 2019), literary animal studies and existing studies on interspecies communication (Moe 2014).

Eco-translation draws on concepts and methodologies that have emerged in the areas of the posthumanities and theories of the Anthropocene (Latour 2017; Morton 2018), to advocate for the practice of translation understood as the reconnection of separated human and non-human actors. Biotranslation, biosemiotic translation (Marais 2019) and the tradosphere defined as "the sum of all translation systems on the planet, all the ways in which information circulates between living and non-living organisms and is translated into a language or a code that can be processed or understood by the receiving entity" (Cronin 2017: 71) are among the concepts deployed in eco-translation to study the circulation of information between different species and living and non-living organisms. How translation practices contribute to the environmental crisis and how translation concepts may be used to advance solutions to the crisis are issues that bear directly on the question of the relationship of translation to ecology. Thinking about this relationship is fundamental to the continued relevance of TS.

References

Baldwin, Richard. 2019. *The Globotics Upheaval: Globalization, Robotics and the Future of Work*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Bihouix, Philippe. 2014. *L'Âge des low tech: vers une civilisation techniquement soutenable*. Paris: Seuil.

Boag, Zan. 2019. "A Fraction of Life". *New Philosopher* 23: 38–39.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.

Cronin, Michael. 2003. *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge.

Cronin, Michael. 2017. *Eco-Translation: Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315689357

Cronin, Michael. 2020. "Translation and Posthumanism." In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Ethics*, ed. by Nike Pokorn and Kaisa Koskinen, 279–293. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003127970-21

De Waal, Frans. 2019. *Mama's Last Hug: Animal Emotions and What They Teach Us about Ourselves*. London: Granta.

Globalization and Localization Association (GALA). 2020. "Language Industry: Facts and Data." Available online: https://www.gala-global.org/industry/industry-facts-and-data (accessed 20 June 2020).

Hu, Gengshen. 2015. *Eco-Translatology: Construction and Interpretation*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Jiang, Xiaohua. 2015. "'Eco' and 'Adaptation-Selection' in Eco-Translatology Explained." In *Translation and Academic Journals: the evolving landscape of scholarly publishing*, ed. by Sun, Yifeng, 135–148. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137522092_9

Kolbert, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*. London: Bloomsbury.

Marais, Kobus. 2019. *A (Bio)semiotic Theory of Translation: the emergence of social-cultural reality*. London: Routledge.

Maran, Timo, Dario Martinelli, and Aleksei Turovski (eds). 2012. *Readings in Zoosemiotics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Moe, Aron. 2014. *Zoopoetics: Animals and the Making of Poetry*. Lanham MD: Lexington.

Scott, Clive. 2018. *The Work of Literary Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108678162

Wallace-Wells, David. 2019. *The Uninhabitable Earth: A Story of the Future*. London: Penguin.

Further essential reading

Kato, Deborah, and Bruce Allen. 2014. "Toward an Ecocritical Approach to Translation: A Conceptual Framework". Available online: file:///Users/michaelcronin/Desktop/State%20of%20the%20Discipline%20Report%20-%20Ecocritical%20Approach%20to%20Translation.webarchive (accessed 20 June 2020).

Latour, Bruno. 2018. *Down to Earth. Politics in the New Climatic Regime*. Oxford: Polity.

Morton, Timothy. 2018. *Being Ecological*. London: Pelican. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11638.001.0001

Emotions and translation

Séverine Hubscher-Davidson
The Open University

Emotions are complex reactions comprising experiential, behavioural, and physiological components. The role that they play in the practice of translation has been mooted for some time. In 1996, Jääskeläinen observed that affective factors, be they personal involvement, commitment, motivation, or attitude, may be a relevant parameter in accounting for translational behaviour. It is only relatively recently, however, that scholars have started to explore empirically the influence on the translation process and product of affect, the term used in psychology to refer to emotions that influence one's thinking and actions. Translation studies (TS) can be thus said to have witnessed an affective turn, inspired by a growing focus on emotions in the field of psychology (e.g., Sander & Scherer 2009), which has dramatically altered and expanded the scope of research on the role of emotions in translation (see also Translation psychology[3]).

Emotion is central to socio-cognitive processes (see also Cognitive approaches[1]) involved in translation work, such as problem-solving and technology use, and translators' emotions can impact both their own behaviour as well as the behaviour and feelings of others, for instance the readers of their translations. Emotions can influence the Translation process[1], but the translation process can also influence translators' emotions. The study of emotions in translation can be said to span three main areas which engage the translator in complex ways: emotion as a property of the text that is translated, emotion as a feature of translators themselves, and emotion as experienced by the receivers of translations.

1. Emotions and source texts

The majority of early works on emotion in translation focused on the emotions and feelings inscribed in source texts, and how emotive words and emotional material can be transferred effectively into another language. In fact, it was mostly literary translators who wrote about and described their experiences of conveying source text emotionality (e.g., Shields & Clarke 2011). One such example of a study concerned with emotion as a textual element is literary translator Julie Rose's (2013) introspec-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.emo1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

tive analysis of translating the emotionality of Hugo's *Les Misérables*. Describing the blazing intensity of Hugo's sparkling prose, Rose suggests that translators need to be able to reproduce the style and energy of source texts, as well as their emotional and aesthetic impact.

Although literary texts are more likely to be labelled as 'emotional', all texts have the potential to elicit emotions in readers, ranging from excitement to fear, or even boredom. Texts of a sensitive nature can be found in many domains where translation takes place (e.g., legal or clinical settings) and the use of emotive language and emotion-eliciting content in these texts has received increasing attention from both translation scholars and practitioners. For instance, in Abbamonte and Cavaliere's (2006) study of the Italian translation of a UNICEF report on the state of the world's children, the authors analysed the use of evaluative language and rhetorical strategies in the ST and TT and convincingly demonstrated a difference in the intensity of the emotions inscribed in the English and Italian documents. In another study, Wittwer (2007) used the example of medical texts in the field of paediatrics to highlight how challenging it can be to translate the emotional features of some ST material, for instance when the latter tackles diseases in children. Wittwer provides guidance on producing so-called emotional words to help translators convey this information.

With their focus placed firmly on (source) texts, these studies serve to raise awareness of a number of linguistic (and other) aspects linked to the translation of emotion-eliciting material and constitute evidence that emotions have long been an important concern for translators. Notably, work in this area paved the way for research into the translator's role and competence in the process of transferring ST emotionality, as well as the impact that some texts can have on translators' mental health and wellbeing.

2. The translator's emotions

In the last decade or so, translation process research has witnessed a reorientation towards the individual translator and a growing interest in, on one hand, the role of human dimensions (feelings, emotions) during the translation process and, on the other hand, how translators interact with their environment, their tools, each other, and their colleagues (e.g., Risku 2014). This reorientation of the field shed light on emotion as an essential element of human meaning-making and engendered a spate of studies highlighting the importance of emotional and relational competencies for translators' wellbeing and performance success in professional settings (e.g., Lehr 2014; Courtney & Phelan 2019).

Advances in terms of research methods and technology, combined with this growing interest in translators' actions and reactions, has led to the design of experiments making use of data collection instruments not traditionally used by translation scholars, such as psychometrics. For example, Hubscher-Davidson (2017) employed a combination of data collection methods, including an emotional intelligence test, to analyse the links between 155 professional translators' sociobiographical variables and their self-perceived emotional skills. The study showed that emotions can influence various aspects of translators' lives and work and that professional translators with different levels of trait emotion perception, regulation, and expression have different profiles in terms of age, education, experience, and job satisfaction.

Recent studies have focused on other emotion-related aspects of translator profiles such as empathy (Apfelthaler 2014), self-efficacy (Bolaños-Medina 2014), and ambiguity tolerance (Rosiers & Eyckmans 2017). Individual differences in these areas have been mooted to differentially impact various aspects of a translator's work, such as target reader orientation, documentation abilities, coping with terminology, and resourcefulness. Together, these experimental studies have started convincingly to demonstrate that the affective profiles of translators can be a key ingredient in the shaping of translations. As a result, there is increasing awareness of the need to describe the profile of participants in translation research and to draw inferences between personal traits and translation abilities.

The translator's emotions, however, cannot simply be reduced to a set of individual differences separate from the social context within which they unfold. Emotions are dynamic phenomena and the translator's immediate environment can play an important role in triggering particular emotions. In their study of translators' emotional narratives about their work, Koskinen and Ruokonen (2017) discovered that emotional engagement with designated objects in the translator's technologized work environment can have a powerful impact on the translation process. Lehr (2014) explored the effect of peer feedback on translators' performance and found that positive and negative feedback can differentially influence idiomatic expression, stylistic adequacy, and correctness of terminology, with the former increasing creativity and the latter enhancing translation accuracy. These studies indicate that translators' emotions are intertwined with both social and cognitive processes.

3. Emotions and target texts

The act of re-expressing a text into another language for a target audience has the potential to elicit emotions both in the translator and in the receivers of that translation. Research in this area is still in its infancy, though translation scholars have long acknowledged that target texts are imbued with the translator's voice, style, and other personal touches.

Translation products can thus reflect a translator's individuality and their expressed emotions, alongside those of the source author. When translating a text that deeply affects them, translators may (inadvertently) share their emotional reactions, for example through the introduction of cognitive and linguistic shifts in the translations. Levels of emotional engagement with a translation assignment may ultimately determine translation success and/or quality. While it has been shown that attempting some translations can lead to illness and non-completion of translation work, adopting a structured approach and tailored coping mechanisms during the translation process can bring about the successful rendering of emotionality in target texts and enhance translation quality (e.g., Hubscher-Davidson 2017; Rose 2013).

Translation reception is another area where the topic of emotions has recently gained prominence, furthering thought and research on the emotional response(s) of readers or audiences. Gaddis-Rose (2012) argued that a loss of emotional intensity in a translation does not necessarily mislead readers who interpret literary texts in individual ways. This individual interpretation by target readers is dependent, in part, on the personal relevance of emotional stimuli perceived. In her analysis of reader responses to poems and their translations, Kenesei (2010) suggests that negative emotions are triggered in some target readers when they read negative constructions in poems. In audiovisual translation, it has been shown that audio description can be extremely effective in creating emotions in both sighted and visually impaired audiences, with different translation strategies resulting in different emotional impacts on addressees (e.g., Ramos-Caro 2016). This research on the reception of emotion-eliciting translations provides additional evidence of the wide range of affective factors that can influence the translation process and its resulting product.

4. Prospects for the future

Despite the relatively recent realisation in TS that the translation process and product is coloured by emotions, there are currently more questions than answers and the topic is ripe for further investigations.

For instance, there are a number of underexplored sub-domains (e.g., marketing, financial) and micro-domains (e.g., novels, short stories) where emotions can be studied. It also remains to be seen to what extent translation practice is influenced by different emotional factors such as social awareness, adaptability, optimism, etc. Furthermore, a fuller understanding of interpersonal emotions and the role of social context may help in the development of training opportunities and professional tools for translators. Another avenue for further research is the extent to which translators' cultural context impacts on their emotional functioning, as there is currently a lack of research addressing emotions involving translation in non-Western languages.

The many connections between emotion and translation are only starting to be understood, and there is much more work to be done to fully appreciate the role of affect in translation.

References

Abbamonte, Lucia, and Flavia Cavaliere. 2006. "Lost in Translation—Politically Incorrect Rendering: English vs. Italian Unicef 'The State of the World's Children 2004' Report." In *Insights into Specialized Translation*, ed. by Susan Šarcevic, and Maurizio Gotti, 235–258. Bern: Peter Lang.

Apfelthaler, Matthias. 2014. "Stepping into Others' Shoes: A Cognitive Perspective on Target Audience Orientation in Written Translation." *MonTI* 1: 303–330. https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2014.ne1.10

Bolaños-Medina, Alicia. 2014. "Self-efficacy in Translation." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 9 (2): 197–218. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.9.2.03bol

Courtney, Jennifer, and Mary Phelan. 2019. "Translators' Experiences of Occupational Stress and Job Satisfaction." *Translation and Interpreting* 11 (1): 100–113. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.111201.2019.a06

Gaddis-Rose, Marilyn. 2012. "Celebrating the Inevitable." In *Translation and Literary Studies: Homage to Marilyn Gaddis-Rose*, ed. by Marella Feltrin-Morris, Deborah Folaron, and María Constanza Guzmán, 25–31. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hubscher-Davidson, Séverine. 2017. *Translation and Emotion—A Psychological Perspective.* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315720388

Jääskeläinen, Riitta. 1996. "Hard Work will Bear Beautiful Fruit. A Comparison of Two Think-aloud Protocol Studies." *Meta* 41 (1): 60–74. https://doi.org/10.7202/003235ar

Kenesei, Andrea. 2010. *Poetry Translation Through Reception and Cognition: The Proof of Translation is in the Reading.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Koskinen, Kaisa, and Minna Ruokonen. 2017. "Love Letters or Hate Mail? Translators' Technology Acceptance in the Light of their Emotional Narratives." In *Human Issues in Translation Technology*, ed. by Dorothy Kenny, 26–42. London: Routledge.

Lehr, Caroline. 2014. *The Influence of Emotion on Language Performance—Study of a Neglected Determinant of Decision-Making in Professional Translators.* Doctoral thesis, University of Geneva.

Ramos-Caro, Marina. 2016. "Testing Audio Narration: the Emotional Impact of Language in Audio Description." *Perspectives* 24 (4): 606–634. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1120760

Risku, Hanna. 2014. "Translation Process Research as Interaction Research: From Mental to Socio-Cognitive Processes." *MonTi* 1: 331–353. https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2014.ne1.11

Rose, Julie. 2013. "The Art of Hearing the Voice." In *Perspectives on Literature and Translation—Creation, Circulation, Reception*, ed. by Brian Nelson, and Brigid Maher, 13–30. London: Routledge.

Rosiers, Alexandra, and June Eyckmans. 2017. "Investigating Tolerance of Ambiguity in Novice and Expert Translators and Interpreters: An Exploratory Study." *The International Journal for Translation and Interpreting Research* 9 (2): 52–66. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.109202.2017.a04

Sander, David, and Klaus R. Scherer (eds). 2009. *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shields, Kathleen M., and Michael J. Clarke (eds). 2011. *Translating Emotion: Studies in Transformation and Renewal Between Languages*. Oxford: Peter Lang. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0353-0109-0

Wittwer, Michael. 2007. "Emotion and Translation: Using the Example of Popularising Medical Texts in Paediatrics." In *Evidence-Based LSP: Translation, Text and Terminology*, ed. by Ahmad Khurshid, and Margaret Rogers, 345–356. Bern: Peter Lang.

Further essential reading

Damasio, Antonio. 2003. *Looking for Spinoza. Joy, Sorrow and the Feeling Brain*. New York: Harvest Book Harcourt.

Ji, Christine, and Susan Petrilli (eds). forthcoming. *Emotions in Translation: An Intersemiotic Approach*. London: Routledge.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2020. *Translation and Affect: Essays on Sticky Affects and Translational Affective Labour*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.152

Maier, Carol. 2006. "Translating as a Body: Meditations on Mediation (Excerpts 1994–2004)." In *The Translator as Writer*, ed. by Susan Bassnett, and Peter Bush, 137–148. London: Continuum.

Empathy

Matthias Apfelthaler
University of Graz

Derived from Ancient Greek ἐμπάθεια, the term “empathy” found its way into English via German in the early twentieth century (Stueber 2008/2019), where it had come to mean “feeling into”. In everyday English, this is likely the meaning that would come to mind first. More formal definitions often distinguish an affective and a cognitive component (Stueber 2008/2019).

Empathy permeates translation and interpreting, as these practices involve other minds and can also be considered interpersonal. The pervasiveness of “empathy” is not yet echoed in the number of publications that employ the term or its equivalents in other languages, but recent years have seen an uptick in the literature, as reflected in the specialized Bibliographies of translation studies[2].

When used in Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS), “empathy” describes a particular relation that is established, or should be established, between actors (see Agents of translation[2]) and elements of the more widely understood interpreting and Translation process[1] (as conceived of in the Theory of translatorial action[2], the Cultural approaches[2] and the Sociology of translation[1]).

Relationships covered in the literature as empathetic are those between the translator/interpreter and:

1. the source text/original (see Original and translation[4]), including the real or fictional people who populate its world, the ideas it contains and its message;
2. the source text author (see Author and translator[4])/original writer) or the speaker;
3. the (actual, explicit or imagined, implicit) audience of the translation or the participants in an interpreted event.

Other relationships mentioned in connection with empathy not centered on the translator/interpreter include those between the narrator of a translated text and the events/characters in that text (Abualadas 2018); or the relationship between the audience of the translation and a marginalized/oppressed group or a cause given voice across space and/or time in the translation or interpretation.

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.emp2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

1. "Empathy" in translation and interpreting research as a non-technical term, synonym or placeholder

When "empathy" is used in the larger part of the translation and interpreting literature, it tends to appear in an everyday affective meaning, is minimally defined, or left undefined to function as a placeholder. Often it is used synonymously or conflated with more established concepts in translation studies (TS) or interpreting studies (IS), such as competence[1], creativity[4], imagination, imitation, intuition or understanding.

In the Hermeneutics and translation[1] tradition, for instance, translators apply empathy to the author and world of the source text, and to the original message for understanding its "authentic meanings" and (re)presenting it in translation (Stolze 2002: 19). Balacescu and Stefanink (2006) liken empathy to creativity, seeing it as a force that enables creative understanding of the source material and a precondition to come up with creative solutions when producing the target text.

It is not always clear what the benefits are of replacing more common, and better-defined, terms in translation and interpreting research with "empathy", often without clearly defining it against the other concepts. Aside from having become somewhat of a trendy term, this may be attributed to the influence of everyday language and the largely positive semantics associated with "empathy" in the sense of sympathy or compassion. Another motivation for using "empathy" could be to highlight what some scholars deem a non-reductive, not-just-rational aspect that needs to be addressed when writing about interpreting or (Literary) translation[2] (Kohlmayer 2004). The use of empathy's everyday meaning and the lack of (explicit, formal) definitions are found more often in publications that do not engage in or report on more complex empirical research (see Empirical approaches[4]), where operationalization with a certain degree of explicitness and clear conceptual delimitations are fundamental.

(Re)interpreting one concept in terms of another can yield interesting studies and results, however: Walsh (2019) draws on the concept of personal empathy to throw light on how a translator's special affinity towards an author motivated the selection of a work of literature for translation and the choices made during the translation process (see Translation strategies and tactics[1]). Deane-Cox (2019: 322) emphasizes a particular Impact of translation[4]: a translation can help create empathy with and muster support for an oppressed (out)group. Maitland (2019) describes how, in multilingual restorative justice settings with offender-victim interaction, interpreters can help generate empathy, compassion and respect; and potentially produce outcomes that increase empowerment and agency for all parties involved by enabling them to put themselves into each other's shoes.

2. "Empathy" in translation and interpreting research as a technical term

A smaller, growing part of the TIS empathy literature relies on more formal definitions of empathy and taps into research from other fields that offer a rich body of knowledge on the matter, such as medical science, social and clinical psychology, cognitive science, neuroscience and writing (process) research.

Building on C. Daniel Batson's work, Apfelthaler (2013) defines *affective* empathy as "coming to *feel* as another person feels, as *feeling* distress at witnessing another person's suffering and *feeling* for another person who is suffering". Affective empathy is different from the affects or emotions (for their role in translation and interpreting, see Translation psychology[3] and Emotions and translation[5]) in that affective empathy focuses on the interpersonal, other-directed part of emotions, not your own emotions (Apfelthaler 2013).

Cognitive empathy is defined "as the ability to put yourself into the shoes of others, to adopt someone else's perspective, to know what another person intends, believes or knows with at least *some* certainty" (Apfelthaler 2014: 313). It refers to the "social and socially developed ability to understand the mental states" of others and "allows us to perceive and interpret human behavior in terms of intentional states such as beliefs, desires, needs, purposes, goals or reasons" (ibid.). Cognitive empathy is also referred to in the social cognition literature as folk psychology, mentalizing, mindreading, perspective taking or theory of mind (ToM; theory-theory/simulation theory).

3. More complex empirical research and new topics

Works published in recent years operate with more refined concepts of empathy, have a marked empirical bend, following a diverse set of approaches to research and methods (see Methodology in Translation Studies[2]), and focus their attention on a multitude of research objects and questions. As part of the University of Geneva's "Translation competence and Theory of Mind" project, Sturm (2020) completed a PhD thesis in 2016 that combines fMRI, eye-tracking and keylogging studies to shed light on how other minds are represented during (intralingual) translation by BA and MA student groups on the cognitive and neural level. The behavioral and neuroimaging evidence from this groundbreaking multi-study PhD thesis provides stimulating insights into translation as an interpersonal practice involving (the metarepresentation of) other minds, and how attention distribution, cognitive effort and quality ratings (see Quality in translation[1]) relate to each other.

Apfelthaler (2014, updated in 2016) is interested in what permits professional translators to cognitively (see Cognitive approaches[1]) take into account the prospective target audience implicit in the translation assignment during translation of a non-technical, non-literary source text. He proposes an observational, cross-sectional study to investigate if (un)successful target audience orientation might be explained by cognitive empathy/perspective taking, or if the (in)ability to anticipate the target audience's perceived needs can be reduced to typical components of translation competence models or some of the dimensions of the translation expertise construct. Drawing on the principle of combining or mixing methods, Apfelthaler suggests triangulating product, process and self-report data to investigate *how* target audience orientation manifests itself and *when*, in which phase(s) of the translation process it happens (if at all), taking into account translators' intra- and interindividual differences. The proposed study relies on a method developed by Schmitt (2011) to independently measure perspective taking, which allows it to differentiate the actual contribution of different facets of perspective taking (including affective-emotional perspective taking); the main construct, perspective taking, is measured using performance-based tasks implemented in E-Prime instead of employing a self-report instrument.

Korpal and Jasielska (2019) conducted a laboratory study to look into whether interpreters are empathetically affected by speakers' emotions in A-B interpreting (see Directionality②), through largely automatic emotional contagion. Adopting galvanic skin response and a self-report scale as their measures, they were able to corroborate this hypothesis. A standout is the carefully constructed set of materials: for example, an affective word list was employed to control for how emotionally laden words are in the neutral vs. emotional speech eventually selected for the study.

Reflecting on Translation didactics①, Hague (2015) assumes empathic accuracy is part and parcel of translation competence and suggests Collaborative translation② activities and perspective-taking exercises to further students' empathic imagination. The paper mentions the importance of the translator's empathy towards *everyone* who has some role in shaping the final version of the target text, including colleagues and clients (Hague 2015: 21, 24); deeper exploration of these particular relationships is still absent in the translation/interpreting and empathy literature. Tomozeiu et al. (2016) consider empathy a key ingredient in teaching intercultural competence in translator training (see Teaching translation/Training translators③). Witte (2020) looks at how empathy/perspective taking and (inter)cultural competence interact by analyzing students' work and comments on the translation of a work of children's literature.

In their empirical study on cognitive and affective empathy-in-interaction in healthcare interpreting, Merlini and Gatti (2015) triangulate audio-recorded mediated consultations analyzed for levels of communicated empathy, and data from questionnaires for situational and dispositional empathy to paint a complex picture of the participating interpreters' empathic attitudes and behaviors. Merlini (2015) stresses that despite still existing suspicions, empathic conduct can successfully combine showing compassion towards a human being with fulfilling an institutional task. Her paper adds a rich contribution to the debate of (in)compatibility of professionalism and neutrality, impartiality or advocacy by putting these staples of translation and interpreting ethics and the discourse on interpreters' roles into relation with empathy. Lan's (2019) empirical study of medical interpreter trainees provides insight into which (nonverbal) turn-taking and relation management cues convey empathy and how this could improve future training. Her discussion of what might hamper the expression of empathy is particularly illuminating (Lan 2019: 185–186). Muñoz-Miquel (2019) points out, and elaborates on, the importance of empathy also for translating written genres in the medical field, providing as an example fact sheets for patients and medical consultations.

Harvey (2003) raises the issue of too much empathy in the (sign language) interpreter. According to him (Harvey 2003: 210), an excess of affective empathy involves the danger of losing oneself, of merging with the other and giving up one's identity (if only temporarily); cognitive empathy, on the other hand, is associated with conserving a sense of self and being separate from the person or thing empathized with, but too much of it might lead to numbing out (Harvey 2003: 211–212). He makes the case for balancing cognitive and affective empathy to avoid empathic pain and numbing out. Harvey (2015) reports on empathic engagement with someone else's distress and the *benefits* of dealing with vicarious trauma. In written translation, too, empathy may have negative connotations, it does not have to be a force for good: for instance, a translator of high empathetic ability might deliberately mislead or manipulate the target audience or any other actor in the translation process to that party's detriment, to achieve morally objectionable goals (see Ideology and translation[3]).

Chica Nuñez (2018) presents a pilot-study design that allows for examining the reception (see Reception and translation[4]) of emotion transmitted through audio description and the affective empathy possibly created in the audience.

4. Outlook

It remains to be seen if "empathy's" upward trend in translation and interpreting research continues, or if it will run out of gas, its place (re)taken by other terms and concepts. Another unknown is whether the tendency towards empirical research and more sophisticated qualitative and quantitative approaches can be sustained. As all studies discussed in this chapter suffer, to different degrees, from methodological flaws, the quality of research should be improved in this corner of TIS, too (see Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies[4]). A more critical assessment of research cited and built-on is encouraged, as is a heightened awareness of the (lack of) validity of the measures at our disposal (Warnell & Redcay 2019) to tackle translation/interpreting and empathy.

References

Abualadas, Othman Ahmad Ali. 2018. "Translation Shifts in Spatial and Temporal Deixis: A Trend Towards a More Subjective Narrative Mood in Fiction Translation." *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies* 2 (1): 182–196. https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol2no1.14.

Apfelthaler, Matthias. 2013. "A Tale of Two Empathies: Their Relation to Other Process-Relevant Cognitive and Affective Factors in Translation, Their Role in Target Audience Orientation." Paper presented at To Feel or not to Feel? That is the Question: International Online Workshop on Affective Factors in Translation Process Research, December 6, 2013. https://osf.io/g82bt

Apfelthaler, Matthias. 2014. "Stepping into Others' Shoes: A Cognitive Perspective on Target Audience Orientation in Written Translation." *MonTI*, Special issue 1: 303–330. https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2014.ne1.10

Apfelthaler, Matthias. 2016. "Are Perspective-Taking Abilities Part of Translation Expertise? A Mixed-Methods Study of Target Audience Orientation in Professional Translators." Poster presented at the 5th Translation Process Research Workshop, University of Graz, Austria, December 2, 2016. https://osf.io/86sfp.

Balacescu, Ioana, and Bernd Stefanink. 2006. "Kognitivismus und übersetzerische Kreativität." *Lebende Sprachen* 51 (2): 50–61. https://doi.org/10.1515/LES.2006.50.

Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2019. "Memory." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker, and Gabriela Saldanha. 3rd ed., 320–324. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678627

Hague, Daryl R. 2015 "Empathic Accuracy and Translator Training: Helping Students Imagine Other Minds." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 9 (1): 20–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010359

Harvey, Michael A. 2003. "Shielding Yourself from the Perils of Empathy: The Case of Sign Language Interpreters." *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 8 (2): 207–213. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eng004.

Harvey, Michael. 2015. "Reaping the Benefits of Vicarious Trauma." *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 7 (2): 5–20. https://www.cit-asl.org/new/reaping-the-benefits-of-vicarious-trauma/.

Korpal, Paweł, and Aleksandra Jasielska. 2019. "Investigating Interpreters' Empathy: Are Emotions in Simultaneous Interpreting Contagious?" *Target* 31 (1): 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17123.kor

Kohlmayer, Rainer. 2004. "Einfühlungsvermögen: Von den menschlichen Grundlagen des Literaturübersetzens." In *Literarisches und mediales Übersetzen: Aufsätze zu Theorie und Praxis einer gelehrten Kunst*, ed. by Rainer Kohlmayer, and Wolfgang Pöckl, 11–30. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lan, Wei. 2019. "Crossing the Chasm: Embodied Empathy in Medical Interpreter Assessment." PhD thesis, Hong Kong Baptist University. https://repository.hkbu.edu.hk/etd_oa/674.

Maitland, Sarah. 2019. “Does Interpreting 'Steal' Conflict? A Translational Perspective on Power and Restorative Justice.” *Translation & Interpreting* 11 (1): 22–42. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.111201.2019.a02

Merlini, Raffaela. 2015. “Empathy: A 'Zone of Uncertainty' in Mediated Healthcare Practice.” *Cultus - The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication* 8: 27–49. http://www.cultusjournal.com/files/Archives/cultus__8_2015.pdf.

Merlini, Raffaela, and Mariadele Gatti. 2015. “Empathy in Healthcare Interpreting: Going Beyond the Notion of Role.” *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 20: 139–160. https://hdl.handle.net/10077/11857.

Schmitt, Markus. 2011. “Perspektivisches Denken als Voraussetzung für adressatenorientiertes Schreiben.” PhD thesis, Heidelberg University of Education. https://opus.ph-heidelberg.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/35.

Stolze, Radegundis. 2002. “Empathy with the Message in Translation.” *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa* 14 (2): 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2002.9678122.

Stueber, Karsten. 2008/2019. “Empathy.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta. 2nd ed. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/empathy/

Sturm, Annegret. 2020. *Theory of Mind in Translation*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Tomozeiu, Daniel, Kaisa Koskinen, and Adele D’Arcangelo. 2016. “Teaching Intercultural Competence in Translator Training.” *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 10 (3): 251–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2016.1236557

Walsh, Andrew S. 2019. “Empathy and Engagement in Translation: Langston Hughes’s Versions of Lorca’s *Gypsy Ballads*.” In *New Approaches to Translation, Conflict and Memory: Narratives of the Spanish Civil War and the Dictatorship*, ed. by Lucía Pintado Gutiérrez, and Alicia Castillo Villanueva, 45–63. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00698-3_3.

Warnell, Katherine Rice, and Elizabeth Redcay. 2019. “Minimal Coherence Among Varied Theory of Mind Measures in Childhood and Adulthood.” *Cognition* 191:Article 103997. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.06.009.

Further essential reading

Chica Núñez, Antonio Javier. 2018. “Methodological Contributions of Social Neuroscience to the Study of the Multimodality of Emotions in Translation.” *Linguistica Antverpiensa* 17: 246–259. https://lans-tts.uantwerpen.be/index.php/LANS-TTS/article/view/486.

Muñoz-Miquel, Ana. 2019. “Empathy, Emotions and Patient-Centredness: A Case Study on Communication Strategies.” *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 59: 71–89. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v59i1.116990

Szpak, Karina S., Fabio Alves and Augusto Buchweitz. 2020. “Perspective Taking in Translation: In Search of Neural Correlates of Representing and Attributing Mental States to Others.” In *Multilingual Mediated Communication and Cognition*, ed. by Ricardo Muñoz Martín, and Sandra L. Halverson, 133 154. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429323867-6

Witte, Heidrun. 2020. “Förderung von Perspektivenübernahme und Zielrezipientenorientierung im Translationsunterricht (Deutsch – Spanisch): Kinderliterarische Ausgangstexte als didaktisches Instrument.” *Lebende Sprachen* 65 (1): 156–180. https://doi.org/10.1515/les-2020-0008

Ergonomics and translation workplaces

Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow
Zurich University of Applied Sciences

The activity of producing translations, in all variations from literature through patient information leaflets to subtitles, does not occur in isolation in a single translator's mind independent of that individual's physical setting. It necessarily involves tools, from those as traditional as pen and paper to complex technology that combines translation memory with adaptive neural Machine translation[1]. Anyone who has been involved in the activity of translation in the last decade or two is aware that it has become inseparable from access to electronic resources, language technology, and human-computer interaction. The latter is often addressed within the discipline of ergonomics, which more broadly is concerned with "understanding the interactions among humans and other elements of a system", as defined by the International Ergonomics Association (IEA).[1] In the case of translation, the other elements of the system include not only source texts, parallel texts, various types of resources, software, computers, and other equipment but also the physical, social, and organizational setting in which the translator is situated or embedded.

1. Translation as a situated activity

The workplaces in which the situated activity of translation happens vary widely. Freelancers might work in separate offices in their own homes with the latest language technology and equipment that they have chosen themselves or they might work on a small laptop at their kitchen tables using little more than word processing software and an internet browser (some even work in transit on hand-held devices). Of course, every combination in between can also be found. Research suggests that the range of workplace settings for institutional and commercial translators is much narrower (see Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016). Many institutional translators have their own offices with equipment and language technology chosen by someone else. However, the use of the latter may be optional and there may be resistance to its

---

[1] http://www.iea.cc/whats/index.html

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.erg1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

uptake (see Cadwell et al. 2018). By contrast, commercial translators often work in open-plan offices with levels of noise and potential distractions that may not be conducive to extended periods of concentration, although many employers try to compensate for such conditions with ergonomic furniture and high-tech language technology, whose use is usually mandatory. The differences in the constraints and affordances of various employment conditions and workplaces must be taken into consideration in any discussion about the factors affecting ergonomics in translation, including the one that follows.

An ergonomic perspective of translation was introduced to translation studies (TS) by Lavault-Olléon (2011), who organized the first academic conference in Europe on the topic. The contributions to that conference and its follow-up five years later explored how physical factors such as non-ergonomic computer input devices and chairs can influence the performance of translators and potentially affect their well-being. Repetitive strain injury, stiffness in the neck or back, and leg pain from being in the same position for too long have all been associated with the type of sedentary activities that those working at computers with language technology engage in. Early research into the realities of translation work also focussed on user interfaces, mental load, and decision-making, all of which would fall under the category of cognitive ergonomics as defined by the IEA. Poor-quality source texts, difficult access to terminology resources, parallel texts, and other information, lack of familiarity with translation technology, and non-intuitive interfaces can have negative effects on the Translation process[1] by slowing translators down and making it harder for them to solve problems (e.g., O'Brien et al. 2017).

Translators are situated not only within the physical space of their workplace but also within the context of some kind of system or organization. Even freelancers working on their own account are linked to and dependent on their clients, suppliers, and communication service providers to various degrees. According to the IEA, organizational ergonomics recognizes that people work within socio-technical systems that include other people as well as tools and equipment (see Vink & Kantola 2011 for an overview). As technology has become such an important part of the language industry, demands concerning efficiency (i.e., productivity and costs) have grown while quality expectations have remained high. Under the pressure of remaining competitive, companies might rush to acquire new Computer-aided translation[1] (CAT) systems that integrate machine translation before they have the processes, organizational structures, or training programs in place to deal with this technology. If human and organizational aspects are not properly addressed, otherwise highly-motivated translation professionals might feel disempowered and frustrated that workflows and working conditions have been disrupted. Any issues with the technology's physical or cognitive ergonomics can become magnified and more difficult to cope with if socio-technical aspects are not handled well.

2. Methodological approaches

The discipline and practice of ergonomics focus on determining whether the needs of the humans operating in socio-technical systems are being met and on optimizing conditions to improve their well-being and overall system performance. Although Risku (2004) did not refer specifically to ergonomics in her early work on professional translation as an expert activity, she pointed out the importance of artefacts as well as the role of interactions among various actors. This was part of a shift in thinking about translation as an activity carried out by an individual in isolation and opened up the discussion in TS to considering it an example of Situated and embodied cognition[5] embedded in a complex network that involves technology, human-computer interactions, and other actors or stakeholders with varying degrees of agency. The increase in research interest in translators and their work was why Chesterman (2009) proposed extending the well-known map of TS with a branch called "translator studies". Rather than being oriented to research on target texts, as the original map was, he suggested that the focus of Translator studies[5] would be on research concerning "the agents involved in translation […], their interaction with their social and technical environment, or their history and influence" (ibid.: 20). The second point perfectly captures the object of interest in most research into the ergonomics of translation workplaces, which would therefore fit very comfortably into such a branch of the discipline.

An obvious way to find out more about the ergonomics of the translation process and of translation workplaces would be to ask as many translators and/or language service providers as possible to provide relevant information, and indeed surveys have been used for this purpose (e.g., Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016; Elia 2019). This research method yields self-report data that can be sorted, quantified, and, if representative enough, used to make generalizations based on factors such as geographic location, demography, employment status, and domain specialization. In the process of filling out a survey with questions related to ergonomics, translators may even develop a heightened awareness of the shortcomings, constraints, and affordances of their workplaces and become empowered to make changes to improve them. However, they could also become frustrated about aspects that are out of their control and emphasize those in their responses, leading to a distorted representation of their working conditions. Individual and focus group interviews, such as those done by Cadwell et al. (2018), allow researchers to explore ergonomic issues related to the translation workplace in much more depth than is possible with pre-formulated questionnaires.

Observational methods can compensate for the limitations of self-report methods to some degree, especially if they are deployed non-intrusively at professional translators' workplaces. The quandary faced by those engaged in workplace research is that their mere presence can disrupt the object of study and pose a threat to ecological validity (also known as the "observer paradox"). LeBlanc (2013) countered this threat by shadowing institutional and commercial translators over an extended period of time, observing their practices, and interviewing them about their CAT tools. Field notes made by an onsite observer and interviews can be supplemented with keylogging, Eye tracking[5], video and/or screen recordings, if the translators, their clients, and their employers can be convinced of the potential benefits of such research. The study done by Teixeira and O'Brien (2017) on the premises of a language service provider is a convincing example of how a mixed-methods approach can contribute to understanding how language technology is actually used by translators on the job, in order to potentially optimize aspects related to physical and cognitive ergonomics.

3. Implications for translation theory and practice

Focussing on the ergonomics of translation workplaces means placing translators in the center of the socio-technical systems in which they are embedded rather than considering their tools, actions, or products in isolation. This is consistent with the sociological turn in TS, as discussed by Bednárová-Gibová (2021) in her consideration of the relationship between organizational ergonomics and translators' happiness at work. It is also in line with the theoretical model of situated cognition, which can help us explore the constraints and affordances that technology can contribute to the cultural sensitivity, discourse and genre awareness, reader empathy, and creativity[4] that are typical of translation and translators' decision-making. Not only is an ergonomic perspective relevant to the discipline of TS and the practice of translation, but it also provides insight into how socio-technical issues can affect other dynamic systems in related professional practices.

Technology has become an integral component of the translation process and has resulted in productivity gains and less tedium in accomplishing routine translation tasks. Too often, however, translators accommodate to their tools and to externally-imposed processes as they become familiar with them rather than make the effort to analyze their own needs and take the initiative to individualize tools and processes accordingly. The research reviewed above suggests that this could have negative long-term consequences for their well-being, job satisfaction, and cognitive load as they are forced to engage in non-ergonomic workarounds to deliver target texts that meet their own and their clients' quality[1] standards. Developing an awareness of the importance of ergonomics in their own workplace is the first step towards empowering translators to make changes that optimize their working conditions and allow them to fully focus their cognitive resources on the challenging and fascinating activity of translation.

References

Bednárová-Gibová, Klaudia. 2021. "Organizational Ergonomics of Translation as a Powerful Predictor of Translators' Happiness at Work?" *Perspectives* 29(3): 391–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1753788

Cadwell, Patrick, Sharon O'Brien, and Carlos S.C. Teixeira. 2018. "Resistance and Accommodation: Factors for the (Non-) Adoption of Machine Translation among Professional Translators." *Perspectives* 26 (3): 301–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1337210

Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies." *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 13–22. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v22i42.96844

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, Andrea Hunziker Heeb, Gary Massey, Ursula Meidert, Silke Neumann, and Heidrun Becker. 2016. "An International Survey of the Ergonomics of Professional Translation." *ILCEA* 27. https://doi.org/10.4000/ilcea.4004

Elia 2019. *Language Industry Survey –Expectations and Concerns of the European Language Industry 2019*. Brussels: European Language Industry Association. https://euatc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/2019-Language-Industry-Survey-Report.pdf

Lavault-Olléon, Élisabeth. 2011. "L'ergonomie, nouveau paradigme pour la traductologie." *ILCEA* 14. https://doi.org/10.4000/ilcea.1078

LeBlanc, Matthieu. 2013. "Translators on Translation Memory (TM). Results of an Ethnographic Study in Three Translation Services and Agencies." *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting* 5 (2): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.105202.2013.a01

O'Brien, Sharon, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Marcel Hasler, and Megan Connolly. 2017. "Irritating CAT Tool Features that Matter to Translators." *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 56: 145–162. https://tidsskrift.dk/her/article/view/97229/146028

Risku, Hanna. 2004. *Translationsmanagement. Interkulturelle Fachkommunikation im Informationszeitalter*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Teixeira, Carlos S.C., and Sharon O'Brien. 2017. "Investigating the Cognitive Ergonomic Aspects of Translation Tools in a Workplace Setting." *Translation Spaces* 6 (1): 79–103. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.6.1.05tei

Vink, Peter, and Jussi Kantola. 2011. *Advances in Occupational, Social, and Organizational Ergonomics*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Further essential reading

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen. 2021. "Translation, Ergonomics and Cognition." In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*, ed. by Fabio Alves, and Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, 147–160. London: Routledge.

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, and Riitta Jääskeläinen. 2019. "Ergonomics of Translation: Methodological, Practical, and Educational Implications." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, ed. by Helle V. Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger, and Karen Korning Zethsen, 132–150. London: Routledge.

Risku, Hanna, Regina Rogl, and Jelena Milosevic (eds). 2019. *Translation Practice in the Field: Current Research on Socio-cognitive Processes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.105

Ethics in translation and for translators

Dorothy Kenny
Dublin City University

Ethics as a branch of philosophy[1] is concerned with how we make decisions as to what is morally good. It covers a vast territory that moral philosophers further divide into the sometimes-overlapping areas of meta-ethics, normative ethics and applied ethics. *Meta-ethics* deals with questions about ethics itself. Such questions are often quite abstract and seemingly far removed from the moral decisions people need to make in their day-to-day personal or professional lives. They include: Who or what is the source of morality? One person might believe, for example, that moral values like truth and honesty exist because that is God's will, while another person might hold that moral values are based on human conventions. We might also ask whether there is a single set of moral values that applies to all humanity, or whether it is reasonable for each society to develop its own values, its own ideas of what is good and should therefore be promoted and defended. Meta-ethics thus touches on issues that pervade the study of translation: What, if anything, is universal? What is particular? Who decides? Such questions have typically been asked with regard to "meaning" in translation studies (TS). And in much the same way as contemporary, and especially postmodern approaches to translation reject the idea of universal, objective and transcendental meanings (see also Ethics and translation[1]), they have also come to reject the idea of a single, unchanging source of truth on what is good. As Kaisa Koskinen puts it: "The contemporary world view has little space for any preordained conditions, stressing issues like individuality and the plurality of choices" (Koskinen 2000: 13). What is more, globalization, technological change and increased interconnectivity – and the concomitant need to work with differing conceptions of moral values like privacy – have also contributed to a situation in which ethical pluralism, defined as the "acceptance of more than one *judgment* regarding the interpretation and application of a shared ethical norm" (Ess 2006: 215; emphasis in the original), has become compelling. In a similar way, the rise of what has become known as the "ethics of alterity" means that for many theorists, ethics is about responding affirmatively to difference, rather than expecting to understand everything and everyone on one's own terms.

Normative ethics is more directly concerned with principles that guide right action. Normative theories traditionally fall into three main types: consequentialist

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.eth3
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

theories hold that whether an action is morally right or not depends solely on the consequences of that action. One variant of consequentialism known as utilitarianism holds that actions are right to the extent that they promote pleasure or happiness. Deontological models, in contrast, define what is ethical “by reference to what is right in and of itself, irrespective of consequences” (Baker 2018: 309). Associated, in particular, with the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant, they are based on fundamental principles or rules that specify duties and guide ethical actions. Virtue ethics, finally, is less concerned with guiding individual actions, and more concerned with the kind of person one should seek to be. It thus emphasizes moral character, but is also related to well-being or human flourishing – *eudaimonia* in Aristotelian ethics – which is based on humans striving to be the best they can in their unique functions as humans. Even if these distinctions are not always watertight, normative theories have been found to be helpful in teasing out the ethical dilemmas that arise in translation and interpreting scenarios, and in characterizing general approaches to ethics adopted in these professions. Kermit (2020), for example, shows how the professionalization of Norwegian sign language interpreting was accompanied by a transition from a predominantly utilitarian ethics, according to which interpreters pursued optimal outcomes for their clients sometimes at the expense of usurping client autonomy, to a predominantly deontological ethics, in which interpreters’ actions became increasingly constrained by a newly adopted code of conduct.

Professional codes of conduct, which epitomize the deontological approach to translation ethics, also bring us firmly into the area of *applied ethics*, that is, the study of ethics as it pertains to more concrete situations, including the exercise of particular professions. Indeed, adherence to a code of ethics is seen as a necessary condition for an individual to be construed as a professional in the first place, and such codes serve important functions in protecting and promoting the rights and interests of both translators/interpreters and their clients (Phelan 2020). Strict reliance on codes has been flagged as a danger by a number of scholars however. Tymoczko (2007: 219), in particular, has warned that the narrow micro-textual and contractual focus of many codes of ethics can be used to inscribe translation professionals with dominant ideologies and blind them to their wider potential for ideological and political empowerment. Such concerns are undoubtedly related to the question of how a theorist understands the scope of translation ethics. Rudvin (2020) argues that scholars like Baker (2018) and Tymoczko (2007) tend not to see a discontinuity between personal and professional ethics, and to make a case for translators’ active engagement at a societal level, whereas others, including Chesterman (2001) and Pym (2012), while acknowledging the translator’s responsibility for the immediate effects of their work and to the wider profession, are less inclined to see translators as engaged in long-term projects of social change (see also Translator studies[5]).

1. Chesterman's models of translation ethics

Whether widely or narrowly focused, reflection on ethical issues as they arise in the translation and interpreting professions has been growing since the end of the twentieth century, spurred on by important publications that addressed the ethics of literary translation and public service interpreting in particular. Drugan (2018) provides a useful account of the evolution of the field. In what remains a very significant contribution, Chesterman (2001) attempted to capture turn-of-the-millennium thinking about translation ethics using four models: the first focuses on representation. Central values in an ethics of representation are accuracy and fidelity. "The ethical imperative", according to Chesterman (2001: 139) "is to represent the source texts, or the source author's intention, accurately, without adding, omitting or changing anything". Representation is a chief concern in approaches to translation that grapple with the difficulty of ensuring ethical treatment of the Other. Theorists such as Venuti (1995), for example, have argued for an approach to literary translation that shuns assimilation and instead allows the foreignness of the source to become manifest in target texts. Chesterman's second model is based on the idea of "translation as a commercial service, performed for a client" (2001: 14). According to this model, which Chesterman associates with functionalism in translation, translators act ethically by complying with the client's instructions and fulfilling the translation brief as efficiently and unobtrusively as possible, respecting deadlines and providing value for money. A key value here is loyalty, to clients, target readers and the original writer. Chesterman's ethics of communication comes back to the idea of how translation operates in encounters with irreducibly different Others. The concern here, however, is not with how we represent, but with how we communicate with the Other, and the philosophical touchstone is the ethics of Emmanuel Levinas. Chesterman sees this model as sharing common ground with Pym's (1997/2012) (non-Levinasian) ethics of cooperation, in which translators, by practising their profession ethically, ultimately ensure the maintenance of intercultural communication. Chesterman's fourth model is norm-based. Here, behaving ethically means behaving the way one is expected to behave as a translator. Chesterman is careful to point out the incompatibilities between and the gaps left by the models he proposes, where the latter includes lack of consideration of the world's responsibility towards translators. Finally, he draws on virtue ethics to explore an alternative way of looking at ethics and translation, defining a virtue as "an acquired human quality that helps a person strive for excellence in a practice" (Chesterman ibid.: 145), and proposes that the most important virtue a translator can possess is the desire to make the right decision: "the translator must *want* to be a *good* translator, must strive for excellence in the practice of translation" (ibid. emphasis in the original).

2. Recent developments

The decades following publication of Chesterman's article have seen a number of noteworthy developments. Firstly, virtue ethics has grown in importance, partly in tandem with increased interest in the ethics of care and the pursuit of social justice, which are central to public service interpreting, translator activism (see Committed approaches and activism[1]) and translation in international development and crises (O'Mathúna – Hunt 2020; Rudvin 2020), but also as a response to increasing globalization and technologization. Against a background of contemporary translation business practices characterized by the general disempowerment of translators, Moorkens and Rocchi (2021), for example, ask whether the translation business can be reformed to allow for the flourishing of the human translators on which it relies. Increased participation of non-professionals in crowdsourced translation and the growing use of machine translation have also led commentators (e.g., Pym 2012) to focus on trustworthiness as a key virtue that distinguishes (professional) human translators from others. And the virtue ethics framework is a fruitful one within which to explore one of the dilemmas of the contemporary workplace, where translators and especially post-editors are asked to provide just "good-enough" work, despite a deep-set desire to strive for excellence. Secondly, increased technologization has opened up new or exacerbated already existing ethical concerns, some of which are related to the narrower contractual ethics of service, others of which speak to wider issues of translator well-being and equality and social justice. The former include renewed interest in the values of: confidentiality, for example of client data that has been shared in digital form, and which can be easily compromised if those data are shared over a network, perhaps with a machine translation provider; privacy, which can be breached using contemporary monitoring technology; and respect for intellectual property rights, which may be eroded with the help of tools that systematically dispossess creators of their data or reuse data without permission. The latter concerns include the deployment of technologies and related policies and discourses in practices that either efface human involvement in translation workflows or create intolerable working conditions for translators. It also includes the risk of contemporary machine translation doing long-term aesthetic harm to creative texts or authors, amplifying bias inherent in the data on which it is trained and thereby promulgating discourses that do a disservice to those who may already be disadvantaged, or being implicated in errors that cause real harm to stakeholders. Most of these issues are broached in the contributions to Moorkens, Kenny and do Carmo (2020). Thirdly, some scholars have begun to turn their attention to the issue of the world's responsibility to translators and interpreters. Baker (2006), for example, considers the precarious situation of translators and interpreters working in conflict[4] zones, and there is a small but growing body of work concerned with translator well-being in more conventional settings (see Moorkens – Rocchi 2021). Fourthly, translation scholars have begun to engage with sustainability as an ethical value, both of translation itself and the moral goods it engenders (ibid.), and as it relates to human beings' moral relationship to the environment and its non-human contents. Cronin (2020) sees translation, and especially translation technology, as deeply implicated in the models of continuous economic growth that are causing on-going harm to the planet and argues for radical change to avert further environmental catastrophe.

References

Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203099919

Baker, Mona. 2018. *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd edition. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187

Chesterman, Andrew. 2001. "Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath." *The Return to Ethics. Special Issue of The Translator* 7 (2): 139–154.

Cronin, Michael. 2020. "Translation, technology and climate change." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology*, ed. by Minako O'Hagan, 516–530. London: Routledge.

Drugan, Joanna. 2018. "Ethics." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Philosophy*, ed. by Piers Rawling, and Philip Wilson, 243–255. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678481-16

Ess, Charles. 2006. "Ethical pluralism and global information ethics." *Ethics and Information Technology* 8: 215–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-006-9113-3

Kermit, Patrick. 2020. "Introduction." In *Ethics in Public Service Interpreting*, by Mary Phelan, Mette Rudvin, Hanne Skaaden, and Patrick Stefan Kermit, 1–23. London: Routledge.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2000. *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*. Tampere: University of Tampere. https://trepo.tuni.fi/handle/10024/67049

Moorkens, Joss, Dorothy Kenny, and Félix do Carmo (eds). 2020. *Fair MT: Towards ethical, sustainable Machine Translation*, *Special Issue of Translation Spaces*, 9 (1). https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00019.moo

Moorkens, Joss, and Marta Rocchi. 2021. "Ethics in the Translation Industry." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Ethics*, ed. by Kaisa Koskinen, and Nike Pokorn, 320–337. London: Routledge.

O'Mathúna, Dónal, and Matthew R. Hunt. 2020. "Ethics and crisis translation: insights from the work of Paul Ricoeur." *Disaster Prevention and Management* 29 (2): 175–186. https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-01-2019-0006

Phelan, Mary. 2020. "Codes of Ethics." In *Ethics in Public Service Interpreting*, by Mary Phelan, Mette Rudvin, Hanne Skaaden, and Patrick Stefan Kermit, 85–146. London: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony. 2012. *On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation between Cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.104

Rudvin, Mette. 2020. "Situating Interpreting Ethics in Moral Philosophy." In *Ethics in Public Service Interpreting*, by Mary Phelan, Mette Rudvin, Hanne Skaaden, and Patrick Stefan Kermit, 24–84. London: Routledge.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2007. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The translators invisibility: a history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Further essential reading

Fieser, James. no date. "Ethics." *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://iep.utm.edu/ethics/ (accessed 27 November 2020).

Eye tracking

Jan-Louis Kruger
Macquarie University, Sydney

1. Introduction

The study of eye movements using eye tracking technology has become an important method in a number of areas within translation studies (TS) (see, for example, Doherty & Kruger 2018; Hvelplund 2014; Kruger 2019; O'Brien 2009; Walker & Federici 2018). It has been used extensively in translation process research (TPR) to study the cognitive[1] processes involved in translation and post-editing[5], as well as in studies on the translator's workspace (see Ergonomics and translation workplaces[5]) and to a lesser extent in other processes like interpreting[1]. The past two decades have seen a rapid and accelerating growth in the use of eye tracking in TPR but also in studies that focus on the processing and reception of translation products. In Audiovisual translation[1] (AVT), subtitling[1] has been studied using eye tracking since the 1980s and as AVT has developed a stronger identity, eye tracking has become one of the most important methods for investigating how viewers process text in multimodal[4] contexts. With a growing number of articles, chapters and volumes on the use of eye tracking in TS, the methodology has become more robust and current trends focus on establishing conversations with neighbouring fields like psychology, cognitive science, and linguistics[2]. Eye tracking is a powerful tool in the hands of TS scholars and, if used responsibly, it can provide sound empirical evidence and allow researchers to test hypotheses and theories about processes during the production and reception of translation that have previously relied predominantly on philosophical approaches and textual evidence.

2. Background

Eye tracking is the process of using eye tracking devices to measure both the position of the eyes at specific points in time, and the movement of the eyes. The two main characteristics of eye movements are those periods when the eyes are relatively stationary, called *fixations*, and the rapid movement of the eyes between successive fixations, called *saccades*. Other characteristics used in research are eye blinks and

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.eye1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

changes in pupil diameter. During fixations, there is an intake of visual information whereas no new visual information is acquired during saccades. The most commonly used eye trackers in TS are video-based eye trackers that record data at anything between 30 Hz and 2000 Hz (samples per second). See Liversedge, Gilcrest and Everling (2011), and Holmqvist et al. (2011) for comprehensive introductions to the history and use of eye tracking.

The use of eye tracking in the field of TS is premised on the assumption that the location of the eyes provides an indication of what the viewer is processing. This is called the *eye-mind assumption* which will be discussed below. Conversely, due to the limits of the visual system, there are attentional constraints that prevent viewers from being able to process visual information located outside a certain area, linked to what is called *perceptual span*. Eye tracking therefore allows us to understand both what can be processed and what cannot be processed at a given moment, and also what translators look at, in what sequence, while translating, as well as the amount of *cognitive effort* a particular textual element causes.

2.1 Eye-mind assumption and cognitive effort

For TS, the most relevant eye tracking studies are those conducted within psychology and cognitive science on reading and information processing (see Rayner, 1998 for an overview of earlier work). TS scholars draw heavily on paradigms and theories established in these areas. Arguably the most influential concept is the eye-mind assumption alongside the immediacy assumption (Just & Carpenter 1980). This assumption makes a direct link between what is looked at and what is processed: "there is no appreciable lag between what is being fixated and what is being processed" (Just & Carpenter 1980: 331). It is also tied directly to cognitive effort in that looking at a particular item for longer than at other items (e.g., words), means that the processing of that item requires more cognitive effort. Although it has been shown that cognitive processing is not limited to the duration of fixations, the basic premise of the assumption still holds in that fixation locations and durations provide researchers with a good indication of what a viewer or reader processes, and when they encounter challenges. However, reading during translation, unlike reading for information or enjoyment, reveals part of the problem with the eye-mind assumption. Due to the nature of the translation task, the translator switches visual attention constantly between reading the source text, looking at the emerging target text, and checking the translation against the original, making it impossible to claim that the translator is only attending the fixated word while looking at it. For example, a longer fixation on a source text item may be due either to a challenge in the source item, or in the translation of that item into the target language (see Jakobson & Jensen 2008).

Other than providing information on the visual routines of translators during the process of translation or post-editing, and on the visual routines of users of translation products such as viewers of subtitled film, the relative duration of fixations at particular locations remains an important measure of cognitive effort in both the production and reception of translation (see Lacruz 2017). Nevertheless, care should be taken in the interpretation of this measure on its own, since fixation duration is also influenced by the nature of the task (e.g., reading for different purposes, scene perception), as well as cognitive processing not related to the fixated word but rather to the integration of information in a clause or sentence (resulting in a longer fixation at the end of a clause) (see Just & Carpenter 1980).

2.2 Perceptual span

It has been established experimentally that the visual system is constrained due to the limited area we can see in high definition when fixating on a particular location. This is called visual acuity (Rayner 2009) and means that we can extract a lot of information around the centre of vision (the fovea, or foveal vision – approximately 2° of the field of vision), but less in the area just outside that (the parafovea or parafoveal vision – approximately 5° of the field of vision), and very little in the area outside that, called the periphery. Parafoveal and peripheral vision help the viewer to identify information that will require the eyes to be moved to get detailed information. These limitations are linked to perceptual span, which is the area around the location of a fixation from which the viewer can get meaningful information. In reading text, it has been established for alphabetic systems that the perceptual span during reading is about 3–4 characters to the left, and 14 to 15 characters to the right of a fixation in languages that read from left to right and vice versa when the direction of reading is from right to left, although words can only be identified within a space of around 7 to 8 characters to the right of a fixation (word-identification span) (see Rayner, Well & Pollatsek 1980).

Being aware of these limitations of the visual system allows researchers in TS to interpret eye movement data collected during translation or post-editing or during the reading of translation products. By examining the fixations on words in the source and target texts, it is possible to determine which words were not fixated, or were never in the perceptual span, but also to identify words that received more attention and required more effort to process. This enables researchers to study the impact of different features of translated text (e.g., foreignizing or domesticating translation choices; literal or idiomatic translation choices, etc.) on the processing of translators during translation or readers during reception.

3. Application of eye tracking in TS research

3.1 Processes

In TPR, eye tracking has been used extensively to study the process of translation, particularly by combining eye tracking with key logging and introspection to study the cognitive activity of translators during translation. There are a number of methodological challenges in this type of research requiring significant technical skills to synchronise data from different streams (i.e., eye tracking data reflecting where, when and how translators looked at the source and the target text as well as resources; and key logging and screen capture data that provide information on the manual typing and mouse clicks). Some of the difficulties researchers face are discussed by O'Brien (2009) and Hvelplund (2014), and include matters such as the difference between fixation locations and thought processes during translation; the difficulty of interpreting fixations on emerging text where the typing, rather than the cognitive effort, may be the cause of more or longer fixations; and the impact of eye tracking accuracy, pupil responses to changes in luminosity and experiment bias on the usefulness of data.

Alves (2015) provides a detailed discussion of the paradigmatic, theoretical and methodological foundations of TPR which is essential reading for anyone wishing to embark on this type of research. Likewise, the collection edited by Walker and Federici (2018) includes a number of contributions on the use of eye tracking in post-editing (Moorkens (2008), in the study of the translation workplace (Teixeira & O'Brien 2018), and in studying the impact of expertise and other translator attributes on translation (Martínez-Goméz, Han, Carl, & Aizawa 2018).

In interpreting research, eye tracking provides important insights into the cognitive processes of the interpreter, focussing on sight translation, multimodal processing and note-reading. Chen (2018) and Chen, Kruger & Doherty (2021), for example, use eye tracking together with pen recordings to investigate the way interpreters create and use their notes during consecutive interpreting. Chmiel, Janikowski and Lijewska (2020) use eye tracking to investigate multimodal processing in simultaneous interpreting with text to illustrate the dominance of the visual modality when interpreters have access to text. Seeber (2017) likewise uses eye tracking to investigate multimodal processing in interpreting. This is doubtlessly the area in TS with the most robust experimental tradition and also the site of significant interdisciplinary work.

3.2 Reception

Eye tracking has been used on a much smaller scale in studies on text-based reception, in spite of growing interest. The area outside of TPR where eye tracking has been used most extensively, is AVT (see Kruger 2019 for an overview). The complexity of studying the reception of AVT is situated in the fact that users of subtitles never only read subtitles, but have to integrate the reading of subtitles with the multimodal input of film. Most studies in this area focus on the distribution of attention between subtitles and the image at a global level, although there is an increasing move to more robust experimental designs (see Doherty & Kruger 2018 and Liao et al. 2020). In AVT, the power of eye tracking is situated in the fact that it provides researchers with a way to look at the impact of different modalities (soundtrack and moving image), different languages (spoken and written; first, second and foreign), and competing cognitive demands on the reading of subtitles and the comprehension of film.

4. Conclusion

In spite of all the advantages of eye tracking for research in TS, it remains an expensive methodology that also requires a significant amount of technical knowledge and the ability to analyse large data sets using sophisticated statistical approaches. Increasingly, however, TS scholars are beginning to collaborate with scholars from neighbouring disciplines in multidisciplinary teams that bring together the necessary expertise to answer complicated theoretical questions. In fact, as eye tracking research in TS begins to align and interact more with developments in cognitive science and psychology, it is becoming an increasingly powerful tool for answering theoretical questions not only about translation, but about language, cognition and bilingualism[3].

References

Alves, Fabio. 2015. “Translation process research at the interface.” In *Psycholinguistic and cognitive inquiries into translation and interpreting*, ed. by Aline Ferreira, and John W. Schwieter, 17–25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.115.02alv

Chen, Sijia. 2018. “A pen-eye-voice approach towards the process of note-taking and consecutive interpreting: An experimental design.” *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* 6 (2): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.6n.2p.1

Chen, Sijia, Jan-Louis Kruger, and Stephen Doherty. 2021. "Reading patterns and cognitive processing in an eye-tracking study of note-reading in consecutive interpreting." *Interpreting* 23v(1): 76–102. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00050.che

Doherty, Stephen, and Jan-Louis Kruger. 2018. "The development of eye tracking in empirical research on subtitling and captioning." In *Seeing into Screens: Eye tracking and the moving image*, ed. by Tessa Dwyer, Claire Perkins, Sean Redmond, and Jodi Sita, 46–64. London: Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781501329012.0009

Hvelplund, Kristian Tangsaard. 2014. "Eye tracking and the translation process: reflections on the analysis and interpretation of eye-tracking data." *MonTi: Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, special issue on Minding Translation/Con la traducción en mente, 201–223. https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2014.ne1.6

Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke, and Kristian T. Jensen. 2008. "Eye movement behaviour across four different types of reading task." In *Looking at eyes*, ed. by Susanne Göpferich, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, and Inger M. Mees, 103–124. Frederiksberg: Samfundlitteratur.

Just, Marcel Adam, and Patricia A. Carpenter. 1980. "A theory of reading: From eye fixations to comprehension." *Psychological Review* 87 (4): 329–354. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.4.329

Lacruz, Isabel. 2017. "Cognitive Effort in Translation, Editing, and Post-editing." In *The handbook of translation and cognition*, ed. by John W. Schwieter, and Aline Ferreira, 386–401. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241485.ch21

Liao, Sixin, Lili Yu, Erik D. Reichle, and Jan-Louis Kruger. 2020. "Using eye movements to study the reading of subtitles in video." *Scientific Studies of Reading*. Advanced online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2020.1823986

Liversedge, Simon P., Ian D. Gilchrist, and Stefan Everling (eds). 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Eye Movements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martínez-Gómez, Pascual, Dan Han, Michael Carl, and Akiko Aizawa. 2018. "Recognition and characterization of translator attributes using sequences of fixations and keystrokes." In *Eye Tracking and Multidisciplinary Studies on Translation*, ed. by Callum Walker, and Federico M. Federici, 97–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.143.06mar

Moorkens, Joost. 2018. "Eye tracking as a measure of cognitive effort for post-editing of machine translation." In *Eye Tracking and Multidisciplinary Studies on Translation*, ed. by Callum Walker and Federico M. Federici, 55–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.143.04moo

O'Brien, Sharon. 2009. "Eye tracking in translation process research: methodological challenges and solutions." In *Methodology, technology and innovation in translation process research*, ed. by Inger M. Mees, Fabio Alves, and Susanne Göpferich, 251–266. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Rayner, Keith. 1998. "Eye movements in reading and information processing: 20 years of research." *Psychological bulletin* 124 (3): 372–422. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.3.372

Rayner, Keith, Arnold D. Well, and Alexander Pollatsek. 1980. "Asymmetry of the effective visual field in reading." *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics* 27 (6): 537–544. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03198682

Seeber, Killian G. 2017. "Multimodal Processing in Simultaneous Interpreting." In *The handbook of translation and cognition*, ed. by John W. Schwieter, and Aline Ferreira, 461–475. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241485.ch25

Teixeira, Carlos S., and Sharon O'Brien. 2018. "Overcoming methodological challenges of eye tracking in the translation workplace." In *Eye Tracking and Multidisciplinary Studies on Translation*, ed. by Callum Walker, and Federico M. Federici, 33–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.143.03tei

Further essential reading

Chmiel, Agnieszka, Przemyslaw Janikowski, and Agnieszka Lijewska. 2020. “Multimodal processing in simultaneous interpreting with text: Interpreters focus more on the visual than the auditory modality.” *Target* 32 (1): 37–58. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.18157.chm

Holmqvist, Kenneth, Marcus Nyström, Richard Andersson, Richard Dewhurst, Halszka Jarodzka, and Joost van de Weijer. 2011. *Eye Tracking: A Comprehensive Guide to Methods and Measures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kruger, Jan-Louis. 2019. “Eye tracking in audiovisual translation research.” In *Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*, ed. by Luis Perez-Gonzalez, 366–382. London: Routledge.

Rayner, Keith. 2009. “Eye movements in reading: Models and data.” *Journal of eye movement research* 2 (5): 1–10. https://doi.org/10.16910/jemr.2.5.2

Walker, Callum, and Federico M. Federici (eds). 2018. *Eye tracking and multidisciplinary studies on translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.143

Food and translation

Renée Desjardins
University of Saint-Boniface

In *An Edible History of Humanity,* Standage (2009: 23–24) indicates that linguistic and archaeological evidence both support a connection between language dispersion and the diffusion of agriculture: "Today, nearly 90 percent of the world's population speaks a language belonging to one of seven language families that had their origins in two agricultural homelands: the Fertile Crescent and parts of China. The languages we speak today, like the foods we eat, are descended from those used by the first farmers". Indeed, the spread and use of specific languages intersects with food behaviours and positions communication and translation (since hunter-gatherers and farmers likely had to communicate across languages to trade knowledge and tools) as inherent to food and agricultural history. In today's contemporary world, translation is central to food production and supply chains. Contemporary consumers have increasingly diversified palates and with the influence of social media, which hosts a wealth of food-related aspirational content, the demand for fresh food and non-local foods is insatiable. This has meant a rise in temporary, migrant, and foreign workforces in areas such as agriculture and meat-processing. Extant research has examined issues related to food supply and the employment of migrant workers, but research on the fundamental role translation plays here, on all levels (from self-translation to the availability of human resources documentation in worker languages), is limited and sometimes even censured. For instance, recent reporting in North America has suggested that meat-processing plants did not provide sufficient or adequately translated materials to inform plant workers on public health measures and risks related to COVID-19, the presupposition being that English should suffice as a pivot language and/or as a lingua franca (Baum, Tait, & Grant 2020). Research on the subject of translation and food was previously circumscribed to the study of food-related discourse in literature, menu, recipe, and label translation, and the translation of culinary tourism discourse. However, the research intersections between food and translation are continuously broadening. More recently, there has been a notable shift towards sociologically-oriented work and intersectional lenses, wherein issues related to social justice and food security are examined. Translation is ubiquitous as far as food is concerned: from how nutritional labels are translated, to how some dishes become "translations" of a culture, to machine automated trans-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.foo1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

lations of restaurant reviews or social media posts, to cookbook or recipe translation. Moreover, if one is to consider a non-anthropocentric perspective, then the overlaps between food and translation multiply: from the "translational" interaction of microbes in the process of fermentation (Desjardins 2019), to the relationships humans maintain with animals and other species, particularly regarding intersemiotic communication and human-animal interactions (Cronin 2015), to name only these two examples.

In their introduction to a special issue of *The Translator* titled *Food and Translation/Translation and Food,* Chiaro and Rossato (2015) affirm the centrality of food in human behaviour and communication, and, by extension, the relevance of translation in food contexts. However, they observe "despite a rapidly expanding market for translation of food-related texts, the relationship between food, culture and translation remains under-researched" (ibid: 237). This special issue followed the 2014 Food and Culture in Translation conference (FaCT).[1] Since, a number of similarly themed conferences have taken place, illustrating growing interest in this area: the second installment of the FaCT conference took place in 2016 in Catania, Italy and the more recently postponed Traduire le culinaire/Culinary Translation was to take place in Lille, France.[2] The conference programmes for these events indicate a scholarly interest in the translation of food phraseology and terminology in literature and tourism texts; culinary and food activism and the role translation plays here; the translation of traditional ingredients or dishes; culinary terminology more broadly; and the translation of public health and nutritional guidelines. In 2016, in Montreal, Canada, a bilingual conference (English, French) titled *Études du fait alimentaire en Amérique/Food studies in America* also discussed the intersections between food and translation. Of note is that the panel discussion on the challenges posed by the very translation of the conference's title: how does one translate "Food Studies" into other languages? The subject of translating "food studies" as a term raises questions about epistemology and this has been discussed by Desjardins, Cooke, and Charron (2015) who observe that different epistemologies constitute the basis for different food-related fields. Not only does the study of food vary between how it is examined in a social sciences and humanities context versus in a nutrition or natural sciences context, but it also varies across different academic traditions, such as the Anglo-Saxon tradition and Continental tradition (ibid.: 261–262). Although the discussion focuses primarily on the English↔French translations of food-related research and the Canadian context, the questions these authors raise may be of interest to researchers in other locales looking at the genealogy and translation of food scholarship in other language combinations and academic traditions.

---

[1] http://fact.sitlec.unibo.it/

[2] https://traduction-culinaire.univ-lille.fr/

An overview of literature on the subject of translation and food indicates the following research strands: food and its translation in literature (see Oster and Molés-Cases 2016); food, tourism, and translation (see De Marco 2015); food terminology, phraseology, and comparative analyses (see Gaspari 2015); translation of non-institutional food-related texts (see Li 2019); translation of institutional food-related texts (e.g., public health guidelines; food labels); food and cultural translation; Audiovisual translation[1] [AVT] (subtitling, dubbing, or a combination) and food (e.g., food vlogs, cookery shows, food in film); non-anthropocentric, intersemiotic, and decolonized understandings of food ecology. In what follows, select strands are more comprehensively described.

Food has found itself as the star of many forms of entertainment: from animated films like Disney's *Ratatouille* and DreamWorks' *Shrek* films, to the Food Network's programming, to amateur cooks taking to culinary vlogging on YouTube, food, as Gonzàlez-Vera (2015) states, takes on different roles and purposes including "acculturation, recreation of cultural identities and stereotypes, or humour". Gonzàlez-Vera's work examines dubbing (English→Spanish) of animated films, including the *Shrek* films, to discern which translation techniques are used, specifically with regard to content aimed at younger audiences. Baños (2018) likens reality TV to "fast-food TV", suggesting that reality TV is considered less "nutritional" than other forms of traditional television programming. Given the popularity of reality TV on food-related networks, this analogy is portent and lends itself to being further examined in the context of Social media[4] platforms like YouTube, where arguably there is no difference 'between "content' and "reality TV". Returning more specifically to Baños' (ibid.) study, the focus is on three reality shows, one being the popular *Kitchen Nightmares.* In a similar approach to Gonzàlez-Vera, Baños examines which translation techniques are used and how these either align or contest established audiovisual translation conventions.

Delia Chiaro is one of the prominent voices in Translation Studies (TS) to incorporate food discourse as an object of study. Her 2004 article on the subject agro-food advertising is an early example of TS research that not only intersects with food, but also with early work on translation and the web. In later work, Chiaro (2013) shifts the focus to cookery texts, examining how food and cultural representation intersect through translocation, assimilation, transadaptation, and substitution. As previously mentioned, Chiaro is also the co-editor of the special thematic issue of *The Translator* on Food and Translation/Translation and Food. The issue's other co-editor, Linda Rossato, has also contributed to this body of work, with a case study on Jamie Oliver's *Jamie's Great Italian Escape* (2015). Rossato examines cultural adaptation and cultural translation in relation to a food show and specific food cultures (the Italian culinary tradition and food culture and its uptake and perception in UK audiences). Researchers interested in an accessible overview of food as an object of study in TS are encouraged to read Chiaro and Rossato's introduction to *The Translator* special issue (2015: 237–243).

Menu translation is another area in which research has proliferated. Desjardins (2011) studied a corpus of print menus from the 20th century from the Château Frontenac in Québec City, Canada. Part of Desjardins' analysis links menu translation to the Canadian Official Languages Act and cultural norms and practices of the time of the menus' circulation. Ghafarian, Kafipour and Soori (2016) examine translation strategies in the translation of restaurant menus from Persian into English. Their case study examines 40 restaurant menus and is likely to be of interest for researchers looking to find a case study outside North America and Europe. A third and final example of menu translation research is Fuentes-Luque's (2017) study on the quality of menu translation in Spain. Fuentes-Luque uses a questionnaire to evaluate the perception of quality in translated restaurant menus from restaurants in Andalusia, Spain. The idea of using a questionnaire to assess quality in menus provides a relevant template for work in this area. This method could also be paired with the analysis of online review sites like TripAdvisor, OpenTable, or Yelp.

At a time when social movements, activists, food workers and some researchers are calling for more equitable and responsible use of land, fairer access to food, better worker rights and bringing to light other issues directly related to food production and public health (including obesity, eating disorders, and nutritional guidance), it would seem opportune to see how translation (in the broadest sense) and interpretation could be leveraged to remedy some of the inequities and disparities present in our foodscapes. For instance, migrant agri-food workers should not have to default to English because human resources documentation cannot be provided in their language of choice. For countries where immigration is on the rise and necessary for economic growth, public health and nutritional guidance should ideally account for comprehensive cultural and linguistic representation (Desjardins 2021): here, intralingual⑤, interlingual, intersemiotic⑤ and intercultural④ translation are crucial. Similarly, with an eye to Indigenous reconciliation and recognition, traditional foodways and food practices must not be secondary in food and nutritional guidance (cf. Desjardins, Cooke, & Charron 2015; Kepkiewicz & Rotz 2018). Translation is present at every level of the food production and supply chain, thus, food and its translation are not only located in content meant to entertain us, but are interconnected in ways that have real-world effects. This makes translational ethics⑤ all the more relevant in food contexts, particularly when human and non-human/other-than-human lives are at stake.

References

Baños, Rocío. 2019. "Translating reality TV into Spanish: when fast-food TV challenges AVT conventions." *Perspectives* 27(2): 265–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1424221

Baum, Kathryn B., Carrie Tait, and Tavia Grant. (2020) "How Cargill became the site of Canada's largest single outbreak of COVID19." *The Globe and Mail*. Available at: https://www.theglobeandmail.com/business/article-how-cargill-became-the-site-of-canadas-largest-single-outbreak-of/ (Accessed 1 June 2020).

Chiaro, Delia and Linda Rossato. 2015. (eds). "Introduction." *The Translator special issue: Food and Translation, Translation and Food* 21 (3). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45037-6_1

Chiaro, Delia. 2013. "Passionate about Food: Jamie and Nigella and the Performance of Food Talk." In *Culinary Linguistics: The Chef's Special*, ed. by Cornelia Gerhardt, Maximiliane Frobenius, and Susanne Ley, 83–102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/clu.10.03chi

Chiaro, Delia. 2004. "Translational and Marketing Communication." *The Translator* 10 (2): 313–328. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2004.10799182

Cronin, Michael. 2015. "The moveable feast: translation, ecology, and food." *The Translator* 21 (3): 244–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1103094

Desjardins, Renée. 2011. "L'étude du menu comme representation de l'identité culinaire Québécoise: le cas des menus du Château Frontenac." *Cuizine: The Journal of Canadian Food Cultures/la revue des cultures culinaires au Canada* 3 (1). https://doi.org/10.7202/1004729ar

Desjardins, Renée. 2019. "Editor's Introduction." *CuiZine: the Journal of Canadian Food Cultures/la revue des cultures culinaires au Canada* 9 (2). https://doi.org/10.7202/1055214ar

Desjardins, Renée. 2021. "Nutrition and translation." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Health*, ed. by. Şebnem Susam-Saraeva and Eva Spišiaková, 385–402. London: Routledge.

Desjardins, Renée, Nathalie Cooke, and Marc Charron. 2015. "Food and translation on the table: exploring the relationships between food studies and translation studies in Canada." *The Translator* 21 (3): 257–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1103095

Fuentes-Luque, Adriàn. 2017. "An approach to analysing the quality of menu translation in southern Spain restaurants." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38 (2): 177–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1187154

Gaspari, Federico. 2015. "Exploring Expo Milano 2015: A cross-linguistic comparison of food-related phraseology in translation using a *comparalled* corpus approach." *The Translator* 21 (3): 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1103099

Ghafarian, M., Reza Kafipour, and Afshin Soori. 2016. "Domestication and Foreignisation Strategies in Restaurant Menu Translation." *Pertanika* 24 (4): 1417–1429.

González-Vera, Pilar. 2015. "Food for Thought: the translation of culinary references in animation." *Íkala*, *Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 20(2): 247–264. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v20n2a07

Kepkiewicz, Lauren, and Sarah Rotz. 2018. "Toward anti-colonial food policy in Canada? (Im)possibilities within the settler state." *Canadian Food Studies/La Revue Canadienne Des études Sur L'alimentation*, 5 (2): 13–24. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v5i2.202

Li, Saihong. 2019. "A corpus-based multimodal approach to the translation of restaurant menus." *Perspectives* 27 (1): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1483408

Oster, Ulrike, and Teresa Molés-Cases. 2016. "Eating and drinking seen through translation: a study of food-related translation difficulties and techniques in a parallel corpus of literary texts." *Across Languages and Cultures* 17 (1): 53–75. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2016.17.1.3

Standage, Tom. 2009. *An Edible History of Humanity*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Further essential reading

Chiaro, Delia. 2008. “A taste of otherness eating and thinking globally.” *European Journal of English Studies* 12 (2): 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570802151470

Genetic translation studies

Anthony Cordingley
University Paris 8 | KU Leuven

Genetic translation studies is a field of research in which the methodology of Franco-Belgian *critique génétique*, or genetic criticism, is used to study translators' drafts, manuscripts, notes, corrected proofs – a translation's *avant-textes* – in order to discern the processes that shaped the writing of translation. *Critique génétique* was first applied to translated texts in the 1990s, when researchers at the Institut des Textes et Manuscrits Modernes (ITEM) in Paris published their investigations into Paul Valéry's translation papers as *Génétique & Traduction* (Bourjea 1995). Scott (2006) advanced a theoretical discussion around questions which themselves gained wider recognition with the special issues of *Genesis* (Durand-Bogaert 2014a) and *Linguistica Antverpiensia* (Cordingley and Montini 2015a), in particular. At this time, reflections on the use of archival sources emerged in other quarters of translation studies (e.g., Munday 2013, 2014; Mitchell 2014). Cordingley and Montini (2015b) proposed that such research be identified as "genetic translation studies" (GTS) to distinguish it from other approaches, such as cognitive[1], descriptive[1], sociological (see Sociology of translation[1]) or corpus-based (see Corpora[1]) translation studies. If GTS sometimes draws on one or more of these, it is defined by the systematic study of the successive phases of a translation through the documentary evidence of a translator's work, and its subsequent evolution. GTS analyses *avant-textes* to determine the different processes and writing strategies engaged by the translator/s; it gauges the factors that inhibit or facilitate translators' autonomy and creativity, including external influences, such as authors, collaborators, publishers, revisers, readers, who may alter the translator's text, often in a series of back-and-forth revisions during the production phase of the text. This research also maps out the text's evolution in its post-text phase, which includes revisions and reeditions of a published translation, and even its role as a source in a retranslation. It acknowledges that at each stage, the writing of translation is shaped by considerations of the translation's function in the target culture, as well as its relationship to the source text. More recently GTS research has explored the translation archive as a site with its own political and aesthetic dynamics (see Cordingley & Hersant 2021).

Critique génétique, the methodology[2] underpinning GTS, emerged in France during the 1960s as an alternative to post-structuralist theories that situate the text

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.gen4

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

within a synchronic network of other texts and signs. Genetic criticism is concerned rather with the diachronic evolution of text, its transformations over time. It conceives of the literary work as a "becoming" not a "culmination" (Hay 1993: x), and literature itself as "a *doing*, as an activity, as movement" (Grésillon 1994: 7). *Avant-textes* are not appreciated teleologically or instrumentalized to explain textual phenomena in the published work, as may occur in traditional philology. Nor are textual variants examined with the aim of producing a best or ideal edition of a text, which often motivates Anglo-American textual criticism. Rather, the "ultimate goal" of genetic research "is not the text, but writing, understood as advent and event, as a process of written enunciation" (Grésillon 1994: 109). Genetic criticism seeks to develop hypotheses with respect to the processes that inform a writer's decision making and motivations at different stages of writing. One may, for instance, distinguish between *écriture à programme* and *écriture à processus*, between writers who follow a pre-established plan of writing and those who journey out with their words into the unknown. These terms are understood to be poles of a spectrum, and each instance of writing is invariably unique. However, decades of research in genetic criticism has developed a vocabulary to describe traits common to writing projects.

Translation genetics draws upon genetic criticism's methodology and its robust theoretical debates with respect to *avant-textes* and the phases of writing, and the ontological or epistemological relationship of each to authorship (see Grésillon 1994; Deppman, Ferrer, & Groden 2004; de Biasi 2011; Van Hulle 2014). A genetic study will typically begin by classifying all documents in the "gentic dossier" chronologically and discern their relationship to the five phases in the text's genesis (precomposition, composition, prepublishing, publication, postpublication) and the three stages of textualization (*avant-texte*, text and post-text) (De Biasi 2011). Textual phenomena are interrogated with respect to their authorship and identified as either endogenetic (authorial or non-authorial/allograph writing, corrections, additions and deletions), exogenetic (notebooks, letters, contracts, emails), epigenetic (pertaining to the form of the text after its author declares it ready for press), paratextual (relating to the form and presentation of the work) or post-textual (relating to its circulation and reception). This prepares analysis of the writing strategies within each identified phase of writing and their relationship to the continuum of writing. Case studies of GTS research may be consulted in many books, edited collections, special journal issues, chapters and articles (in English, French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian) listed on the website of the Multilingualism, Translation, Creation Research Group at ITEM (http://www.item.ens.fr/multilinguisme).

Archival approaches and manuscript studies are not however entirely foreign to translation studies. Gideon Toury studied the evolution of Avraham Shlonsky's Hebrew translation of Hamlet's "To be or not to be" monologue by comparing successive manuscript drafts. María Guzmán analyzed Gregory Rabassa's translations of

Gabriel Garcia Márquez with reference to the large Gregory Rabassa collection at the Howard Gotlieb Archival Research Centre at Boston University. Lawrence Venuti made extensive use of the Paul Blackburn papers or the Pellegrini and Cudahy publishers' archive. These and other such studies do not have a shared methodology or research objectives. On the other hand, Munday's (2013) analysis of the *avant-textes* of David Bellos's translation of George Perec's *Les Choses* seeks to build upon Toury's categories of *textual sources* and *extratextual sources* – less precise than GTS terminology – to develop an approach to archival research per se. Munday (2014) extended this reflection, advocating for the use of a microhistory approach, inferring larger trends from limited data, as a way of coping with the patchy archival records of translators' work.

In the same year, Breon Mitchell (2014) – who assembled one of the largest translation archives in the world from 2001 to 2012 as director of the Lilly Library at the Indiana University Bloomington– identified four key uses for literary translation archives, each compatible with GTS methods. Mitchell argues that, firstly, translator's archives offer "unique insights into the author's mind and intentions, and revea[l] in part the creative process by which the original work came into being" (2014: 262). He singles out the correspondence between author and translator as key documents for opening a window upon the translation process; they may also explain anomalies or differences in the translation, even disclosing how an original work was altered as a result of its translation. He relates, for instance, that his own translation of Martin Grzimek's *Die Beschattung* was made from a shortened and revised version of the novel, which evolved as a result of his collaboration with the author on its English translation; Grzimek then insisted that this new version of the German text be used for the subsequent French translation.

Secondly, translators' archives also "give us a clearer understanding of the way in which literary works enter a new culture, providing evidence of how and why particular works get translated, and detailing a process of selection that includes reader's reports and the enthusiasm of individual editors" (ibid.: 264). Mitchell points to the fact that translators are often called upon by publishers as expert readers to assess foreign works; their reader's reports, which detail a rationale for publication or not, becoming precious resources for translation research.

Thirdly, literary translators' archives "reveal a great deal about the business of translation" (ibid.: 265): contracts, book production, royalties, and advertising attest to the material conditions of translation, how those conditions may be contested by translators, as well as to the history of unpublished translations.

Lastly, translation manuscripts offer students and practitioners of translation precious insights into the art of literary translation and its transformations within the editorial chain, "from inception to publication, including early drafts, the submitted manuscript, editor's revisions and copy editing, further revisions for galley proofs, and the final text" (ibid.: 265). Indeed, Mitchell affirms that the complexity of a translation's genesis is "often greater than that which generated the original text" (ibid.: 265).

Major repositories of translators' manuscripts include the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin; Yale's Beinecke Library; Harvard's Houghton Library; the British Archive for Contemporary Writing, University of East Anglia, UK; the Institut Mémoires de l'Édition Contemporaine (IMEC) in Caen, France; the German Literature Archive, Marbach, Germany; the Chinese Literature Translation Archive, Bizzell Memorial Library, University of Oklahoma. Another centre, the Chinese Literature Translation Archive at the Chinese University of Hong Kong has published facsimiles online of manuscripts by renowned translator David Hawkes. Making such material accessible to all is crucial for the democratization of GTS research. Furthermore, transcribing and encoding genetic materials in a language such as eXtensible Markup Language (XML) enables their full exploitation. The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project (www.beckettarchive.org), for example, allows users to compare the manuscript evolution of different versions of Beckett's originals and self-translations in an automatic collation engine (CollateX). Such projects are however very costly, and like specific collections of translators' papers in general, they are typically reserved for high profile translators only, often prestigious authors who also translate. GTS is faced with the problem that the materials available do not represent the reality of the profession. A more accurate view of the day-to-day work of translators may be gained from publishers' archives, which include correspondence, contracts, and corrected proofs; they are valuable especially for gauging collaboration with editors and others, though rarely contain the precious early drafts that witness the translation coming into being.

Methodologies compatible with GTS are also practised in disciplines outside of translation studies. For instance, in 2015 the Biblical scholar Jeffrey Alan Miller discovered that the notebook of Samuel Ward – a member of the so-called Second Cambridge Company of *King James Bible* translators – conserved at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, contained Ward's draft of his translation of apocryphal text 1 *Esdras* (*Ezra*) and a partial draft of *Wisdom* 3–4.6. Miller proves this remarkable document to be the earliest known draft of the *King James Bible*. Yet Miller is interested not only in what Ward's draft tells us about the Bible but in Ward the translator – his working methods, his style and word choices, the way he weighs one source against another, the questions he raises. Miller writes of Ward's notes, "they are manifestly not a clean copy or record of thinking already done, decisions already made. Rather, they show Ward making mistakes, changing his mind" (2018: 209). Ward's draft, "seems to reveal him working out his proposed translations for the first time as he goes along, rather than simply recording proposed translations on the basis of a previous draft that he or someone else had already composed" (ibid.: 223). Miller expands on what these translation choices tell us about the "the whole cultural firmament out of which the translation emerged" (ibid.: 192–193) and concludes that Ward's extremely rare draft offers grounds for revising orthodoxies with respect to how the most fundamental text in the English literary tradition came into being: it "reveals that the King James Bible may be far more a patchwork of individual translations—the product of individual translators and of individual companies working in individual ways—than has ever been fully considered" (Miller 2018: 260).

If many ancient translation manuscripts survive, Ward's, dating from 1604 to 1608, is one of the oldest translation *drafts* in English – it is older than the partial draft of the New Testament epistles in the Lambeth Palace Library in London, or the nearly complete drafts of the Old Testament and the Gospels at the Bodleian Library at Oxford, a revision inscribed over a 16th-century Bishops' Bible, the base text used by King James translators. Yet Ward's genetic dossier is not exceptional in that its aporetic and fragmented reflection of Ward's translating resembles the state of many dossiers that GTS researchers of printed texts encounter today. The historical reasons for this relate above all to the lower status accorded to translators' work, which rendered their drafts symbolically and economically negligible (Durand-Bogaert 2014b; Cordingley & Montini 2015b). These dossiers and archives demand a more flexible application of genetic criticism than authorial texts require. To accommodate lacunae in the record of translation genesis researchers may triangulate GTS methods with those of cognate disciplines such as the sociology of translation, book history and other social sciences.

References

Bourjea, Serge (ed.). 1995. *Génétique & traduction*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Cordingley, Anthony, and Chiara Montini (eds). 2015a. Towards a Genetics of Translation, Special issue of *Linguistica Antverpiensia (New Series) 14*.

Cordingley, Anthony, and Chiara Montini. 2015b. "Genetic translation studies: an emerging discipline. *Linguistica Antverpiensia (New Series)* 14: 1–18.

De Biasi, Pierre-Marc. 2011. *Génétique des textes*. Paris: CNRS.

Durand-Bogaert, Fabienne (ed.). 2014a. *Traduire*, Special issue of *Genesis*, 38.

Durand-Bogaert, Fabienne. 2014b. "Les deux corps du texte." *Genesis* 38: 11–33. https://doi.org/10.4000/genesis.1284

Grésillon, Almuth. 1994. *Eléments de critique génétique*. Paris: PUF.

Hay, Louis. 1993. *Les Manuscrits des ecrivains*. Paris: Hachette, CNRS.

Miller, Jeffrey Alan. 2018. "The Earliest Known Draft of the King James Bible: Samuel Ward's Draft of 1 Esdras and Wisdom 3-4." In *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Scholarship and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible*, ed. by Mordechai Feingold, 187–265. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004359055_008

Mitchell, Breon. 2014. "The Lives of the Translators." In *The Man Between: Michael Henry Heim & a Life in Translation*, ed. by Esther Allen, Sean Cotter, and Russell Scott Valentino, 250–269. Rochester, NY: Open Letter.

Munday, Jeremy. 2013. "The role of archival and manuscript research in the investigation of translator decision-making." *Target* 25 (1): 125–139. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.25.1.10mun

Munday, Jeremy. 2014. "Using primary sources to produce a microhistory of translation and translators: theoretical and methodological concerns." *The Translator* 20 (1): 64–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2014.899094

Scott, Clive. 2006. "Translating the literary: Genetic criticism text theory and poetry." In *The Translator as Writer*, ed. by Susan Bassnett, and Peter Bush, 106–117. London: Continuum.

Further essential reading

Cordingley, Anthony, and Patrick Hersant (eds). 2021. *Translation Archives*, Special issue of *Meta* 66 (1).

Deppman, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden (eds). 2004. *Genetic criticism: Texts and avant-textes*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Van Hulle, Dirk. 2014. *Modern Manuscripts: The extended mind and creative undoing from Darwin to Beckett and beyond*. London: Bloomsbury.

Healthcare interpreting

Letizia Cirillo
University of Siena

1. Overview and contextualization

Healthcare interpreting – also called Medical interpreting[2] – is a specific type of *Community interpreting*[1] occurring whenever healthcare service users and providers need to communicate but do not share the same language. This is a common circumstance in a "superdiverse" society, in which medical tourism, doctor and patient mobility, and migration have been steadily growing (Angelelli 2019).

Healthcare interpreting takes place within encounters that are a) inherently *institutional*, i.e., goal-oriented, shaped by context-related constraints, associated with expectations about the interaction and its outcomes, and, generally speaking, b) *collaborative* (Hsieh 2016), their overarching goal being the delivery and reception of healthcare. Specifically, healthcare interpreting cuts across various settings and events that involve different participants, norms, registers, and modes, with situations ranging from routine check-ups at medical practices to emergency room visits, from paediatric genetic counselling sessions to palliative care encounters with nursing home residents, from consultations between deaf healthcare providers and hearing patients to maternal and child home visits, from medical screening examinations at field clinics in disaster areas to mental health interviews with refugees and asylum seekers.

Accordingly, a variety of *interpreting modes* are used: on-site bilateral interpreting with "chuchotage" and short consecutive[1] (with or without note-taking); Simultaneous interpreting[1], as is often the case in Sign language interpreting[1]; Sight translation[1] (e.g., of prescriptions or discharge instructions); and *Remote interpreting*[2], recently welcomed by both service users and service providers as a way of reducing costs and improving access to healthcare. Remote interpreting has in fact been increasingly employed in health-related settings and situations, and includes telephone-mediated encounters, common in some countries since the 1970s, and video-mediated encounters, which have been gaining ground thanks to advances in ICT and developments in tele-healthcare.

Dealing with such a wide array of contexts and situations requires knowledge and skills that go well beyond mere language transfer and demand high levels of prepa-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.hea1
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

ration and professionalism. The *practice* of healthcare interpreting, however, is not universally recognized as a *profession*: the availability of qualified interpreters varies between and within countries, education and training opportunities (see Teaching interpreting/training interpreters[4]) are uneven, and status[2], accreditation systems (where present), and codes of conduct differ widely due to disparate institutional requirements and working arrangements.

It is only in the past thirty years that professionalism has received a much-needed impetus, thanks to a growing body of *research* conducted within interpreting studies (IS) and related fields (such as applied linguistics and intercultural communication), and the launch of the Critical Link conference series on community interpreting, which have shed light on the variable practices and contingencies of interpreted health communication. Studies on quality of healthcare by medical scholars have likewise underlined the need to recruit well-qualified interpreters. For instance, Flores (2005) reported that professional interpreters commit fewer errors compared to their lay counterparts, thereby leading to greater overall patient and practitioner satisfaction and better clinical outcomes.

2. Role of the healthcare interpreter

The role of the healthcare interpreter is an issue that has traditionally been at the centre of much debate among professionals as well as researchers.

Research conducted in medical settings from the 1980s onwards (e.g., Kaufert and Koolage 1984) has highlighted how medical interpreters are called to navigate various and often conflicting roles, ranging from mere *language translator* to *cultural informant* and *culture broker* (providing clarifications respectively for health professionals regarding the patients and their communities and for patients regarding the biomedical culture of the health system). Other roles identified include those of *cultural mediator* brokering between clashing value systems, and *advocate* acting on behalf of patients, should their needs not be met due to systemic barriers.

Hsieh (2007) suggests that, given her/his procedural knowledge, the interpreter may act – subject to approval by the health providers – as a *provider proxy*, collecting information from the patient during the history-taking stage and then reporting back to the health professional, or even as a "*co-diagnostician*", providing suggestions or instructions during the advice stage of the consultation.

Approaching the medical interpreter's role from the perspective of cross-cultural psychology, Leanza (2005) observes that the interpreter may act as a *system agent,* suppressing or assimilating cultural difference; a *community agent,* acknowledging cultural difference; an *integration agent*, assisting both migrants and the host society in negotiating a shared way of behaving; or a *linguistic agent,* maintaining a technical relationship with cultural difference and intervening only at the level of language.

However, it is within IS that the debate about the role of (healthcare) interpreters has acquired new significance. By the second half of the 1990s, the "social turn" in interpreting studies had already brought about a paradigm shift at both the theoretical and methodological levels, in which dialogue interpreting started to be seen as a social situated activity that is jointly constructed by its co-participants. In line with this turn, analysts started to show an interest in its interpersonal dimension and dialogic format (e.g., Wadensjö 1998) and to question the acritical transfer of interpreter role constructs from conference (or adversarial) to medical settings. They also began to consider as worthy of investigation not just practitioners', patients', and interpreters' accounts but also the actual interaction among them, including non-verbal aspects like gaze and body orientation (e.g., Krystallidou 2014).

Healthcare interpreters have thus been identified as playing a *coordinating role* (Wadensjö 1998). Doing so may involve filtering out information, i.e., acting as an "*institutional gatekeeper*" (Davidson 2000), providing "*epistemic brokering*" (Raymond 2014) between participants with knowledge asymmetries and different rights of access to knowledge (with the interpreter acting as a patient "navigator"), or engaging in *Intercultural mediation*[4] to bridge the gap between participants' values at different levels of the cultural iceberg.

Ultimately, given the complexity of the interactional dynamics of interpreted health encounters, some researchers (e.g., Bot and Verrept 2013) have suggested that healthcare interpreting is best viewed as a continuum of *context-dependent, co-constructed roles.*

3. Variables affecting perceived roles of healthcare interpreters

The role of healthcare interpreters is influenced by both situational factors and the wider social context in which interpreting takes place. Specifically, how the interpreter's role is perceived – including on the part of the interpreter her/himself – depends on the expectations of all participants in mediated health interactions and, at a more general level, on the demands of the institutional and lay beneficiaries of healthcare interpreting.

As regards situational aspects, for instance, interpreting may occur remotely rather than on site. Typical configurations involve two-point calls, with the interpreter at a different location from the co-located health service provider and user, and three-point calls, with all three parties at different locations. This "dematerialization" implies limited or no access to visual and other sensory input, which is likely to have a bearing on the coordinating role of the interpreter and the overall interactional dynamics of the interpreted event. As pointed out by de Boe (2019) in a study comparing face-to-face and remote interpreting, while remote modalities do not seem to impact transactional aspects of health communication, with very few differences found between remote and on-site interpreting at the level of message equivalence, they do have repercussions at an interactional level, with significantly more instances of repair and optimization strategies (e.g., clarification requests and meta comments) occurring with remote interpreters compared to on-site ones.

As regards social variables, how healthcare interpreters are perceived is dependent, among other things, on the interpersonal relationships they have with service users and providers, which may affect not just the encounter but also the interpreter's position vis-à-vis the users' communities. The issue of interpersonal relationships is crucial when it comes to "non-professional interpreters" (Antonini et al. 2017), a category that can be divided in turn into two main sub-groups, namely *family interpreters*, i.e., patients' family members (including children, but also carers or friends) and *bilingual healthcare staff* such as nurses – also referred to as "dual role" interpreters.

Some studies have pointed out that professional and non-professional interpreters position themselves differently within the Trust-Control-Power triangle (Brisset et al. 2013). As a result, different types of non-professional interpreters may present different advantages and limitations. Dual-role interpreters like nurses, for instance, may elicit information that is crucial to clinical decision-making but also undermine patients' credibility. Family interpreters, instead, while tending to exert control over the patient's agenda, have privileged access to patient information and thus play a key role in ensuring information transfer (even after the encounter) and, more generally, patient care.

Variation in settings, quality requirements and analytical methods makes research findings on different types of interpreters extremely difficult to compare. Comparable data would be desirable in order to understand the distinctive impact that different types of interpreters have on the dynamics and outcomes of interpreted healthcare encounters, particularly in terms of the extent to which they meet the expectations of practitioners and other stakeholders in different specialties (e.g., emotional detachment in mental health vs. emotional support in oncology; see Hsieh 2016) or within the same specialty (e.g., with remote as opposed to on-site interpreting in therapy sessions; see Bot 2019).

References

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2019. *Healthcare Interpreting Explained*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315310978

Antonini, Rachele, Letizia Cirillo, Linda Rossato, and Ira Torresi (eds). 2017. *Non-Professional Interpreting and Translation in Institutional Settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.129

Bot, Hanneke. 2019. "Mental Health Interpreting: Challenges and Opportunities." In *Multicultural Health Translation, Interpreting and Communication*, ed. by Meng Ji, Mustapha Taibi, and Ineke H.M. Crezee, 205–216. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351000390-10

Bot, Hanneke, and Hans Verrept. 2013. "Role Issues in the Low Countries: Interpreting in Mental Healthcare in the Netherlands and Belgium." In *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape: Selected Papers from Critical Link 6*, ed. by Christina Schäffner, Krzysztof Kredens and Yvonne Fowler, 117–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.109.11bot

Brisset, Camille, Yves Leanza, and Karine Laforest. 2013. "Working with Interpreters in Health Care: A Systematic Review and Meta-ethnography of Qualitative Studies." *Patient Education and Counseling* 91: 131–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2012.11.008

Davidson, Brad. 2000. "The Interpreter as Institutional Gatekeeper: The Social-Linguistic Role of Interpreters in Spanish-English Medical Discourse." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4: 379–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00121

de Boe, Esther. 2019. "Remote Healthcare Interpreting: A Methodology to Investigate Quality." *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7 (1): 58–78.

Flores, Glenn. 2005. "The Impact of Medical Interpreter Services on the Quality of Health Care: A Systematic Review." *Medical Care Research and Review* 62 (3): 255–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558705275416

Hsieh, Elaine. 2007. "Interpreters as Co-diagnosticians: Overlapping Roles and Services between Providers and Interpreters." *Social Science & Medicine* 64: 924–937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.10.015

Hsieh, Elaine. 2016. *Bilingual Health Communication: Working with Interpreters in Cross-cultural Care*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315658308

Kaufert, Joseph M., and William W. Koolage. 1984. "Role Conflict among 'Culture Brokers': The Experience of Native Canadian Medical Interpreters." *Social Science & Medicine* 18: 283–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(84)90092-3

Krystallidou, Dimitra. 2014. "Gaze and Body Orientation as an Apparatus for Patient Inclusion into/Exclusion from a Patient-centred Framework of Communication." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 8 (3) : 399–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.972033

Leanza, Yvan. 2005. "Roles of Community Interpreters in Pediatrics as Seen by Interpreters, Physicians and Researchers." *Interpreting* 7: 167–192. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.7.2.03lea

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2014. "Epistemic Brokering in the Interpreter-Mediated Medical Visit: Negotiating 'Patient's Side' and 'Doctor's Side' Knowledge." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 47 (4): 426–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.958281

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London: Longman.

Further essential reading

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004a. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-Cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486616

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2004b. *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role. A Study of Conference, Court, and Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico and the United States*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.55

Ji, Meng, Mustapha Taibi, and Ineke H. M. Crezee (eds). 2019. *Multicultural Health Translation, Interpreting and Communication*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351000390

Nicodemus, Brenda, and Melanie Metzger. (eds). 2014. *Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Pöchhacker, Franz, and Miriam Shlesinger (eds). 2007. *Healthcare Interpreting. Discourse and Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.9

Indigenous peoples and translation

Valerie Henitiuk & Marc-Antoine Mahieu
Concordia University of Edmonton | INALCO Paris

While there is no globally accepted definition of Indigenous peoples, the term is generally used to identify those who were already there at first contact, whose descendants exist as distinct from the dominant population, and who may occupy a disadvantaged position owing to colonialism. In Canada, Indigenous refers to a wide range of First Nations peoples, as well as Métis and Inuit; in central and southern Africa, the term may encompass the Pygmy, the San, and the Xhosa; in Australasia, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and the Māori; or in Russia, various Siberian tribes such as the Khanty or the Koryak. A defining feature respecting global Indigeneity is diversity, especially of culture and language, as well as the growing assumption of a political positioning in the fight for social justice.

1. Unique challenges

Predominantly oral[2] and adapted to local cultures, Indigenous languages are often characterized by multiple dialects, little standardization, and (owing to language loss) few fluent speakers – all features posing particular challenges to translation. Structural inequities including a lack of formal education among Indigenous populations coupled with a scarcity of dictionaries and other linguistic tools have also not infrequently meant an imbalance of power[4] with non-Indigenous "experts" trained in Eurocentric[3] disciplines and techniques, not to mention interpretive approaches. Research can prove one-sided, with "native informants" being exploited to further academic careers or other agendas, and little thought given to how such activity can aid and directly further Indigenous aims, or to how knowledge keepers can be equal partners in research design. Further, the history, methods and problems related to translation within Indigenous communities can be seen to involve both physical and spiritual danger (Swann 2011).

Evangelism is behind much translation into Indigenous languages, and Catholic missionaries in particular have produced fundamental linguistic description, drawn upon by later translators. Nonetheless, the work of Bible translators (see Religious translation[1]) has led to charges of aggressive missionary activity impacting vulnera-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.ind1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

ble linguistic populations, even resulting in cultural genocide. The Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), for example, funds translation field work to produce Christian texts for Indigenous communities worldwide and has been criticized (Carcelen-Estrada 2010) for acting in complicity with resource extraction corporations, rather than producing materials for their intended use. Anthropological and ethnographic work has also long involved a focus on transcription and translation, seeking to capture cultural materials such as story and song, but at the risk of removing them from any meaningful context. Nonetheless, linguists have done important work in collaboration with native speakers, creating orthographies, grammars and other resources, often in a race against time to document languages at risk of extinction.

Translation into Indigenous languages, including the development of legal, medical and other specialized terminology, has been posited as a way to ensure their survival. In the other direction, however, translation can function as a threat. Some authors and poets concerned for the survival of minority[2] languages have argued (Krause 2013, Londoño 2016) that, by eliding their original, translation undermines the language's autonomy, rendering it again invisible as well as lessening the incentive to learn it. They also point out that not only is their targeted audience precisely the Indigenous, rather than non-Indigenous reader, but also that it is the Indigenous perspective that must be foregrounded. Post-colonial[1] theory has proven useful in underscoring how translation, ostensibly a means toward increased understanding, has instead been used to perpetuate hierarchies, especially the "supposed superiority of the colonizers" (Batchelor 2014: 246).

2. Interpreting

Community[1] interpreters perform vital, but often underpaid, under-resourced and under-appreciated work. Inherently problematic are cases where bilingual children are asked to interpret for their unilingual parents, or someone lacking proper training but who happens to speak a given language (or even only a related one) is brought in to help with such sensitive matters as explaining rights and procedures, attaining informed consent, or intervening in social work or asylum cases. Even experienced interpreters struggle with gaps between the Indigenous language and that of the court, for example; most speakers of the dominant language remain unaware of this gap, putting both the interpreter and the interpreted at a disadvantage. This has serious implications for human rights, safety, and dignity, and is all the more concerning when historically denigrated Indigenous languages are involved. Situations such as the migrant crisis at the US-Mexico border give rise to urgent calls for those able to interpret for speakers of Mayan languages or Zapotec, while the coronavirus pandemic has underscored the need to provide timely, accurate, and comprehensible medical information to various communities worldwide.

3. Colonialism and activism

Colonization throughout history provides examples of appropriation and resistance, with scholars arguing that conquest has been "the dominant approach to translation in the Western world" (Rafael 2015: 83). Translation and other forms of intercultural communication can be viewed as acts of violence serving political agendas (Shamma 2020). Impactful movements have arisen within activist translation circles, particularly in support of linguistic diversity, also expanding our understanding of translational paradigms and practices (Boéri & Maier 2010).

4. Process

Translating from one European language into another, for all its challenges, proceeds in a relatively straightforward way, finding equivalencies in dictionaries or through shared daily habits and interaction. With many Indigenous languages, very little is so straightforward. Common difficulties range from first having to produce a transcription from which to work; to determining the exact meaning of the text; to how best to render an oral storytelling performance; knowledge rights also play an important role (see also Religious texts and oral tradition[5]). Even gaining access to and maintaining regular communication with and among communities, often located in distant locales that are expensive to get to and from, and serviced by less-than-optimal internet connections, can pose significant problems.

5. Historical case study – The Eliot Bible

Among the first translations ever published in North America was the Eliot Indian Bible, in the Algonquian Wampanoag (Massachusett) language, brought out in 1663. As Brooks (2018) explains, the financially struggling Harvard College had begun raising funds specifically for the education of Amerindians. Its 1650 Charter promises to do all "that may conduce to the education of the English and Indian youth of this country", and an "Indian College" was the second building erected on its campus. The Harvard press inaugurated American literature with a series of bilingual English-Algonquian publications.

Of interest is the focus on not only language, but also translation and interpreting. The Indigenous students were expected to “attain the knowledge of other tongues and disperse their Indian tongue in the Collige” and, interestingly, at least one colonial student was denied admission for not having the required fluency in Algonquian (Brooks 2018: 85). Among the goals outlined in the university’s Charter is “the advancement of all good literature, arts, and sciences”. The necessarily complex process of adapting texts to appeal to new receptor cultures depends for its success on translators, known and unknown. Although attributed to the Puritan John Eliot, this Bible benefited from the work of Indigenous colleagues. Eliot writes to a benefactor in 1649: “I having yet but little skill in their language … must have some Indians, and it may be other help continually about me to try and examine Translations” (Brooks 2018: 87), and he was assisted by two Massachusetts Indian converts, Job Nesuton and John Sassamon.

Instances of “the temporal, semiotic, and [sometimes] intentional miscommunication” (Carcelen-Estrada 2010: 65) occurring when imperialist powers encounter Indigenous communities would have been present between the schoolmasters and their pupils. Further, we know that motives for translating holy texts have been many and various, including at times the exploitation of others through the destruction of native belief systems. Given the unequal power relationships involved – and one tragic result of this contact was the extinction of many tribes, along with their languages and stories – one cannot but wonder whether the work of Indigenous collaborators may have been exploited by colonizers more to subjugate their compatriots than to liberate them.

6. Contemporary case studies

One can look to the Canadian context for many recent examples of novel approaches to working with Indigenous languages. In 2018, novelist and playwright Tomson Highway teamed up with the Montreal Symphony to tour an opera titled *Chaakapesh*, based on his libretto written as a collaboration with artists across five linguistic groups: Cree, Innu, Inuktitut, French, and English. Tshaukuesh Elizabeth Penashue worked with Elizabeth Yeoman to produce in 2019 an English-language version of her diaries (composed in Innu-aimun, some passages having already been translated by others into English and French), which describe years of direct action to safeguard her people’s traditional lands in Labrador and Quebec. Inuvialuit, Dene and Cree playwright Reneltta Arluk describes her 2020 Cree-infused production of *Pawâkan Macbeth*, set in the 1870s in Treaty 6 territory (Alberta), as a “take over” play intended to offer Indigenous youth a fresh perspective on the Western canon. And the first Indigenous novel ever published in Canada has finally been released (Patsauq 2021) in rigorous French and English translations based on Markoosie Patsauq's 1969–70 Inuktitut manuscript.

Because translation can be understood as "the central act of European colonialism and imperialism in America" (Cheyfitz 1991: 104), readers and scholars need to locate ourselves, read critically, and recognize the meaningful mediation that occurs in any cultural or linguistic encounter. Patsauq submitted ᐆᒪᔪᕐᓯᐅᑎᒃ ᐅᓈᑐᐃᓐᓇᒧᑦ, ᒫᑯᓯᐅᑉ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᑐᐊᖕᒋᑦ (*Uumajursiutik unaatuinnamut, Maakusiup unikkaatuangit*, literally "one-who-looks-for-animals with-just-a-harpoon, Markoosie's good-length-stories") to a journal, whose editor encouraged him to produce an English version; that text, titled *Harpoon of the Hunter*, was then promptly released by McGill-Queen's University Press. By foregoing dependence on a translator, bilingual authors are theoretically able to retain control of their work, but other stakeholders are necessarily involved, and the act of self-translating is anything but unproblematic.[1] While the author of both *Uumajursiutik unaatuinnamut* and the "second original" in English is the same, these texts remain asymmetrical, because the dynamics of dominated/dominating language use are so different. Particularly in the case of minority languages, self-translations also confound the prevailing dichotomy whereby a single source text takes precedence over a supposedly more ephemeral target text, but the tables are turned where self-translation[1] from a minority into a majority language is concerned. Because subsequent translations are generally done relay[3]-style from the majority language, it is that version that becomes the stable text. As we see with the translations into many languages done indirectly from Patsauq's English adaptation, it clearly underwent this process – arguably to the detriment of not only his original story but also Inuktitut as a developing literary language.

There are significant challenges in translating both into Inuktitut and from Inuktitut into other languages. Literary domination in colonial and post-colonial contexts along with the role of gatekeepers reflect the asymmetry of this exchange. Patsauq's original story was heavily edited in a bid to craft something deemed accessible for the southern readership of the day, which was assumed to consist primarily of younger readers. Therefore, while this author has been all but ignored in histories of Canadian literature, he is referenced in various children's[1] literature resources. The language of the English adaptation is full of flourishes and over-dramatizations that are completely foreign to the Inuktitut text. In sharp contrast stands the stark original as written in Patsauq's mother tongue. It has been suggested that "just as land is appropriated by the Canadian state, so is the experience and imagination of aboriginal writing appropriated by non-aboriginals" (Hulan 2002: 74), or through any process whereby Indigenous authors are expected to rewrite for a mainstream readership.

---

1. Also of interest are translations of Ainu oral narratives (see, e.g., Sato-Rossberg 2011).

Our approach has been to respect Patsauq's style, vocabulary and pacing, even though features common to Inuktitut such as lexical repetition might be negatively received by non-Inuit readers. Translators of Indigenous languages have been advised to "leave clues to our compromises, signs of our unwillingness to compromise" (Wiget: n.d.), recognizing that Inuit literature "doesn't read like English Canadian literature. Inuit don't speak English like people in the South, and they don't write like people in the South" (Gedalof & Ipellie 1980: 10). This recent work done in collaboration with Patsauq seeks to counter fifty years of misconceptions, taking seriously the text's actual form and content, to avoid simply reproducing the colonizer-colonized relationship.

7. Conclusion

As Indigenous peoples worldwide gain political traction, long-standing practices in the translation and interpreting of their languages and cultural products become suspect. Autonomy and agency are now being demanded, with formerly dominant voices needing to make space for new approaches, identified by community members with an eye to their own needs and priorities. As has been noted, "[t]he quantity and quality of the textual flows and translation activity between and within the Indigenous worlds, and between the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous worlds is [sic] growing every year" (Martin 2005). This rapidly developing area in translation studies (TS) deserves fuller attention along with greater support for emerging scholars and practitioners, especially those from Indigenous communities.

References

Batchelor, Kathryn. 2014. "Postcolonial Issues in Translation: The African Context." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 246–58. Chichester: John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118613504.ch18

Boéri, Julie and Carol C. Maier (eds). 2010. *Compromiso social y traducción/interpretación—Translation/Interpreting and Social Activism.* Granada: ECOS.

Brooks, Lisa. 2018. "The Harvard Indian College Scholars and the Algonquin Origins of American Literature." In *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War*. 72–106. Princeton, NJ: Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1z27jbr.9

Carcelen-Estrada, Antonia. 2010. "Translation of the Bible into Huao Terero." In *Translation, Resistance, Activism*, ed. by Maria Tymoczko. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Cheyfitz, Eric. 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonialism from The Tempest to Tarzan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gedalof, Robin and Alootook Ipellie. 1980. *Paper Stays Put.* Edmonton: Hurtig.

Krause, Corinna. 2013. "'Why bother with the original?': Self-translation and Scottish Gaelic poetry." In *Self-Translation: Brokering originality in hybrid culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley, 127–40. London: Bloomsbury.

Londoño, Vanessa. 2016. "Why a Quechua Novelist Doesn't Want His Work Translated." *Americas Quarterly*, April 5th.

Martin, Ian. 2005. "Translation and Indigenous Languages." *Tusaaji* 4 (4).

Patsauq, Markoosie. 2021. ᐆᒪᔪᕐᓯᐅᑎᒃ ᐅᓈᑐᐃᓐᓇᒧᑦ/ *Uumajursiutik unaatuinnamut/Hunter with Harpoon/Chasseur au harpon*. Edited, translated and with a critical framing by Valerie Henitiuk and Marc-Antoine Mahieu. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1gm0090

Penashue, Tshaukuesh Elizabeth. 2019. *Nitinikiau Innusi: I Keep the Land Alive*, ed. by Elizabeth Yeoman. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Rafael, Vicente L. 2015. "Betraying Empire: Translation and the ideology of conquest." *Translation Studies* 8 (1): 82–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2014.928649

Sato-Rossberg, Nana. 2011. *Translating Culture—The Creative Translations of Ainu Chanted-Myths by Mashiho Chiri*. Sapporo, Japan: Sapporo do.

Shamma, Tarek. 2020. "Conquest." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, third edition, ed. by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. 101–5. London: Routledge.

Swann, Brian (ed.). 2011. *Born in the Blood: On Native American Translation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1df4gp3

Wiget, Andrew. n.d. *Personal correspondence, quoted in* Recovering the Word: Essays on Native American Literature, ed. by Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat, 1987, 247–54. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Further essential reading

Swann, Brian (ed.). 1992. *On the Translation of Native American Literatures*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Tedlock, Dennis. 1971. "On the Translation of Style in Oral Narrative." *The Journal of American Folklore*, 84 (331): 114–133. https://doi.org/10.2307/539739

Indirect translation

Hanna Pięta
NOVA University Lisbon

1. Introduction

When translation scholars talk about indirect translations, they are usually referring to translations of translations. The English terminology used to label this practice varies immensely. Designations in current use include compilative, double, eclectic, intermediate, mediated, pivot, relay[3], second-hand, secondary translation.

Some scholars understand indirect translation in a narrow sense: as a translation via a third, typically more well-known, language (e.g., Ringmar 2007, St. André 2019). In these narrow terms, an indirect translation is understood as being done in two steps: a first translation from language A into language B, and then a second translation by a different translator from language B into language C.

Others, however, define indirect translation more broadly (e.g., Gambier 1994, Assis Rosa et al. 2017). They recognize that the term is broad enough to include a great diversity of interlinguistic and intermodal translation processes. Possible examples of indirect translation subsets include:

- retranslation[1]: the translation of a text which has been translated into the same language at least once before
- back-translation: a translated document that is translated back into the source language
- support translation: when only isolated fragments of previous translations are used as a part of a research conducted by a translator
- the novelization of a film or video game that is itself based on a book: when a written text is translated into image and sound and from there again into a written text.

In this chapter the term is used in a narrow sense, unless indicated otherwise.

Indirect translation has been common throughout history (e.g., translations of the *Bible*, *I Ching*, *The Arabian Nights*) and continues to exist as a phenomenon worldwide, in various settings, platforms, modes and media. For example, streamed media not originally in English is generally first translated into an English template which is used to produce subtitles in other languages. In international news produc-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.ind2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

tion (see Journalism and translation[1]), media outlets often rewrite wire dispatches that already include translations. With the increase in the number of language combinations in multilingual institutions (e.g., the European Parliament), a system of relay languages is often used: documents are first translated into a major language (e.g., English, French, German) and then from that language into many others (see Institutional translation[2]). The same happens with neural Machine translation[1] engines (such as Google Translate), which rely on machine learning and hence the availability of large parallel data for training. Since such data are not available for most language pairs, present-day technologies often need to use pivoting approaches as a work-around to translate between languages with scarce resources for the development of language technology.

While the prevalence of indirect translation varies depending on the fields and settings, there is no evidence of reduced relevance across the board, at least in the foreseeable future. For example, globalization[1] often prompts situations where there is a sudden need to translate between language pairs for which there are not enough competent direct translators. This is when translation often goes indirect: translators translating specifically with a further translation in mind or from an already translated text.

This entry provides an overview of research on indirect translation. For an overview of indirect translation practice, see the entry on Relay translation. The focus here will be on written texts. Spoken texts are dealt with in the entry on Relay interpreting[1].

2. Terminological, theoretical and methodological challenges and developments

Indirect translation research has been characterized by terminological and conceptual confusion (at least in English), as well as by methodological constraints. Lately, efforts have been made to organize the metalanguage and to lay theoretical foundations. Assis Rosa et al. (2017: 117) identify a number of patterns in English-language terminology. They show that “indirect translation” has gained ground over competing terms, although “pivot” is still preferred in publications on audiovisual and machine translation, whereas “relay translation” is privileged in publications on Chinese translation traditions.

Relatively systematic typologies of indirect translation have been proposed (Assis Rosa et al. 2017; Washbourne 2013). While increasingly used, these typologies have also been criticized for adopting too complex a labelling system and for being inadequate for certain text types (e.g., St. André 2019, 470).

Some hypotheses about indirect literary translation have been developed and await systematic testing. Ringmar (2007: 11) has hypothesized that translators working indirectly take more liberties with the mediating text than they would with the ultimate source text. By contrast, Špirk (2014) posits that more changes are introduced during the transition from the original to the mediating text than in the passage from the mediating text to the final translation. In turn, Hadley's (2017) "concatenation effect hypothesis" claims that indirect translations tend to omit elements of the text that are identifiable with the source culture and also describe themselves as something other than translations.

The identification of the most plausible mediating texts and languages is one of the trickiest elements of studying indirect translation. Challenges hindering easy identification typically derive from the fact that there is a plethora of indirect translation situations and that indirectness is often unacknowledged or explicitly hidden. This lack of (explicit) acknowledgement it often due to the controversial status of this practice, although attitudes towards it vary across time and settings. As a result, on many occasions the information on the mediating languages and texts is unavailable or unreliable (Ivaska 2019). Diachronic reconstructions of the origin of specific translations often prove to be merely probabilistic.

Some methodological guidelines have been developed with regard to the indirect translation of literature (Assis Rosa et al. 2017; Ringmar 2007). It remains to be seen to what extent these can be adapted to other translation domains. These recommendations boil down to a combination of two approaches: analyzing and comparing the texts involved (ultimate source – mediating – ultimate target text) and extracting information from supplementary material (archival documents, bibliographies, databases). The first approach has recently yielded particularly promising insights, tapping into advances from forensic linguistics and genetic criticism (e.g., using technologies developed in order to detect plagiarism (cf. Marin-Lacarta 2017); putting an indirect translation through computational source language detection (cf. Ivaska 2019). One noteworthy methodological conclusion seems to be that, irrespective of the translation domain, product-oriented methods (e.g., frame analysis, discourse analysis, corpus-based studies, recourse to stylometry) have so far proved insufficient and need to be combined with process- and/or participant-oriented approaches (e.g., eye-tracking, keystroke logging, interviews, non-participant observations).

3. Past and current topics and contributions

For many years indirect translation has been marginalized by translator trainers, practitioners and researchers. This is partly because many traditions of translation reflection and translator education have long been anchored in models that prioritize translating from the original. Moreover, mainstream translation studies (TS) do not typically deal with situations where translation occurs between the so-called languages of low diffusion, which are the very situations where indirect translation is most common (see Minority languages and translation[2]). This may also explain why systematic studies on indirect translation are a recent development.

For quite some time now, most studies have adopted a historical approach that rarely looks beyond the twentieth century. Traditionally, the emphasis has been on a small range of language pairs and geographic areas (mostly in Asia, Europe and South America), one medium (the printed book) and one text type (literature). Much has been said and written about the negative consequences of indirect translation, adding to the common perception that the practice is a threat to:

- translation quality[1] (the reasoning is that mistakes in the pivot versions are necessarily replicated in further translations)
- the jobs and ethics of translators[5] (direct translation between less-known languages tends to be more costly than indirect translation via a more popular language, for which there are more translators available; translating from a major pivot language may therefore mean taking translation work away from people who are already marginalized because of the minor language they use)
- the balance between languages and cultures (with English acting as a main pivot language worldwide there is a danger of economic, cultural and epistemological homogenization, whereby consumer preferences are anglicized and English mediating is preferred to direct translation from more peripheral languages).

However, in recent years indirect translation research has experienced a wave of changes. It is going digital and global: there is an increasing number of studies focusing on digital domains and using digital technologies to identify and study indirect translation (e.g., Ivaska 2019; Oziemblewska and Szarkowska 2020). The range of examined domains, regions and language combinations is clearly expanding (see, for example, van Rooyen 2018 on news translation in South Africa). Most studies deal with translation situations where English is the main pivot language, but increasing attention is being paid to regional pivot languages (Japanese in East Asia, Portuguese in Lusophone Africa, etc.).

Dedicated studies are starting to shift the focus to the advantages of this practice, highlighting its potential as an empowering aid that allows speakers of low-diffusion languages to access important information and to be heard on the global stage, or as a pedagogical resource that can help teachers make the most of linguistic diversity in translation classrooms (Torres Simón et al. 2021; Van Rooyen 2018). High-quality indirect translation might help in realizing global aspirations of sustainable development, where the same access to opportunities exists, independent of the language spoken.

Although still peripheral to TS, research on indirect translation has already produced insights that are relevant to the discipline as a whole. For instance, while foregrounding the intricate threefold nature of many translation processes (source-mediating-ultimate target text), research on indirect translation makes us rethink some of the foundational concepts, such as equivalence[3], original and translation[4]. Since studies of indirect translation ask questions about the process of text production, as well as the ethical and technological implications of power struggles among languages and cultures, these studies are starting to open up useful entry points for interdisciplinary dialogues with other fields of inquiry interested in these issues. These studies can also add new perspectives to ongoing debates about inaccessibility, inequality, and other global concerns that hinder sustainable growth and are thus of keen interest to scientific communities, governments, companies, and society at large.

At the same time, the need to train future translators to translate from a translation and with a further translation in mind has been recognized; different teaching and training approaches are beginning to be explored and tools and aids for translators are starting to be developed (Torres Simón et al. 2021; Oziemblewska and Szarkowska 2020). Researchers are no longer only describing and analyzing how people in the past translated indirectly. They are also developing research-informed recommendations on how to produce high-quality indirect translation in the years to come.

All these different aspects point to the diminishing marginality of indirect translation practice. They also indicate that the issue of indirect translation is a timely one for translation research and for training and language technology providers.

4. Future directions

Research on indirect translation has increased significantly over the last few years. Nevertheless, the potential of indirect translation as an object of inquiry has remained largely untapped. There are still many questions to be asked and answered, although some of these answers are already within view. Below is a snapshot of the pressing questions with which ongoing research on indirect translation is engaging:

- how exactly are indirect translations different from direct translations, for example in terms of their linguistic make-up?
- are there core features of indirect translation that are common to various translation domains (e.g., audiovisual, literary, machine translation; interpreting; localization)?

- what specific competences and technologies are needed to translate efficiently from a translation or with a further translation in mind?
- how exactly can we train human translators and machine translation systems to produce indirect translations of the highest quality possible?

A further question is that of the future of broadly defined indirect translation (see Section 1) as an autonomous concept. After all, there is inevitably some kind of mediation (Chesterman 2006), and therefore – one could argue – a degree of indirectness, in all translation processes. This reasoning has already led some researchers to question the existence and sustainability of both direct and indirect translations as useful, self-contained notions, and to suggest that this binarism imposes an overly simplistic view of an extremely complex reality. For example, even if a text is translated directly, a pre-existing version (in the same or a different language) may have triggered the choice to commission a translation in the first place. Or a reviser could have used previous versions when finalizing the translation for the client. Therefore, while the term "indirect translation" is increasingly popular in scholarly jargon, and while the multifaced practice of indirect translation seems to be here to stay, it remains to be seen whether we can say the same about the future of broadly defined indirect translation as a theoretical notion.

References

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. "Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 113–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2017.1285247

Chesterman, Andrew. 2006. "Interpreting the meaning of translation." *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 19: 3–11.

Gambier, Yves. 1994. "La retraduction, retour et détour." *Meta* 39 (3): 413–417. https://doi.org/10.7202/002799ar

Hadley, James. 2017. "Indirect translation and discursive identity: Proposing the concatenation effect hypothesis." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 183–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2016.1273794

Ivaska, Laura. 2019. "Distinguishing translations from non-translations and identifying (in)direct translations' source languages." In *Proceedings of the research data and humanities (RDHUM) 2019 conference*, ed. by Jarmo Harri Jantunen, Sisko Brunni, Niina Kunnas, Santeri Palviainen and Katja Västi, 125–138. Oulu: University of Oulu.

Oziemblewska, Magdalena, and Agnieszka Szarkowska. 2020. "The quality of templates in subtitling. A survey on current market practices and changing subtitler competences." *Perspectives*. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1791919

Ringmar, Martin. 2007. "Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations." *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*, ed. by Francis Mus. Leuven: CETRA. http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/ringmar.pdf.

Špirk, Jaroslav. 2014. *Censorship, Indirect Translation and Non-translation: The (Fateful) Adventures of Czech Literature in 20th-century Portugal*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

St. André, James. 2019. Relay. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3rd ed., ed. by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 470–373. London: Routledge.

Torres Simón, Ester, Hanna Pięta, Rita Bueno Maia, and Catarina Xavier. 2021. "Indirect translation in translator training: Taking stock and looking ahead." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 15(2): 260–281.

Van Rooyen, Marlie. 2018. "Investigating translation flows: community radio news in South Africa." *Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (2): 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2018.19.2.7

Washbourne, Kelly. 2013. "Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation." *Meta* 58 (3): 607. https://doi.org/10.7202/1025054ar

Further essential reading

Ivaska, Laura. 2020. *Mixed-Method Approach to Indirect Translation: A Case Study of Finnish Translations of Modern Greek Prose 1952-2004*. Turku: Annales Universitatis Turkuensis.

Pięta, Hanna, Laura Ivaska, and Yves Gambier (eds). Forthcoming. *What can indirect translation research do for Translation Studies?* Special Issue of *Target*.

International business and translation

Rebecca Piekkari & Susanne Tietze
Aalto University | Sheffield Hallam University

1. Introduction

International Business (IB) is an interdisciplinary field, which builds on economics, strategy, sociology, psychology, economic geography and cross-cultural studies. IB scholars typically study areas such as activities, strategies and structures of multinational corporations; interactions between multinationals and other actors, institutions and markets; cross-border activities of firms; the effects of the international environment on firms as well as how firms grow and expand internationally through different operation modes (e.g., strategic alliances, mergers and acquisitions, foreign direct investments). What unites these research areas is a focus on international phenomena that cross borders, often also cultural and language borders.

Although "acts of translation" form a central element of an incalculable number of cross-border exchange processes" (Holden and Michailova 2014: 907), mainstream IB research still has an under-developed link with translation studies (TS). IB scholars typically associate translation with interlingual translation only and the technicalities of back translating research instruments in cross-cultural and comparative research (Chidlow, Plakoyiannaki, & Welch 2014; Holden & Michailova 2014; Usunier 2011). When studying e.g., the move of organizational practices such as total quality management or talent management or knowledge flows across borders that also involve shifts in meaning, IB researchers have tended to employ concepts of "transfer" or "recontextualization" rather than translation. Transfer[1] is commonly used when referring to headquarters of a multinational corporation exporting its organizational practices from the home country to foreign subsidiaries in host countries. The concept of recontextualization in turn draws on semiotics[1] to examine various meanings that social actors assign to organizational practices and symbols when they move to a new cultural context (Brannen 2004). Since imported management models and organizational practices "do not speak for themselves" but "require articulation and interpretation" (Westney and Piekkari 2020: 61), the notion of translation has considerable potential in IB research.

In this entry, we argue that the integration of translation into the intellectual trajectory of IB is currently gaining momentum (e.g., Tietze and Piekkari 2020;

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.int6
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

Westney & Piekkari 2020). A sub-stream in IB, commonly referred to as language sensitive research, has emerged, establishing language plurality and its consequences as a central area of study (Brannen, Piekkari, & Tietze 2014). Scholars within this stream have started to pose the following question: If language plurality exists and the use of English as a lingua franca[4] is not a universal solution to language plurality, is translation the inevitable global communicative resource? Recent research has begun to use TS as a source of inspiration and innovation (Gutierrez-Huerter O, Moon, Gold, & Chapple 2019; Holden & Michailova 2014; Westney & Piekkari 2020). Translation has also been applied reflexively to deepen our understanding of cross-border language research, both qualitative (Xian 2008) and quantitative (Chidlow et al. 2014; Usunier 2011). This is not to say that there was no prior research on the role of language plurality within international business preceding the contemporary development. However, the early studies focused more strongly on methodological considerations in cross-national research and cross-cultural management rather than the significance of language plurality for the strategy and inner workings of the multinational corporation.

2. Increasing awareness of the potential of translation studies for IB scholarship

In order to understand the contemporary use of translation in IB scholarship, it is necessary to briefly sketch out the development of the language-sensitive research stream. The advances of this stream have been documented in three reviews which summarize the field's take on language plurality: Karhunen, Louhiala-Salminen, Kankaanranta and Piekkari (2018) identify the approach of language as social practice as the most promising trajectory of how language plurality is enacted in multilingual environments. Tenzer, Terjesen and Harzing (2017) accept the "transformative power of translation" (Brannen, Piekkari, & Tietze 2014: 501) and encourage researchers to transcend disciplinary boundaries and turn to TS. Tietze and Piekkari (2020) capture the momentum of this field as being based on three significant junctures of development (language as sideshow, late 1980s to 2010; gaining momentum 2011 to 2014 and from 2015 onwards into the future). These authors see translation as a way to break away from the dominance of English as the pre-given language of knowledge production in IB and therefore as a major concept for future research.

The integration of translation into IB research is seen as an "important intellectual shift" (Tietze & Piekkari 2020: 187) to address some of the hidden key processes which underpin international business operations. As Barner-Rasmussen and Aarnio (2011: 293) put it, "[s]omewhere in between, products, systems, plans, visions, strategies, budgets and contracts… are translated. Which aspects are picked out for translation, by whom, how faithfully the translations are conducted, at what cost, and to which standard of quality, we do not know". Since then, language-sensitive IB research has woken up to the validity of this statement and systematically focused its inquiry upon translation phenomena in empirical settings. Recent IB research has also incorporated some of the vocabulary taken from TS such as indirect[5] and direct translation (Westney & Piekkari 2020) as well as equivalence[3], ambiguity and cultural interference (Holden & Michailova 2014) into its conceptual repertoire.

An important contribution to contemporary development was made by Janssens, Lambert and Steyaert (2004: 415) who advocated "an interdisciplinary move to translation studies" to understand the way in which international companies approach language diversity. They proposed "three metaphorical perspectives each with a different conception of translation and language": mechanistic, cultural and political translation strategy (Janssens et al. 2004: 414). This publication remains influential as it was an early piece that demonstrated the usability of translation within IB discourse for example by referring to the work by translation scholars (e.g., Venuti). Thus, this publication marks the beginnings of awareness within IB scholarship of the role that translation could play to explain strategic phenomena in internationalizing firms.

While Janssens et al. (2004) remained for some years the only reference engaging with both IB and TS, an increasing number of IB scholars have now followed suit. In contemporary research, there is an on-going conversation about collective translation behaviour (Ciuk, James, and Śliwa 2019; Piekkari et al. 2013) as well as the agency of individual translators (Tietze, Tansley, & Helienek 2017), including their political translation behaviour (Logemann and Piekkari 2015) in international firms. IB researchers have also incorporated insights from TS to shed light on the move of organizational practices in and around multinational corporations (Outila et al. 2020; Westney & Piekkari 2020). These authors describe the collective sense-making of practices and meanings that have been imported from headquarters to foreign subsidiaries that are located in very different institutional, cultural, political and linguistic contexts. Holden and Michailova (2014: 907) further "problematize the translation of management terms and concepts across languages" and highlight the importance of embedding the translation process both historically and culturally. Piekkari, Tietze and Koskinen (2019) develop a conceptual matrix which explains the relationship between interlingual translation and metaphorical translation (i.e., sense-making processes) in multilingual settings. Together, these contributions unravel the nature of mundane translation work, the identity of the translators and the direction of translation flows and processes that take place in multilingual contexts.

Thus, contemporary language-sensitive IB research has embraced the notion of translation and is now using it rather comfortably as part of its key vocabulary and thinking. Based on an analysis of a management text, Holden and Michailova (2014) advocate a wider view of translation that also covers the historical and cultural embeddedness of translations, translation processes and the translators themselves. They invite IB scholars to move beyond the “microscopic concept of translation in IB research” (906) that “detaches language from its sociocultural context” (909) to understanding translation “as cross-border interplay of entire terrains of corporate contexts and experience linking multiple mental and social frames of reference” (Holden & Michailova 2014: 906). Concomitant with the increasing popularity of translation in conceptual and empirical studies, the field is starting to engage with translation-related questions of epistemology and methodology in cross-language research (Chidlow et al. 2014; Tietze 2018; Xian 2008). These publications challenge the equivalence paradigm between languages, denying that “translation is the quest for identical meanings” (Chidlow et al. 2014: 563) and problematizing whether such equivalence actually exists (Tietze 2018). These authors argue for making translation central in all cross-language research.

3. Conclusion

For a considerable period of time, IB was “translation-blind” and did not seriously engage with the notion of translation beyond concerns for back translation in cross-cultural and comparative empirical research. Through the establishment and influence of a sub-field titled language-sensitive IB research, language plurality became a legitimate phenomenon of study and translation a significant part of exploring cross-border exchanges (Tenzer et al. 2017; Tietze & Piekkari 2020). Consequently, more specific questions arose about the role of translation in mediating language plurality as well as the use of English as a global *Lingua franca*[5]. This dawning awareness and interest has recently materialized into a fleet of empirical studies and conceptual papers as well as a vivid conversation about language-related methodological and philosophical questions (cf. Tietze 2021).

Thus, in the main, empirical studies in IB favour the view of translation as an enacted social practice (Karhunen et al., 2018) that situates the agency (see Agents of translation[2]) of individual and collective translators within their relevant socio-political and historical contexts. IB researchers have also been inspired by a micropolitical perspective on language plurality and translation that allows to identify language hierarchies and shadow structures in multilingual organizations as well as to redefine the boundaries between privileged and disadvantaged groups (Piekkari & Tietze 2014). However, the reception and appropriation of translation within IB research is rather recent and the conceptual and theoretical work still in its infancy. Therefore, it is difficult to predict with certainty which of the contemporary approaches such as Machine translation[1] will solidify into trends or avenues of exploration (e.g., Piekkari et al. 2019). Finally, we firmly believe that the notion of translation offers a means to challenge orthodox IB discourses which have taken the use of English as a universal language for granted.

References

Barner-Rasmussen, Wilhelm, and Christoffer Aarnio. 2011. "Shifting the Faultlines of Language: A Quantitative Functional-Level Exploration of Language Use in MNC Subsidiaries." *Journal of World Business* 46 (3): 288–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2010.07.006

Brannen, Mary Yoko, Rebecca Piekkari, and Susanne Tietze. 2014. "The Multifaceted Role of Language in International Business: Unpacking the Forms, Functions and Features of a Critical Challenge to MNC Theory and Performance." *Journal of International Business Studies* 45 (5): 495–507. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.24

Brannen, Mary Yoko. 2004. "When Mickey Loses Face: Recontextualization, Semantic Fit, and the Semiotics of Foreignness." *Academy of Management Review* 29 (4): 593–616. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.14497613

Chidlow, Agnieszka, Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki, and Catherine Welch. 2014. "Translation in Cross-Language International Business Research: Beyond Equivalence." *Journal of International Business Studies* 45 (5): 562–582. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.67

Ciuk, Sylwia, Philip James, and Martyna Śliwa. 2019. "The Micropolitical Dynamics of Interlingual Translation Processes in an MNC Subsidiary." *British Journal of Management* 30 (4): 926–942. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12323

Gutierrez-Huerter O, Gabriela, Jeremy Moon, Stefan Gold, and Wendy Chapple. 2019. "Micro-Processes of Translation in the Transfer of Practices from MNE Headquarters to Foreign Subsidiaries: The Role of Subsidiary Translation." *Journal of International Business Studies* 51 (3): 389–413. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-019-00234-8

Holden, Nigel J., and Snejina Michailova. 2014. "A More Expansive Perspective on Translation in IB Research: Insights from the Russian Handbook of Knowledge Management." *Journal of International Business Studies* 45 (7): 906–918. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.10

Janssens, Maddy, José Lambert, and Chris Steyaert. 2004. "Developing Language Strategies for International Companies: The Contribution of Translation Studies." *Journal of World Business* 39 (4): 414–430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2004.08.006

Karhunen, Päivi, Leena Louhiala-Salminen, Anne Kankaanranta, and Rebecca Piekkari. 2018. "Let's Talk about Language: A Review of Language-Sensitive Research in International Management." *Journal of Management Studies* 55 (6): 980–1013. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12354

Logemann, Minna, and Rebecca Piekkari. 2015. "Localize or Local Lies? The Power of Language and Translation in the Multinational Corporation." *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 11 (1): 30–53. https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-02-2014-0011

Outila, Virpi, Rebecca Piekkari, Irina Mihailova, and Jo Angouri. 2020. "'Trust But Verify': How Middle Managers in a Multinational Corporation Translate an Imported Management Concept." *Organization Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620934065

Piekkari, Rebecca, Denice E. Welch, Lawrence S. Welch, Jukka-Pekka Peltonen, and Tiina Vesa. 2013. "Translation Behaviour: An Exploratory Study within a Service Multinational." *International Business Review* 22 (5): 771–783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2012.12.004

Piekkari, Rebecca, and Susanne Tietze. 2014. "Micropolitical Behavior in the Multinational Enterprise: A Language Perspective". In *Multinational Enterprises, Markets and Institutional Diversity: Progress in International Business*, ed. by Alain Verbeke, Robert Van Tulder, and Sarianna Lundan, 259–277. Bingley: Emerald. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1745-886220140000009010

Piekkari, Rebecca, Susanne Tietze, and Kaisa Koskinen. 2019. "Metaphorical and Interlingual Translation in Moving Organizational Practices across Languages." *Organization Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619885415

Tenzer, Helene, Siri Terjesen, and Anne-Wil Harzing. 2017. "Language in International Business Research: A Review and Agenda for Future Research." *Management International Review* 57 (6): 815–854. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-017-0319-x

Tietze, Susanne. 2018. "Multilingual Research, Monolingual Publications: Management Scholarship in English only?" *European Journal of International Management* 12 (1–2): 28–45.

Tietze, Susanne. 2021. "New Perspectives and Approaches to Language-based Research". In *Managing Multilingual Workplaces: Methodological, Empirical and Pedagogic Perspectives*, ed. by Sierk Horn, Philippe Lecomte, and Susanne Tietze. General introduction. London: Routledge.

Tietze, Susanne, and Rebecca Piekkari. 2020. "Languages and Cross-Cultural management." In *SAGE Handbook of Contemporary Cross-Cultural Management*, ed. by Betina Szkudlarek, Joyce S. Osland, Dan V. Caprar, and Laurence Romani, 181–195. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714340.n15

Tietze, Susanne, Carole Tansley, and Emil Helienek. 2017. "The Translator as Agent in Management Knowledge Transfer." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 17 (1): 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595817701509

Usunier, Jean-Claude. 2011. "Language as a Resource to Assess Cross-Cultural Equivalence in Quantitative Management Research." *Journal of World Business*, 46 (3): 314–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2010.07.002

Westney, D. Eleanor, and Rebecca Piekkari. 2020. "Reversing the Translation Flow: Moving Organizational Practices from Japan to the U.S." *Journal of Management Studies* 57 (1): 57–86. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12435

Xian, Huiping. 2008. "Lost in Translation? Language, Culture and the Roles of Translator in Cross-Cultural Management Research." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 3 (3): 231–245. https://doi.org/10.1108/17465640810920304

Intersemiotic translation

Elin Sütiste
University of Tartu

1. Definition

The term “intersemiotic translation” refers to translation between different sign systems, as in the case of a verbal rendition of a pictorial message or a screen adaptation① of a novel. As such, it overlaps to a considerable extent with notions like “intermedial translation”, “transposition”, or “adaptation”, while the choice of a particular term is often dictated by one’s disciplinary background (intermedial studies, adaptation studies, transfer① studies, interarts studies, semiotics① of translation, etc.). For instance, speaking of ekphrasis, Claus Clüver points out that “particular forms of ekphrasis amount to intermedial or intersemiotic transposition, the transformation of a text into a self-sufficient text in a different medium or sign system” (Clüver 2007: 24). Nicola Dusi defines intermediality as “configurations which have to do with a *crossing of borders between media*” (Dusi 2015: 122), and regards intermediality in this perspective as a synonym of intersemiotic translation.

Although there is no such separate discipline as intersemiotic translation studies, there is growing recognition of the semiotic nature of the issues involved in crossing sign system or media borders, which are common to various fields studying different forms of transfer.

2. Background of the term

The term “intersemiotic translation” originates with Roman Jakobson’s paper “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, published in 1959. Jakobson (1886–1982), a major figure in the 20th century structural linguistics and literary studies, was convinced of the semiotic nature of communication. In the abovementioned paper, he distinguished three ways of interpreting a verbal sign: intralingual translation or rewording (interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language), interlingual translation or translation proper (interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language), and intersemiotic translation or transmutation (interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems, for

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.int7
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

example when rendering a poem into a painting or into a piece of music) (Jakobson 1966[1959]: 233).

While in the 1950s Jakobson's idea that translation can be regarded wider than occurring just between languages was quite revolutionary and remained for a long time a little-explored potential in translation studies (TS), in the recent decades (since 1990s, but especially in the 21st century), the understanding that it is indeed possible to talk about a form of translation between radically different kinds of sign systems has grown prominently.

In addition to the general semiotic logic that regards translation as a universal cultural meaning-generation process, of which interlingual translation presents one subtype, another argument in favor of including also nonverbal kinds of translation in the general paradigm of translation, is more pragmatic and proceeds from the fact that we are witnessing a rising trend of combining various media in overall communication and hence also translation. Henrik Gottlieb, among others, has advocated for a wider notion of translation "in order to accommodate not only the nonverbal channels present in much modern communication, but also the types of communication not involving language in a traditional sense" (Gottlieb 2008: 39–40).

3. Reasoning behind the concept of intersemiotic translation

The concept of intersemiotic translation stems from the acknowledgment that there exists a multitude of communication systems, of which human verbal language is but one, and that transfer of meaning – essentially, translation – can and does take place between different kinds of sign systems. At the same time, it is also clear that the extent and detail in which such translations are possible vary considerably, depending on the aims and functions of transfer as well as sign systems, messages, participants and contexts involved.

Although historically translation has been predominantly regarded as a matter pertaining to human verbal language, from the viewpoint of semiotics as a study of meaning-making systems and processes throughout the living world, it is only natural to observe verbal language against the background of other communicative systems. Therefore, also Jakobson's definition of intersemiotic translation as "interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems" has been criticized as being too linguo-centric and his tripartite division has on several occasions been revised by other scholars. Gideon Toury (1986: 1113–1114) rearranged Jakobson's typology by de-centralizing verbal language and distinguishing, first, between intra- and intersemiotic translation (for instance, between verbal language and music), and secondly, dividing intrasemiotic translation further into intrasystemic (such as translating within one natural language, e.g., rewording in French) and intersystemic translation (such as between different languages, e.g., between French and Russian). A more radical revision has been proposed by Susan Petrilli (2003), according to whom "translation does not only concern the human world, anthroposemiosis, but rather is a constitutive modality of semiosis, or more exactly, of biosemiosis" (Petrilli 2003: 17) and therefore, translative processes can be said to pervade the entire living world, the biosphere. Thus, in Petrilli's typology, translative processes range from intersemiosic processes in biosemiosphere to diamesic, diaphasic, and diglossic translation within one natural language (Petrilli 2003: 19–20).

In the field of semiotics, the two most productive approaches to contribute to the development of the concept of intersemiotic translation have been those of interpretative semiotics the main representative of which is American pragmatist philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914), and cultural semiotics, represented foremost by Juri Lotman (1922–1993).

Peirce's concept of sign and especially his notion of interpretant have been very productive in contributing to the development of semiotics of translation and specifically also the concept of intersemiotic translation. In Peirce's semiotics, alongside the representamen and the object, the interpretant is one of the three components constituting a sign. The representamen is that perceivable (or imaginable) aspect of a sign which represents the object, and the interpretant is the effect that the sign elicits in the subject interpreting it. In other words, the interpretant is the relationship that is created in the subject's mind between the representamen and the object – essentially, the meaning of the sign.

Jakobson was one of the first linguists to study Peirce and in the development of his ideas on translation, the Peircean notion of interpretant played an important role: "For us, both as linguists and as ordinary word-users, the meaning of any linguistic sign is its translation into some further, alternative sign, especially a sign "in which it is more fully developed", as Peirce, the deepest inquirer into the essence of signs, insistently stated." (Jakobson 1966[1959]: 232–233). Since for Peirce the interpretant to which a sign gives rise in the interpreting process need not be limited to verbal language but can instead be of any kind, the process of interpretation (*resp.* translation) can naturally cross over the borders of a single sign system.

Another scholar whose works provide a general and comprehensive ground for viewing intersemiotic translation as a legitimate and natural part of cultural processes is Juri Lotman. Elaborating his understanding of the workings of culture, Lotman became convinced that "a minimally functioning semiotic structure consists of not one artificially isolated language or text in that language, but of a parallel pair of mutually untranslatable languages which are, however, connected by a "pulley", which is translation. A dual structure like this is the minimal nucleus for generating new messages and it is also the minimal unit of a semiotic object such as culture" (Lotman 2000[1990]: 2). By "mutually untranslatable languages", Lotman means incommensurable semiotic systems, for instance, a discrete system like verbal language and a continuous system like abstract art. Between elements of such radically different systems, there can be no one-to-one correspondence, already because the continuous system does not allow for similar segmentation into elements as the discrete system. Despite the seemingly unsurmountable difficulties ("untranslatability") involved, the exchange of information does take place between even principally different sign systems in the form of conventional, "approximate equivalences determined by the cultural-psychological and semiotic context common to both systems" (Lotman 2000[1990]: 37). According to Lotman, such approximate translation is one of the most important features of creative thinking and constitutes a precondition for the workings of culture (Lotman 2000[1990]: 37). Because of the "dual-system" workings characteristic of the human brain, we have the tendency to complement a verbal text with some (mental) images, and vice versa – when faced with an image, we "translate" it to ourselves verbally (even if only in inner speech). Thinking along somewhat similar lines, Agata Holobut has proposed to treat the concept of intersemiotic translation as an "interpretive device, which reveals implicit structural correspondences between different works of art" (Holobut 2013: 39).

4. Criticism of the term

Not all scholars agree that the notion of translation could be expanded to include also intersemiotic transfer. Among others, Umberto Eco has suggested that Jakobson's three types of translations are in fact varieties of interpretation. Eco warns against the temptation "to identify the totality of semiosis with a continuous process of translation; in other words, to identify the concept of translation with that of interpretation" (Eco 2001: 68). He recommends avoiding the identification of the concepts of translation and interpretation, since "the universe of interpretations is vaster than that of translation proper" (Eco 2001: 73).

More recently this issue has been addressed by Brian Mossop (2019) who has spelled out the key problem in defining intersemiotic transposition as translation: translations (in the ordinary sense) are most of the time invariance-oriented, while intersemiotic transpositions typically exhibit a high degree of variance. He suggests "that some set of very clear (even if loosened) criteria are needed if intersemiotic transposition is to be seen as a kind of invariance-oriented translating" and warns against "latching onto superficial similarities between interlingual and intersemiotic work, especially transpositions between language and visual media. [...] Semioticians and adaptation theorists may wish to focus on the similarities, but for the purposes of Translation Studies, the differences are far too great" (Mossop 2019: 90).

The concern about equating translation and interpretation or translation and intersemiotic transposition is understandable, as indeed there are considerable differences involved in the varieties of transfer, whether interlingual, intersemiotic or of some other kind. Therefore, in addition to the similarities with “translation proper” (interlingual translation), the study of intersemiotic translation should not overlook the differences.

5. Study and analysis of intersemiotic translation

While the pervasiveness and importance of intersemiotic translation is now being recognized and theorized quite widely in semiotics, TS and several other adjoining disciplines, the question how to practically analyze such phenomena is yet far from unanimous solution. Some scholars have made use of models borrowed from more established fields like literary studies or verbal language-oriented TS, some others have proposed their own models based on semiotics.

Among the first scholars to tackle the issue of translation between different sign systems under the name of “intersemiotic transposition” has been interarts specialist Claus Clüver. Clüver relies largely on literary studies, emphasizing that considerations such as “the function the translation is to serve” and “the context in which it will appear” apply similarly to interlingual as well as to intersemiotic translation (Clüver 1989: 61). He explains that in transposing of a painting into a verbal text it is necessary to draw “on the codes and conventions of a literary (and not merely a linguistic) system” that would functionally correspond to the pictorial system of said painting (Clüver 1989: 61).

Nicola Dusi points out that in analyzing intersemiotic translation, the emphasis should be on the invariant aspect or “intertextual links of *continuity and equivalence*” (2015: 123): “Intersemiotic translations or transpositions from novel to film are possible provided that source text and target text are analysed in terms of *what is not a variation*” (Dusi 2015: 122).

Daniella Aguiar and Joao Queiroz (2009) propose their own conceptual framework to intersemiotic phenomena, one that proceeds from Peirce’s model of sign process and foregrounds hierarchical properties and aspects of texts. They emphasize that “The main methodological difficulty [in studying intersemiotic translation] is related to the comparison between radically different semiotic systems. […] It seems theoretically natural to describe an interlinguistic translation by establishing direct correlations between comparable semiotic layers of organization – morphological-morphological, phonetic-phonetic, rhythmic-rhythmic […]. However, an intersemiotic translation does not exhibit the same principle of corresponding layers.” (Aguiar & Queiroz 2009: 2). They go on to explain that intersemiotic translation “operates on different 'description levels', selecting relevant aspects from the source and recreating them into the target [...]. In this way, certain layers have their relevant properties selected and translated into new materials and processes. For example, from literature to dance, linguistic layers (rhythmic, prosodic, syntactic, or psychological ambience) are translated into dynamic of movement, organization of space, light design, costumes, scenography, etc. Notably, a 'mapping of correlations' cannot be easily established between layers of different nature (different semiotic systems)" (Aguiar & Queiroz 2009: 3).

Peeter Torop has suggested that semiotics should be able to provide analytical methodology that would be applicable to all kinds of translation, which means that such methodology has to be adjustable to texts in different sign systems. Torop has proposed his own concept of total translation with the accompanying taxonomy of translation types as one such possibility (Torop 2000). In Torop's approach, culture is regarded as an ongoing process of translation, which includes four main types of textual communication: (1) textual translation where whole texts are translated into other whole texts; (2) metatextual translation where whole texts are translated in the form of various metatexts, such as annotations, reviews, parodies, etc. that supplement textual translations and integrate the latter with the receiving culture; (3) intextual and intertextual translation where texts or text groups are translated into text units; (4) extratextual translation where texts made of one substance (for instance, verbal) are translated into texts made of some other substance (for example, audiovisual) (Torop 2000: 72). The term "extratextual translation" largely overlaps with Jakobson's term "intersemiotic translation", but in Torop's view, intersemioticity extends to the whole culture as an infinite process of intersemiotic translation, since "intertextuality, interdiscursivity and intermediality as the environment of text generation and reception impel us to regard the signs of different texts as intersemiosic, being comprehended simultaneously within the frameworks of different sign systems" (Torop 2000: 71). In his taxonomical model, Torop applies three basic oppositions to describe a translation process as predominantly (1) recoding (translation of the expression plane) or transposing (translation of the content plane), (2) analytic (oriented towards the source text) or synthetic (oriented towards the target text and its reception), and (3) tending towards an autonomous translation of just one plane (either the plane of expression or the plane of content) or tending towards a dominant translation of one plane while retaining its interrelations with the other plane (Torop 2000: 88). A central notion in describing any translation is that of the dominant: "But the most important task is to determine the dominant, an element or a level providing textual unity. [...] It is precisely the transposing of the dominant from one level to another, from structure to function etc. which characterizes the types of translation within the framework of the single translational model." (Torop 2000: 88). Torop himself has illustrated his model by applying it to describe screen adaptations

(Torop 2000: 90–95), but potentially the model could be used to describe any type of translation.

That a methodology for studying intersemiotic translation should be grounded in semiotics is concluded also by Aguiar and Queiroz who postulate that "an approach to the intersemiotic translation phenomena cannot be viable if dissociated from a general theory of sign, which should provide (i) a model of semiotic processes and (ii) a classification of semiotic morphological variety" (Aguiar, Queiroz 2013: 291).

While there is no single unanimously accepted method, the abovementioned approaches foreground some aspects that are important in analyzing intersemiotic translation: a focus on the invariant aspect alongside approximate and conventional correspondences that are established between the source and target texts and are based both on the function of the translation as well as on the morphology of the semiotic systems involved.

Intersemiotic translation contributes to our understanding of translation in general, first of all by providing a wider background for interlingual translation so that the latter is placed on a continuum of various translational processes. Secondly, since from the viewpoint of semiotics of culture all our communication necessarily involves two sign systems as a minimum (most commonly verbal and pictorial), intersemiotic translation, by its manifest inclusion of different sign systems, helps to clarify and expose also the workings of "ordinary" translation where the non-dominant sign system(s) usually remain hidden (unmaterialized).

References

Aguiar, Daniella, and Joao Queiroz. 2009. "Towards a model of intersemiotic translation." *The International Journal of the Arts in Society* 4, http://www.arts-journal.com.

Aguiar, Daniella, and Joao Queiroz. 2013. "Semiosis and intersemiotic translation." *Semiotica* 196: 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2013-0060

Clüver, Claus. 1989. "On intersemiotic transposition." *Poetics Today* 10 (1): 55–90. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772555

Clüver, Claus. 2007. "Intermediality and interarts studies." In *Changing Borders: Contemporary Positions in Intermediality*, ed. by Jens Arvidson, Mikael Askander, Jørgen Bruhn, and Heidrun Führer, 19–38. Intermedia Studies Press.

Dusi, Nicola. 2015. "Intersemiotic translation: Theories, problems, analysis." *Semiotica* 206: 181–205. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0018

Eco, Umberto. 2001. *Experiences in Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gottlieb, Henrik. 2008. "Multidimensional translation." In *Understanding Translation*, ed. by Anne Schjoldager, Henrik Gottlieb, and Ida Klitgård, 39–65. Aarhus: Academica.

Holobut, Agata. 2013. "Paintings re-seen. Poems re-read. A few remarks on intersemiotic translation." In *Translation and Meaning, part 10* ed. by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, and Marcel Thielen, 39–51. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting.

Jakobson, Roman. 1966[1959]. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *On Translation*, ed. by Reuben A. Brower, 232–239. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lotman, Juri. 2000[1990]. *Universe of the Mind*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mossop, Brian. 2019. "'Intersemiotic translating'. Time for a rethink?" *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 14 (1): 75–94. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00031.mos

Petrilli, Susan. 2003. "Translation and semiosis. Introduction." In *Translation Translation*, ed. by Susan Petrilli, 17–37. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Torop, Peeter. 2000. "Intersemiosis and intersemiotic translation." *S: European Journal for Semiotic Studies* 12 (1): 71–100.

Toury, Gideon. 1986. "Translation: A cultural-semiotic perspective." In *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics, Tome 2 (N-Z)*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 1111–1124. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Intralingual translation

Karen Korning Zethsen
Aarhus University

The practice of rewriting a text, of translating it with another purpose or for another audience within the same language, has presumably existed since time immemorial. The term "intralingual translation", however, is inextricably linked to Roman Jakobson and his tripartite division of translation. Jakobson builds on Peirce's theory of signs and meaning and postulates that "the meaning of any linguistic sign is its translation into some further, alternative sign" (Jakobson 2012: 114). The implication is that translation is a component in all language transactions and Jakobson divides these transactions into three kinds of translation or "ways of interpreting a verbal sign":

> Intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.
> Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.
> Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson 2012: 114)

It is immediately understandable that translation between two national languages is often a necessity and there is no doubt that translation scholars and the translation industry alike consider translation proper to be the prototypical kind of translation. It is fair to assume that people in general would also define prototypical translation as something which involves two national languages, although it is interesting to see how everyday language acknowledges the existence of intralingual translation by frequently using the verb "to translate" in connection with e.g., incomprehensive expert language that is needed in a simpler form in the same language, as in "I need help to translate this tax form".

Even though translation scholars constantly mention and acknowledge Jakobson's other kinds of translation, i.e., intralingual and Intersemiotic translation[5] (the kinds of translation which are not "translation proper"; the name itself indicating its prototypical status), these are often classified as peripheral, or *de facto* considered of no real relevance to the discipline of translation studies (TS). Once Jakobson's seminal text has served its purpose of broadly defining translation, authors quickly move on to the field of translation proper, or to the restricted area of translation proper,

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.int8

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

which has their particular interest. However, this seems to be changing and within the past decade or so we have seen more and more interest within the field of intralingual TS.

It is sometimes discussed whether intralingual translation does in fact belong within the field of TS and this discussion is tied up with the very definition of translation[1]. This is not the subject of the present entry, but for arguments in favour of its natural inclusion within TS and a broad definition of translation, see Zethsen (2007) and Hill-Madsen and Zethsen (2016) – see also Alternative labels for "translation"[5].

1. Examples of intralingual translation and their motivation

Following Jakobson, intralingual translation is translation, or rewording, within one language: "The intralingual translation of a word uses either another, more or less synonymous, word or resorts to a circumlocution" (Jakobson 2012: 114). As is the case with interlingual translation, intralingual translation is an umbrella term which covers many different kinds of translation. Typical examples include: easy-readers for children, localization (e.g., different versions of manuals, marketing material or different national versions of literature within the same language, such as US versions of UK books), précis-writing, expert-to-lay translation into plain language, new translations of religious texts or the classics for various reasons, such as comprehension or ideology. The latter group may also be classified as retranslation, but inherently the need for a new translation indicates that a certain degree of intralingual translation takes place at the same time. For seminal texts it is also common to consult or even base a new translation on other retranslations which may add new layers of intralingual translation.

Also, in other situations it is very common to see both intralingual translation and "translation proper" involved in a translational activity. For instance, in the context of medical information for laymen many EU texts are translated interlingually from English into all the other member languages and at the same time the process involves a certain amount of intralingual translation throughout the text to make it more lay-friendly. A very concrete example would be if a medical term such as "hepatitis" is part of everyday language in English, but not in the target language where a lay term exists. Another example, as pointed out by Curran in Sato-Rossberg & Wakabayashi (2012: 153), is that the Japanese literary translation tradition as such often results in situations where "interlingual and intralingual translation rub against each other".

As can be seen from the above list, intralingual translation takes place between different varieties of the same language. Very little empirical research has been carried out on the general nature of intralingual translation, however, Zethsen (2009: 805ff) attempts a description based primarily on different intralingual translations of the Bible. Results indicate that intralingual translation is typically motivated by differences within the parameters of knowledge, time, culture or space. An intralingual translation can be referred to one of the four main categories as regards the primary motivation for its production, but in many cases the categories overlap, and more than one parameter is involved:

Knowledge

Motivation

This parameter centres around the ability of comprehension of the target group, i.e., the target group's general ability to understand a text, its level of general background knowledge or its level of expertise (or lack of) in connection with a specific subject.

Examples

The parameter of knowledge often involves interpretation (explicitation, explanation, addition) of information and typical intralingual translations as a result of this parameter are of the expert-to-layman kind (patient package inserts containing information on medicine, tax leaflets based on new legislation, manuals for durable consumer goods) or children's versions (easy-readers) of classical texts. See for example Nisbeth Jensen 2015 for intralingual medical translation for laymen.

Time

Motivation

This parameter covers instances where it is the temporal distance which makes a new version necessary. It is of course related to the parameters of culture and knowledge, but in this case it is the diachronic factor which results in the lack of knowledge or cultural understanding. As mentioned above, it seems that the motivation for these diachronic translations can be further divided into *comprehension*, i.e., related to the parameter of knowledge or *ideology*, i.e., related to the parameter of culture.

Examples

Intralingual translations instigated by the parameter of time (diachronic translations, or retranslation[1]) are typically new and more contemporary translations of classical texts such as religious texts and literature. See for example Stanton 2002 for intralingual translation of the Bible in Anglo-Saxon England as well as Zethsen 2009 for an analysis of five different versions of the Bible.

Culture

Motivation

The parameter of culture refers to the need to explain cultural references in a text which time or general background knowledge prevent the target group from understanding even though the languages involved are the same.

Examples

Intralingual translations instigated by the parameter of culture (intercultural translations) could typically be an American version of an English book, or localization within a business context in the form of different cultural versions of the same text within the same language. See for instance Denton 2007 on the need for UK-US intralingual translation.

Space

Motivation

This parameter covers instances where the text is either reduced or extended, i.e., the main motivation for rewriting the text is changing the physical space of the text.

Examples

Intralingual translations instigated by the parameter of space are typically either various kinds of summarizing such as précis-writing, shortened versions of classical texts (easy-readers), news reporting or subtitling for the deaf when space requires a text to be shortened, or extension/addition, which is typically seen when explanation is needed due to comprehension limits in the target group caused by time, culture or especially lack of knowledge. In the case of easy-readers the intralingual translation of a text may both reduce the extent of the text at the same time as adding information and even though space is of the essence we can no longer say that it is the main motivation for these translations as with for instance executive summaries. In the case of easy-readers, both strategies of reduction/extention are based in limited knowledge on the part of the perceived audience (see Zethsen 2009 for intralingual Bible translations for children).

2. Characteristics of intralingual translation

Intralingual translation is, in many ways, similar to interlingual translation. The translator between Danish and English may look for adequate words and phrases in

English to cover what was said in Danish, whereas the intralingual translator of an expert-to-layman translation may look for synonyms or synonymous expressions to make a text accessible to a layman audience, etc.

As mentioned above, there is a limited number of empirical research projects investigating general characteristics of intralingual translation. One of the few is the Polish ParaTrans project which compares the translation process of inter- and intralingual translation from a cognitive point of view and on the basis of both process and product data from key-logging, eye-tracking and screen-capture. The results have led the researchers to some interesting tentative conclusions:

- professional translators transfer their processing patterns and expertise from interlingual translation practice to intralingual translation, i.e., "inter- and intralingual translation draw from the same pool of generic skills" (Whyatt, B. et al. 2016: 35) and metacognitive skills such as planning, self-monitoring and self-revision (Whyatt & Naranowicz 2019).
- there are some process differences, namely that there is faster typing when paraphrasing than when translating and task duration is significantly longer for interlingual translation (Whyatt et al. 2016: 35, Whyatt 2017: 187). This probably means that even though the processes are similar, the processing effort may be higher when two national languages are involved. It may well be that this is a general tendency, but one may speculate that some intralingual translation tasks might match the processing effort of interlingual translation, for instance, if a highly technical text is to be rewritten for the lowest common denominator.

Apart from processing differences, there also seems to be some notable differences in the strategies employed by the translator (see Translation strategies and tactics[1]). Again, there is a lack of research into the strategies used by intralingual translation, and perhaps in particular into the microstrategies of different kinds of intralingual translation. Zethsen (2009: 809) found that in addition to being motivated by one or more of the four key parameters mentioned above, intralingual translation seems to be characterized by two overall tendencies:

- a tendency to involve a form of simplification – a strategy which is not so often applied as the overall *skopos* of a translation proper, but rather as the occasional microstrategy
- a tendency to apply certain strategies in a much more radical way than what is seen in the majority of interlingual translations. Because of the frequent purpose of simplification, the microstrategies applied in intralingual translation (the additions, omissions, restructuring, etc.) are taken more to the extreme than is often the case within interlingual translation. If, for example, a text is translated intralingually for children the explanations added may be much more comprehensive

> than what is normally seen within interlingual translation. In other words, the differences in microstrategies are more a question of degree and frequency than of kind.

One of the few other researchers who have investigated the subject is Ersland (2014), who has investigated norms[1] and Translation universals[2] in intralingual translation. Ersland's work is based on an analysis of the BE and AE versions of Philip Pullman's *The Amber Spyglass,* and confirms that inter- and intralingual translation share the same strategies:

> Whereas Korning-Zethsen [2009] focused on intralingual translation in a historical perspective by studying different Bible versions published over a number of years, it is interesting to see that so many of the same strategies [such as explicitation and simplification] can be found in this study, which focuses on translation in a contemporary perspective, i.e., where a ST and a TT have been published within a short time of each other. (Ersland 2014: 84–85)

Ersland (2014: 88) concludes that the findings from his analysis support the hypothesis "that intralingual translations are subject to the same norms and shifts that are thought to influence interlingual translations".

Also, the ParaTrans project mentioned above has reached the tentative conclusion that interlingual translation competence, which would include a set of available microstrategies, seems to be transferable to intralingual translation (Whyatt, Stachowiak, & Kajzer-Wietrzny 2016).

3. The future of intralingual translation

Much more research within intralingual translation is needed, but the studies which have been carried out so far point to the fact that the similarities between intra- and interlingual translation by far outweigh the differences (Zethsen 2007, 2009; Hill-Madsen & Zethsen 2016; Whyatt 2017). Both similarities and differences are potentially theoretically interesting to TS and may help to gain deeper insights into each discipline. As a practical consequence, trained interlingual translators are likely to be well-equipped to carry out intralingual translation (Zethsen 2007: 301; Whyatt 2017: 186) and as Whyatt (2017: 184) points out, intralingual translation services have indeed recently been included in ISO 17100 (2015) as a part of professional translators' job description. The increased focus on research into intralingual translation and its close kinship with interlingual translation may also lead to didactic impacts so that translation competence is taught and trained not solely as a bilingual competence.

References

Curran, Beverley. 2012. "Japanese in Shifting Contexts: Translating Canadian Nikkei Writers into Japanese." In *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*, ed. by Nana Sato-Rossberg, and Judy Wakabayashi, 152–166. London: Continuum.

Denton, John. 2007. "'…waterlogged somewhere in mid-Atlantic'. Why American Readers Need Intralingual Translation but don't often Get it." *TTR* 20 (2): 243–270. https://doi.org/10.7202/018826ar

Ersland, Anita. 2014. *Is change necessary? A study of norms and translation universals in intralingual translation*. MA thesis Bergen, Norway. http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/7967/119571513.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 11 May 2020).

Hill-Madsen, Aage, and Karen Korning Zethsen. 2016. "Intralingual translation and its place within Translation Studies – a theoretical discussion." *Meta* 61 (3): 692–708. https://doi.org/10.7202/1039225ar.

Jakobson, Roman. (1959) 2012. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 126–131. London: Routledge.

Nisbeth Jensen, Matilde. 2015. "Optimising comprehensibility in interlingual translation: The need for intralingual translation." In *Translation and Comprehensibility*, ed. by Karin Maksymski, Silke Gutermuth, and Silvia Hansen-Schirra, 163–194. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Stanton, Robert. 2002. *The culture of translation in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Whyatt, Boguslawa. 2017. "Intralingual Translation." In *The Handbook of Translation and Cognition*, ed. by John W. Schwieter, and Aline Ferreira, 176–192. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241485.ch10

Whyatt, Boguslawa, and Marcin Naranowicz. 2019. "A robust design of the translator's skill set: evidence for transfer of metacognitive skills to intralingual paraphrasing." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 14 (1): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2019.1617028

Whyatt, Boguslawa, Katerzyna Stachowiak, and Marta Kajzer-Wietrzny. 2016. "Similar and different: Cognitive rhythm and effort in translation and paraphrasing." *PSiCL* 52 (2), 175–208. Special issue *"Language Processing in Translation"*. https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2016-0007

Zethsen, Karen Korning. 2007. "Beyond translation proper – Extending the field of translation studies." *TTR* 20 (1): 281–308. https://doi.org/10.7202/018506ar

Zethsen, Karen Korning. 2009. "Intralingual translation: An attempt at description." *Meta* 54 (4): 795–812. https://doi.org/10.7202/038904ar

Further essential reading

Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2019. "Challenging the boundaries of translation and filling the gaps in translation history: Two cases of intralingual translation from the 19th century Ottoman literary scene." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, ed. by Helle Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger, and Karen Korning Zethsen, 168–180. London: Routledge.

Jiménez Carra, Nieves. 2016. "De Argentina a España: la adaptación de la variación lingüística en el subtitulado intralingüístico de El secreto de sus ojos [From Argentina to Spain: adapting linguistic variation in the intralinguistic subtitles of El secreto de sus ojos (The Secret in Their Eyes)]." *JoSTrans* 26: 211–231.

Karas, Hilla. 2016. "Intralingual intertemporal translation as a relevant category in translation studies." *Target* 28 (3): 445–466. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.28.3.05kar

Montalt, Vicent, and Karen Korning Zethsen (in press). "Translating medical texts." In *The Cambridge Translation Handbook*, ed. by Kirsten Malmkjær. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zethsen, Karen Korning. 2018. "Access is not the same as understanding. Why intralingual translation is crucial in a world of information overload." *In Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (1): 79–98. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2018.19.1.4

Lingua franca

Lance Hewson
University of Geneva

1. Introduction

The term “lingua franca” has both a general and a specific meaning. In general terms, it refers to a contact language, that is any language that people from different linguistic backgrounds use to communicate. When (usually) written with capital initials, it refers specifically to the pidgin language that was used up to the end of the nineteenth century in the Mediterranean area as a means of facilitating communication between traders or travellers. This article examines lingua francas in the general sense of the term.

Lingua francas, together with translation and interpreting, have since time immemorial provided a means of linguistic exchange between people who otherwise would not be able to communicate. Aramaic was the most ancient lingua franca, spoken in the ancient Near East in the first millennium B.C.E. (Bae 2004). The role of lingua franca was taken over by Greek and then, concomitantly, Latin. Greek retained its lingua-franca status until the break-up of the Byzantine Empire, and Latin was used as the language of scholarship well into the late modern period.

Many languages today qualify as lingua francas. The most wide-spread is undoubtedly English (see English as a lingua franca[4]), which some scholars see as the first truly global lingua franca (e.g., Albl-Mikasa & Ehrenberger-Dow 2019: 46). A significant number of other languages are used as lingua francas, including French, German, Spanish, Arabic, Portuguese, Chinese, Russian, Swahili and Indonesian. All lingua francas are subject to changing fortunes, depending not only on political, geopolitical and economic factors, but also on the ever-evolving use of languages on the Internet. As English is one of the most prevalent lingua francas today, it is given particular attention in the following sections. Looked at from the European perspective, the growing importance of English as a lingua franca certainly partly explains the loss of influence of lingua francas such as French, German or Russian. The French language, while still very present in the former French and Belgian colonies, is on the decline. It is no longer the key language of international diplomacy, and efforts to address its decline by means of national language policies and the creation of the *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie* (1970) have not been sufficient

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.lin2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

(Wright 2006). German has lost its prestige position as the language of science, now replaced (but by no means definitively) by English. Russian was the undisputed lingua franca of the former Soviet Union, but since 1991, language policies in the successor states have been markedly different, ranging from Russian dominance and the promotion of Russian to derussification (Pavlenko 2006).

2. Characteristics of lingua francas

It is hypothesized in this section that lingua francas share a number of common features. It will be argued that these features can best be identified by examining potential lingua-franca users.

Scholars working in the field of English as a lingua franca (henceforth ELF) have envisaged a range of potential lingua-franca users which, in all probability, can be extended to any language used as a lingua franca. Some users possess native or native-like competence in the underlying language and have been categorized as "successful" (Promodrou 2008: 52) lingua-franca users. Others demonstrate low, or very low, levels of competence, and have been categorized as "low-proficiency speakers" (Albl-Mikasa 2017: 375). Many users will be situated at different points along the sliding scale between "successful" and "low-proficiency".

The first, perhaps surprising, characteristic of a lingua franca can be identified when only successful users are involved in the communicative situation. As these users have native or near-native competence, the lingua franca in this instance can be assimilated to the underlying native language. This implies that a lingua franca is much more than a kind of simplified version of that language.

Even when a communicative situation involves less successful (but not low proficiency) users, there will not necessarily be a move towards simplification. Such users may indeed rely upon a more limited lexis, but may also be lexically inventive, for example by forming and trying out neologisms. They will manifest different degrees of departure from standard grammar (as measured by native-speaker norms), but, as scholars such as Jenkins (2007) have underlined, it would be unproductive to judge users' grammatical performance by means of the "deficit" model of the mother tongue. The potential presence of non-standard lexis and grammar constitutes a second defining characteristics of a lingua franca.

It follows from the above that a lingua franca may manifest a richness whose nature is essentially unpredictable, in that it arises from the potentially creative uses of the language proper to its different speakers and the wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds to which they belong. Users may thus choose to "bend" the language by means of lexical creation or grammatical innovation, often under the influence of their own mother tongues, or indeed of any other languages that they are familiar with, as Schaller-Schwaner and Kirkpatrick point out (2019: 236). The implication here is that formal codification of a lingua franca becomes an unrealistic prospect, given the very varied linguistic backgrounds of its users.

When low-proficiency users are involved in the communicative situation, the lingua franca will necessarily become a highly simplified vehicle for communication. A restricted series of lexical items, used individually or in limited combination, perhaps also with other means of communication such as gesture, may be sufficient to meet the needs of the particular communicative situation, with little or no recourse to the constraints of grammar. But even at this level, it is not possible to rule out innovation, as users try out all possible means to achieve successful communication.

The overall picture that emerges of the characteristics shared by lingua francas can be summarized as follows. Lingua francas are dynamic systems that are constantly reconfigured by their users and the communicative situations in which they take part. They are driven by speakers of other languages, whose (unconscious) linguistic and cultural frameworks influence – to a greater or lesser extent – their use of the particular lingua franca. It can thus be said that lingua francas are fundamentally hybrid in nature. Finally, lingua francas have the potential to be complex and rich, to be used in unpredictable and creative ways, going "beyond" their underlying languages, while also having the potential to be pared down and used in the simplest possible ways.

3. Lingua francas, interpreting and translation

Interpreting and translation are areas that are not usually addressed by academic studies on lingua francas, even in the much-researched field of ELF (Albl-Mikasa 2017: 371). A lingua franca, by its very existence, is supposed to obviate the need for spoken or written translation, and when interpreting or translation are indeed involved, it is interesting to note that many of the research findings contrast with the positive picture painted by scholars who study lingua francas in their own right. Addressing the field of ELF, Albl-Mikasa and Ehrensberger-Dow (2019: 50) point to the "overly optimistic" view of researchers, who stress the "emancipatory liberation of the majority of the world's non-native English speakers from the unattainable target model of the native speaker gold standard" (2019: 49). Indeed, as will be seen below, a lingua franca may prove to pose intractable problems to interpreters and translators alike when it is used as a source language, and lead to comprehension problems when, in the case of translation, it is used as a target language.

As no lingua franca is genuinely global, but, at best, only a *presumed* lingua franca, interpreters or translators will be called in when there is an anticipated or actual breakdown in communication between the lingua-franca user and the intended audience or readers. The problems faced by interpreters and translators revolve around the quality of the spoken or written text to be interpreted or translated. The examples below, which are taken from research into ELF, reflect the real problems that have arisen with the ever-increasing use of this lingua franca. It is, however, hypothesized that the difficulties encountered are the same, whatever the lingua franca under consideration.

There has been a vast increase in the number of ELF source texts and speeches (Albl-Mikasa 2017: 371). The problems that arise are due to non-standard language input (Albl-Mikasa and Ehrensberger-Dow 2019: 46), attributable to low-proficiency users of the language. This, of course, does not mean that native speakers consistently produce coherent, well constructed texts that can be put into the target language in a straightforward manner, and a body of research in interpreting and translation studies highlights various types of difficulty (see Translation "errors"[1]). However, there is considerable evidence that lingua-franca source texts may be cause of particular concern.

Difficulties faced by interpreters have been explored by Albl-Mikasa and Ehrensberger-Dow (2019). They stress that processing non-standard language leads to interpreters experiencing additional cognitive load, negative emotion and stress (2019: 47). They note the problem of non-native accents and of "unconventional sentence structures and unusual lexical choices as well as various other types of negative transfer from speakers' L1" (2019: 53). They refer to research (Reithofer 2013) which underlines that comprehension is greater when conference participants listen to professional interpretation rather than the ELF original (2019: 50).

Difficulties faced by translators have been explored by Hewson (2009, 2013). Problems of how to interpret the source-text author's intended meaning constitute one of the major difficulties. As might be expected, people with a low level of competence in the lingua franca may produce texts that simply defy comprehension, and when there is no way of checking intended meaning with the author, translators – once they have exhausted the range of plausible meanings suggested by context – may have to rely on inspired guesswork (2009: 113). Going beyond problems of non-comprehension, Hewson points to a series of other difficulties that are either linguistic in nature (involving lexis, lexicogrammar and pragmatics), or linked to the presupposed cultural background (2013: 271). While the linguistic problems are visible on the page, cultural presuppositions need to be teased out of a source text, when that can indeed be done, relying as it does on recognising the dominant language and culture that lies behind the user's text production in the lingua franca.

Interestingly, greater competence in the lingua franca does not necessarily lead to fewer difficulties in pinning down the source-text author's intended meaning. Fluency in expression may give the impression of mastery of nuance, when, in actual fact, the source-text author is unaware of the subtleties of the linguistic system

(Hewson 2009: 115). Moreover, certain texts appear to be “correct”, but their weaknesses are only revealed when they have to be translated. The translator is then obliged to invest a great deal of effort and time in order to produce a target text of sufficient quality. It is no surprise that the European Commission’s Directorate General for translation and the European Parliament in Luxemburg have set up editing units for texts written in non-native English and French, the aim being to produce quality texts (which can then go on to be translated). The study by Albl-Mikasa, Fontana, Fuchs, Meret Stüdeli & Zaugg (2017) of translations before and after editing clearly shows how unedited texts written by non-native speakers prolong translational decision-making and potentially lead to inadequate solutions.

The situation concerning lingua-franca target texts differs from that of lingua-franca source texts. While the latter have become part of interpreters’ and translators’ professional environment, the former are the result of a conscious decision to interpret or translate into a non-native language. There is no simple way of categorising lingua-franca target texts. The “deficit” model, whereby lingua-franca productions are necessarily seen to be substandard, is not an appropriate one when discussing the world of professional language services. Professional interpreters regularly work into their “B” languages (a “B” language is not a mother tongue, but is a language in which the interpreter is perfectly fluent). And many professional translators translate into their passive languages – in some countries, not to do so would mean never having enough work (see Directionality[2]). Trained linguists are well aware of their own potential shortcomings, which is why translators working into their passive languages may ask native speakers to check their work. However, it would be wrong to play down real problems that arise today as a result of the state of the professional translation market.

Hewson (2010, 2013) analyses the disparate nature of the professional translation market today. Leaving aside the “top” end of the market, where skilled professionals translate in acceptable conditions and with reasonable reward, there is a large grey area where translation is carried out, by people who merely claim to be translators, or by those who have no choice but to work in unacceptable conditions. Other factors exacerbate this situation, such as machine translation[1] with no revision[2], or any form of Collaborative translation[2], such as crowd-sourcing, without the necessary quality control. These various factors help to explain the large number of documents available, particularly on the Internet, which are clearly translations that do not meet professional standards. Documents intended for tourists are a case in point (Hewson 2013; see also Tourism translation[5]), particularly given the status of English, which is today considered to be the default lingua franca that is “universally” understood. Such documents enable us to see that at least in the world of translation, the reliance on a lingua franca as a target language is by no means a guarantee of successful communication.

4. Conclusion

The use of a lingua franca is just one of the ways of meeting the vast demands of communication in today's multilingual world. Research, particularly in the field of ELF, has highlighted the liberating effects on spoken communication of a lingua franca that no longer relies on native-speaker norms. However, in the world of interpreting and translation, a different picture emerges. The various factors outlined above suggest that a lingua franca is a potential obstacle that adds to cognitive load, slows down output and leads to issues of ambiguity that cannot always be solved. Both translation and interpreting markets are undergoing profound changes, and the ever-increasing use of ELF is one of the reasons for those changes. There is a need for more research, firstly into how efficient "successful" users of a lingua franca really are, and secondly with a view to determining how professional standards of translation and interpreting can continue to be upheld in a world where lingua francas, and particularly English, seem bound to play an ever-greater part.

References

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2017. "ELF and translation/interpreting." In *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, ed. by Jennifer Jenkins, Will Baker, and Martin Dewey, 369–383. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173-31

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela, Giovanna Fontana, Laura Maria Fuchs, Lena Meret Stüdeli, and Aline Zaugg. 2017. "Professional translations of non-native English: 'before and after' texts from the European Parliament's Editing Unit." *The Translator* 23 (4): 371–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2017.1385940

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela, and Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow. 2019. "ITELF: (E)merging Interests in Interpreting and Translation Studies." In *Translation and Interpreting. Convergence, Contact, Interaction*, ed. by Eugenia Da Fovo, and Paola Gentile, 45–62. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Bae, Chul-hyun. 2004. "Aramaic as a Lingua Franca During the Persian Empire (538-333 B.C.E.)." *Journal of Universal Language* 5: 1–20. https://doi.org/10.22425/jul.2004.5.1.1

Hewson, Lance. 2009. "Brave New Globalized World? Translation Studies and English as a Lingua Franca." *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée* 14: 109–120. https://doi.org/10.3917/rfla.141.0109

Hewson, Lance. 2010. "Ethics and Choice." In *Sur le fil – traducteurs et éthique, éthiques du traducteur*, ed. by Christine Pagnoulle, 21–30. Liège: Université de Liège.

Hewson, Lance. 2013. "Is English as a Lingua Franca Translation's Defining Moment?" *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7 (2): 257–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798854

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2006. "Russian as a lingua franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26: 78–99. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000055

Prodromou, Luke. 2008. *English as Lingua Franca. A Corpus-based Analysis*. London: Continuum. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn064

Reithofer, Karin. 2013. "Comparing modes of communication. The effect of English as a lingua franca vs. interpreting." *Interpreting* 15 (1): 48–73. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.15.1.03rei

Schaller-Schwaner, Iris, and Andy Kirkpatrick. 2020. "What Is English in the Light of Lingua Franca Usage?" In *Ontologies of English: Conceptualising the Language for Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*, ed. by Christopher J. Hall, and Rachel Wicaksono, 233–252. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108685153.012

Wright, Sue. 2006. "French as a lingua franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26: 35–60. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000031

Multimodality in interpreting

Franz Pöchhacker
University of Vienna

The term multimodality (see also Multimodality and audiovisual translation[4]) came into wider use in interpreting studies only after 2010, though its underlying concept has been significant in various ways ever since the emergence of the interpreting profession in the mid-twentieth century. As the academic discourse that bears on the topic of multimodality evolved in different periods and for different professional practices, a summary presentation and critical review of the current state of knowledge requires separate consideration of major professional domains.

Recent scholarship in translation and interpreting studies mostly relies on Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001: 20) to define multimodality as "the use of several semiotic modes in the design of a semiotic product or event". As pointed out by Kaindl (2020), however, this social semiotic proposal for a theory of communication, with strong roots in systemic functional linguistics, builds on a number of antecedents in the area of semiotics[1] that have gone largely unacknowledged. Given the initial focus of social-semiotic multimodal analysis on the relationship between written text and images, it is not surprising that antecedents in the field of nonverbal communication studies, with its focus on face-to-face interaction, had similarly received scant attention. Multimodality in interpreting was therefore studied under different headings, and a few early proposals should be acknowledged here before progressing to a more detailed review of relevant approaches and contributions.

1. Preparing the ground

The assumption that an interpreter's performance had to go beyond rendering the speaker's words was articulated already in Herbert's (1952) *Handbook* on conference interpreting. Herbert saw it as part of the interpreter's task to convey "the impression which the speaker wishes to be made" (1952: 28) and explicitly mentioned the considered use of intonation and gesture.

A combination of message components in different sensory modalities is also posited in Kirchhoff's (1976) interaction model of interpreting, where the verbal part of the speaker's message reaches receivers through the interpreter, whereas visual

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.mul3

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

nonverbal components (posture, gestures, gaze, etc.) can be perceived directly, in a blend with vocal nonverbal message components supplied by the interpreter. Despite its dated code model of language, Kirchhoff's conceptualization is noteworthy for its comprehensive view of interpreter-mediated communication as a culturally shaped and socially situated process of interaction in which meaning is made through a combination of audible and visible sign systems.

This proto-multimodal conception of interpreting was developed further in the 1980s along empirical as well as theoretical lines. Bühler (1985) gathered survey data among professional interpreters in support of her view of conference interpreting as a "multichannel communication phenomenon". Nearly all of her 62 respondents found it essential to have visual access to speakers so as to see their facial expression, hand and finger movements, head movements, gaze, posture and general appearance. In laying a broad theoretical foundation, Poyatos (1983) drew up a comprehensive account of interpersonal communication in the tradition of nonverbal communication studies. Conceiving of face-to-face communication as "body-to-body" communication, he modeled eight sign systems, including proxemic, thermal, dermal and chemical, three of which are singled out as indispensable and referred to as the "basic triple structure" made up of verbal language, paralanguage and kinesics. Significantly, Poyatos (1987/2002) went on to apply his inherently multimodal view of interpersonal communication to the two main modes of interpreting – consecutive[1] and simultaneous[1]. Modeling the interpreting situation as a constellation of interactants (Speaker, Listener, Interpreter), he considers which communicative signs in the three basic systems can be produced and received in the acoustic and/or visual channels, and by whom. Rather than offering a static matrix or taxonomy, Poyatos uses his model for a functional analysis of the variable interplay between the different sign systems and indeed their interchangeability, exemplifying how verbal language in speech can be replaced, supported, repeated or contradicted by paralanguage and kinesics. A key theoretical (and professional) issue raised by Poyatos (1987/2002) – and in fact also by Kirchhoff (1976) – concerns the interpreter's leeway in going beyond words when reconstituting the speaker's message. Notwithstanding his many examples of how this might be done, Poyatos privileges verbal language as the basic sign system for conveying conceptually complex messages, and this is well suited to prevailing professional norms for interpreting as a task involving the production of (verbal) language, whether spoken or signed – or even written in real time.

Poyatos (1987/2002) also included broadcast media settings in his purview, which makes his model relevant for the study of recent screen-based forms of interpreting. But even though his work on face-to-face communication would suggest otherwise, it has hardly been applied to the study of dialogue interpreting, which emerged as an object of (interdisciplinary) research only in the course of the 1990s. On the whole, two main orientations can therefore be made out in research on multimodality in interpreting – one centered on cognition and the other on interaction. Cognition-oriented research on multimodality focuses on the processing of multimodal input in (monologic) simultaneous interpreting, with particular regard for the cognitive effect of concurrent visual input in spoken-language interpreting. Interaction-oriented research, on the other hand, investigates the role of multimodal resources in dialogic interpreter-mediated communication, mainly on the basis of discourse-analytical approaches. Both of these orientations share a special interest in such kinesic phenomena as gaze and gesture.

2. Multimodality in cognitive processing

Though simultaneous conference interpreters have long claimed direct visual access to the speaker, the meeting room and projection screens as an essential prerequisite for performing their task (Bühler 1985), little is known about the way interpreters process such multimodal input. For experimental as well as fieldwork studies, eye tracking has emerged as the method of choice. Seeber (2012) used it to investigate the allocation of visual attention in an experiment on number interpreting, in which ten simultaneous interpreters saw a video of the speaker and slides side by side. Measuring the duration of eye gaze on the speaker's face, hand gestures and slides, Seeber (2012) found that interpreters generally looked mainly at the speaker's face but had significantly longer fixations on the slides during sentences containing large rather than small numbers. His study demonstrates that simultaneous interpreters draw on complementary information available in the visual channel, particularly when faced with complex numerals which are associated with an increase in cognitive load.

Whether multimodal input (in the acoustic and visual channels) can offer interpreters cognitive relief thanks to the complementarity of information, or whether it may also cause cognitive overload, has generated considerable research interest. In an experiment on concurrent auditory and visual information processing, Chmiel, Janikowski and Lijewska (2020) investigated the dual-input condition known as simultaneous interpreting with text. Measuring accuracy rates as well as fixation times, the authors found that the two dozen Polish conference interpreters in their study relied more on the visual modality in resolving incongruences in their multisensory input. This focus on attention management and cognitive effort has also been extended to include interpreters' own gestures, with special regard for the role of beat gestures accompanying and supporting cognitive processing and target-language production.

Compared to the role of multimodal resources in conference interpreters' comprehension and production processes, there has been little interest in their effect on the audience. Reception[4] studies are largely absent even for "classic" (note-based) consecutive interpreting, where maintaining eye contact and controlling gesture have long been recognized as important components of the interpreter's performance. Where multimodality and audience reception have been brought together, to some extent, is in the area of paralanguage, where such delivery features as fluency and intonation in simultaneous interpretations have been shown to affect quality-related perceptions and even comprehension (Shlesinger 1994). On the whole, however, the interplay of verbal language and paralanguage in speech remains surprisingly underexplored. This applies primarily to (simultaneous) interpreting in conference settings, but research on dialogue interpreting has similarly foregrounded kinesic phenomena rather than paralinguistic features.

3. Multimodality in dialogic interaction

In interpreter-mediated face-to-face communication, embodied semiotic resources are quite salient in the perceptual space but have received only sporadic scholarly attention since the late 1970s. It was only after the turn of the century that research on multimodality in dialogue interpreting began to gather momentum (see Davitti 2019: 10). Aside from legal and educational settings, particular interest has been given to interpreting in healthcare communication (e.g., Pasquandrea 2012, Krystallidou 2016), with special emphasis on the role of gaze in turn-taking behavior and in the co-constructed dynamics of the interaction in general. Head and body orientation have likewise received significant attention, often in conjunction with gaze. This core interest in gaze and body orientation has been extended to include gesture and proxemics as well as interaction with artifacts (e.g., Davitti & Pasquandrea 2017).

Like studies of dialogue interpreting in general, such research is based on recordings of authentic (and sometimes simulated) interactions, the transcriptions of which are analyzed in a discourse-based theoretical and methodological framework. Most authors have relied on conversation analysis (CA) or various approaches to discourse analysis. In any case, research is based on video recordings, the transcription of which presents significant challenges if ensembles of multimodal semiotic resources are to be captured and adequately reflected. Based on the use of annotation tools such as ELAN, multimodal transcripts have increasingly relied on the incorporation of selected image frames, often with image anonymization techniques and graphic annotation. Nevertheless, the need for a more consistent approach to transcription, and to multimodal analysis in general (Davitti 2019), persists.

An innovative and highly promising approach involves the use of mobile eye trackers. Vranjes et al. (2019) used such devices to investigate the interplay of gaze behavior, speech and gestural listener responses in an authentic interpreter-mediated therapeutic dialogue. They found a strong relationship between mutual gaze and head nods in expressing affective cooperation (affiliation) with the client, highlighting the role of nonverbal semiotic resources in serving the interactional goals of therapeutic talk.

Another noteworthy example of multimodal interaction analysis in interpreter-mediated healthcare consultations is provided by Krystallidou (2016), who shows how interpreters' use of nonverbal resources can promote communicative inclusion in doctor-patient communication. Based on the Goffmanian assumption of dynamic participant roles and a multimodal conception of ratification processes, she describes (and visualizes) how the interplay of interpreters' gaze, body orientation and gesture reflects their active involvement in the interaction while their verbal language use, relaying primary participants' utterances, seems consistent with the normative principle of non-involvement.

These and other studies embracing a multimodal analysis of interpreting in dialogic encounters lend rich further support to the well-founded belief that interpreters do more than relay verbal messages. As demonstrated by case studies of their use of nonverbal semiotic resources, interpreters' embodied presence and actions endow them with a degree of agency (see Agents of translation[2]) that has yet to be fully understood and accounted for in codes of professional ethics and standards of practice.

Even as the present state of the art in multimodal studies of on-site (body-to-body) interpreting suggests a considerable degree of convergence, the increasing use of video-mediated remote interpreting is opening up new frontiers, and the multimodality of interaction needs to be understood in the framework of an audiovisual mediality that places a variety of constraints on the interpreter's perception and production of nonverbal semiotic resources. The study by Licoppe and Veyrier (2020) on asylum court interpreting with remote participants appearing via video link, which focuses on the management of turn-taking for extended utterances, is a case in point. Using multimodal transcripts with screenshot images, the authors document the constraints arising from interpreters' screen-mediated presence, which leads them to favor obtrusive moves, such as overlaps or verbal instructions, over nonverbal resources such as reorientations of body and gaze as well as hand gestures.

Given the widespread use of video remote and video relay service interpreting for sign language users, perceptual constraints in the visual channel pose particular challenges for signed language interpreters, most of which have yet to be fully explored. Except for media settings, research on multimodality in signed language interpreting could almost be said to be conspicuous by its absence – as far as explicit reference to this scholarly buzzword is concerned. In fact, however, the inherent multimodality of sign languages, which rely on a range of gestural and other kinesic resources, may well explain why this notion holds less attraction for scholars of signed language interpreting than for those working with spoken languages. After all, the latter's understanding of language has had to evolve from early conceptions of interpreters' cognitive processing of verbal information or the analysis of triadic interactions based on verbal transcripts of audio-recorded talk. As has been shown, scholars of spoken-language interpreting have come a long way in embracing the idea of multimodality and studying its implications.

References

Bühler, Hildegund. 1985. "Conference interpreting – a multichannel communication phenomenon." *Meta* 30 (1): 49–54. https://doi.org/10.7202/002176ar

Chmiel, Agnieszka, Przemysław Janikowski, and Agnieszka Lijewska. 2020. "Multimodal processing in simultaneous interpreting with text: Interpreters focus more on the visual than the auditory modality." *Target* 32 (1): 37–58. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.18157.chm

Davitti, Elena. 2019. "Methodological explorations of interpreter-mediated interaction: Novel insights from multimodal analysis." *Qualitative Research* 19 (1): 7–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794118761492

Davitti, Elena, and Sergio Pasquandrea. 2017. "Embodied participation: What multimodal analysis can tell us about interpreter-mediated encounters in pedagogical settings." *Journal of Pragmatics* 107: 105–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.04.008

Herbert, Jean. 1952. *The Interpreter's Handbook: How to Become a Conference Interpreter*. Geneva: Georg.

Kaindl, Klaus. 2020. "A theoretical framework for a multimodal conception of translation." In *Translation and Multimodality: Beyond Words*, ed. by Monica Boria, Ángeles Carreres, María Noriega-Sánchez, and Marcus Tomalin, 49–70. London: Routledge.

Kirchhoff, Hella. 1976. "Das dreigliedrige, zweisprachige Kommunikationssystem Dolmetschen." *Le langage et l'homme* 31: 21–27.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. 2001. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.

Krystallidou, Demi. 2016. "Investigating the interpreter's role(s): The A.R.T. framework." *Interpreting* 18 (2): 172–197. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.18.2.02kry

Licoppe, Christian, and Clair-Antoine Veyrier. 2020. "The interpreter as a sequential coordinator in courtroom interaction: 'Chunking' and the management of turn shifts in extended answers in consecutively interpreted asylum hearings with remote participants." *Interpreting* 22 (1): 56–86. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00034.lic

Pasquandrea, Sergio. "Co-constructing dyadic sequences in healthcare interpreting: A multimodal account." *New Voices in Translation Studies* 8: 132–157.

Poyatos, Fernando. 1983. "Language and nonverbal systems in the structure of face-to-face interaction." *Language & Communication* 3 (2): 129–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(83)90010-1

Poyatos, Fernando. 1987/2002. "Nonverbal communication in simultaneous and consecutive interpretation: A theoretical model and new perspectives." In *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, ed. by Franz Pöchhacker, and Miriam Shlesinger, 235–246. London: Routledge.

Seeber, Kilian G. 2012. "Multimodal input in simultaneous interpreting: An eye-tracking experiment." In *Translation Studies: Old and New Types of Translation in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Lew N. Zybatow, Alena Petrova, and Michael Ustaszewski, 341–347. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Shlesinger, Miriam. 1994. "Intonation in the production and perception of simultaneous interpretation." In *Bridging the Gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation*, ed. by Sylvie Lambert, and Barbara Moser-Mercer, 225–236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.3.17shl

Vranjes, Jelena, Hanneke Bot, Kurt Feyaerts, and Geert Brône. 2019. "Affiliation in interpreter-mediated therapeutic talk: On the relationship between gaze and head nods." *Interpreting* 21 (2): 220–244. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00028.vra

Further essential reading

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2020. "'Going video': Mediality and multimodality in interpreting." In *Linking Up with Video: Perspectives on Interpreting Practice and Research*, ed. by Heidi Salaets, and Geert Brône, 13–45. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.149.02poc

Museums and translation

Robert Neather
Hong Kong Baptist University

Museums are important sites for the presentation of culture, in which translation plays a key part. Translation can be understood here as referring to two levels, the interlingual and the cultural (see also Cultural approaches[2]), a distinction summarized by Sturge (2007) as "translation in museums" versus "museums as translations". On the first of these levels, interlingual translation is vital in catering to visitors from different linguacultural groups; on the second level, museum exhibitions "translate" cultures, constructing cultural representations (see also Cultural translation[3]). This entry begins by examining issues at this broader representational level. It then turns to consider interlingual translation in the intersemiotic exhibition space as a part of such representational practice, before discussing questions of textual modification to suit target language visitors. The entry concludes with pointers for future inquiry.

1. Translation and the exhibition space: Representation and contact

Museums work as translations through the construction of representations in the exhibition space. An exhibition functions as a three-dimensional multimodal text, in which a variety of different meaning-making resources interact. These include objects, written texts of different genres, photos and visuals, explanatory diagrams, interactive multimedia resources, and audio-guides. Meaning-making here is thus "combinational and relational" (Hooper-Greenhill 2000), and comprises both intrasemiotic (visual-visual, textual-textual) and intersemiotic (textual-visual) interactions. Space is a further element in this semiotic aggregate. The way that objects are arranged separately or in juxtaposition in particular areas of the exhibition space will highlight very different meanings. As Hooper-Greenhill (2000) discusses, a portrait of an English duchess and her young black servant in London's National Portrait Gallery takes on a wholly different significance when exhibited in proximity with a set of slave shackles. Exhibition spaces may thus be seen as a form of "cultural cartography" (Whitehead 2012), in which particular epistemologies of culture are "mapped out" through the spatial arrangement of the objects on display in relation to particular discursive elements.

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.mus2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

A crucial question here is who constructs such epistemological mappings, or to put it another way, who gets to tell what story about a particular area of knowledge. For, even in the most seemingly objective exhibition, Bennett (2006) reminds us, what we see is always mediated by a particular curatorial vision that is in turn underpinned by institutional power structures. Thus, it is the curator who is invested with the power to select, order and organize objects, and through that process, to create narratives that may variously enhance or upset existing perceptions of the represented culture. Bennett (2006) notes how, particularly in settler societies such as Australia, museums have increasingly become "differencing machines", technologies for the promotion of cross-cultural understanding, and this reflects a broader shift in museum practice towards a philosophy of greater inclusiveness and respect both for the communities and cultural groups represented in exhibitions, and more broadly for the publics which such exhibitions serve. Museums, at least in more Anglo-Saxon contexts, have thus moved towards what Hooper-Greenhill (2000) refers to as the "post-museum", in which the museum becomes a place of inclusive community engagement. In pursuing such engagement, museums can thus be seen as "contact zones", or as Neather (2021) suggests, "translation zones", in which intercultural[4] contact is itself a form of translation, although the effectiveness of such contact in breaking down the curatorial and institutional power structures is not always effective, as numerous case studies have shown.

2. Interlingual translation: Intertextual and intersemiotic issues

Interlingual translation in the museum must take account of these factors, and of the various different relationships between the elements of representation used in the multimodal ensemble of the exhibition space. At the textual level, several interactions may be discerned. Firstly, individual source texts exhibit varying degrees of cross-reference that are employed to create a kind of intertextual complementarity. Here, similar or related information is delivered through different genres that work together to function as a "macro-genre" (Ravelli 2006). Thus, an object label may give a limited amount of factual information, while a "group text" thematically describing a group of objects may reprise some of that information from a broader context; an audio guide may present still another angle, perhaps including additional interpretive material such as interview snippets from art historians. When a text is translated, the resulting target text not only relates intertextually to the source text from which it was derived, but also to the whole ensemble of other target texts, which in turn work together as a coherent whole while also reproducing the overall intertextual effect of the source text system. This systemic approach to translation allows for adjustments at the level of individual texts in accordance with target audience needs. For instance, material not present in the English translation of a label may be made available in the audio guide. Different language versions can thus prioritize different information across different genres for particular audiences.

Moving from intertextual to intersemiotic[5] relations, the spatial and visual aspects of display also impact on translation strategy. Spatial restrictions are especially striking in the translation of object labels. Material in the source text may need to be excised in the interests of keeping the target text short enough to fit the designated space. This is a particular problem in translating from a spatially compact language such as Chinese, which can occupy half the space of English. Neather (2008) finds that one strategy is to cut material that is already "visually available" to the visitor. For instance, where a label in the Chinese source text indicates the design of an exhibited teapot as being a "flower and bird pattern", this is deleted from the English as the pattern is already visually clear. Cutting of source elements in the translation can also involve spatial aesthetics, where for instance two languages side by side need to appear visually balanced. Still a further question of textual layout is code preference: the spatial positioning of a language in a multilingual ensemble can be used to indicate it as the "preferred code", the preference being made for a variety of possible reasons including geopolitical or thematic considerations.

3. Addressing different visitors

Museum texts are constructed with consideration as to how much information is needed to achieve the museum's purpose, and how best the different texts in the museum text system can deliver this information to the intended target visitors. Ravelli (2006) proposes that museum texts be analysed in terms of three frameworks which broadly correspond to the concepts of Field, Tenor and Mode in systemic functional linguistics. The representational framework concerns the information content of the text, the interactional framework denotes how the text addresses its readers, while the organizational framework addresses organization at both the clause and sentence levels as well as the broader genre structure. While Ravelli's work deals with a monolingual context, it provides a useful way of thinking about modifications in the translation of museum texts. At the representational level, information may be cut not only for reasons such as space, discussed above, but also because it is perceived as unnecessary or overly specific for target language visitors. Equally, other information content will be added. Neather (2008) analyses a historical text in a Hong Kong museum, in which significant foregrounding of Chinese dynastic names occurs, where these are backgrounded in the source text. In another Hong Kong museum, texts in an exhibition on Cantonese Opera evince a consistent tendency on the part of the translator to repackage key information into a series of bullet points, a modification that relates to the organizational framework. Elsewhere, at the interactional level, it is often necessary to introduce a "cultural filter" to modify the tenor of a text or to make it more interpersonally interactive (e.g., in the use of questions) where in the source it is not.

Such modifications reflect more fundamental differences in museum and visual epistemologies across cultures. This is powerfully evident in more complex interpretive texts such as the explanations accompanying traditional Chinese paintings in an online museum catalogue analysed by Jiang (2012). Jiang examines "visual distance cues", which have a crucial ostensive function, inviting the viewer to read the painting and the different dimensions of distance in the landscape it depicts, in a particular way. How such cues are reflected in translation relates to culturally different ways of seeing, and to how pointers to visual aesthetic appreciation are differently encoded in different linguacultures. Visitors viewing the painting with reference to the English version of the accompanying text may thus experience the painting differently to those using the Chinese version. In a similar vein, Guillot (2014) contrasts French and English labels in an exhibition on the artist Lucien Freud, noting that differences levels of technicality and subjectivity (both more pronounced in the French texts) suggest contrasting approaches to the construction and presentation of knowledge in the French and Anglo-Saxon museum cultures. Thus, Guillot (2014: 91) cautions, "It is critical for museums to recognise that foreign visitors bring with them different assumptions about, and expectations of, the museum".

These issues of addressing different language audience expectations within the same museum space are particularly acute in certain environments such as trauma and memorial museums: if the museum speaks to the trauma of a particular local populace, can it also speak to the needs of international heritage tourists? Deane-Cox (2014), for example, discusses a French memorial museum and the extent to which shifts in the English translations of the French source texts are successful in constructing "prosthetic memory" – an empathetic engagement with the collective memory of others – in English-speaking visitors whose cultural background places them outside the French local populace's shared context of remembrance. In a more multilingual context, Deganutti et al. (2018) show how multilingual resources can structure remembrance in terms of "agonistic memory", a form of memory that seeks to include the voices of all participating sides in a conflict. In certain cases, museums may even create two strikingly different narratives. Liao (2015) details the case of a bilingual Chinese/English exhibition in the UK which presented the work of an orientalist British photographer: while the English texts established a tone that critiqued the photographer's cold, imperialist gaze towards his Chinese subjects, the Chinese text presented a much more positive, Chinese-friendly picture.

4. Future directions

Studies of museum translation have tended to focus on analysis of the intersemiotic exhibition environment, textual adjustments, the construction of dual narratives, or questions of translation quality (see Quality in translation[1]). Issues surrounding the production and consumption of museum translations, however, have seen less scholarly interest. Some ethnographic[1] research involving curator interviews has explored the interactions and mechanisms at work in the production process, and the acquisition of translation expertise among museum professionals. With regard to the consumption of translations, while museum studies research has seen a strong focus on the visitor perspective, little empirical research exists regarding the visitor experience of bilingual and multilingual exhibitions, and how translation is used by visitors from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This, then, is perhaps the most pressing task for future inquiry, an inquiry that will not only benefit the further theorization of museum translation, but will also have significant practical relevance for museum translators.

References

Bennett, Tony. 2006. "Exhibition, Difference, and the Logic of Culture." In *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, ed. by Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, 46–69. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2014. "Remembering Oradour-sur-Glane: Collective Memory in Translation." *Translation and Literature* 23: 272–83. https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2014.0156

Deganutti, Marianna, Nina Parish, and Eleanor Rowley. 2018. "Representing Multilingual Difficult History: Voices of the First World War in the Kobarid Museum (Slovenia) and the Historial de la Grande Guerre (France)." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 29: 63–80.

Guillot, Marie-Noëlle. 2014. "Cross-cultural Pragmatics and Translation: The Case of Museum Texts as Interlingual Representation." In *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. by Juliane House, 73–95. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137025487_5

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.

Jiang, Chengzhi. 2012. "Visual Pragmatic Effects of Distance Representation in Bilingual Museum Catalogue Entries of Chinese Landscape Paintings." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (12): 1639–1660. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.07.002

Liao, Min-Hsiu. 2015. "One Photo, Two Stories: Chinese Photos in British Museums." *East Asian Journal of Popular Culture* 1 (2): 177–191. https://doi.org/10.1386/eapc.1.2.177_1

Neather, Robert. 2008. "Translating Tea: On the Semiotics of Interlingual Practice in the Hong Kong Museum of Tea Ware." *Meta: Translators' Journal* 53 (1): 218–240. https://doi.org/10.7202/017984ar

Neather, Robert. 2021. “Museums as Translation Zones”. In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Globalization*, ed. by Esperança Bielsa and Dionysios Kapsaskis, 306–319. London: Routledge.

Ravelli, Louise. 2006. *Museum Texts: Communication Frameworks*. London: Routledge.

Sturge, Kate. 2007. *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Whitehead, Christopher. 2012. *Interpreting Art in Museums and Galleries*. London: Routledge.

Further essential reading

Bennett, Tony. 2018. *Museums, Power, Knowledge: Selected Essays*. London: Routledge.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 1992. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203415825

Liao, Min-Hsiu. 2018. “Museums and Creative Industries: The Contribution of Translation Studies.” *Journal of Specialised Translation* 29: 45–62.

Neather, Robert. 2018. “Museums, Material Culture, and Cultural Representations.” In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, ed. by Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés, 361–378. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315670898-20

Silverman, Raymond A. (ed.). 2015. *Museum as Process: Translating Local and Global Knowledges*. London: Routledge.

NGOs and translation

Wine Tesseur
Dublin City University

1. Defining "NGOs"

The term non-governmental organisations (NGOs) tends to bring to mind images of charities helping those living in poverty, or of citizens who unite in environmental and human rights campaigns. Yet defining NGOs is notoriously difficult. In fact, they are often defined by what they are not rather than by what they are: non-profit organisations that operate independently from the government. As an umbrella term, NGO refers to a wide variety of organisations. These include the type of charities already mentioned, who provide assistance in humanitarian and development contexts, as well as advocacy NGOs that focus on human rights, animal rights or environmental issues. What is perhaps lesser known is that there are organisations working in other sectors too that are defined as NGOs. For example, some NGOs work in science (e.g., the International Council for Science), sports (e.g., International Association for Sports and Leisure Facilities, IAKS), or even the business sector (e.g., International Chamber of Commerce; Davies 2014).

The origins of the term shed more light on why "NGO" refers to such a heterogeneous mix of organisations that seem to have little in common. It was first used in the 1945 United Nations Charter to differentiate between (inter)governmental agencies, such as the World Health Organisation, and private organisations. In its Charter, the UN referred to (inter)governmental agencies as "specialised agencies", and to private organisations as "non-governmental", but the term was left undefined. Private organisations nevertheless were quick to adopt the new terminology, although the term NGO did not move outside the sphere of international diplomacy until the 1970s (Willetts 2011: 7). Many of the organisations involved in UN policy making are international NGOs, which means that they have their roots in one country and are active in at least one other. In this entry, the focus is on international NGOs that provide humanitarian and development assistance and that engage in right-based advocacy work.

International NGOs are often described as new powerful actors in world affairs. They have significantly increased their influence in geopolitics during the second half of the 20th century by for example gaining more participation rights in various UN

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.ngo1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

assemblies and councils (Willetts 2011). In addition, INGOs position themselves as being able to mobilise and represent citizens from around the world in campaigns for justice and rights. The increase in the sheer number of INGOs around the world is also often cited as a way to describe INGOs as new forces in international politics. The Yearbook of International Organisations 2014–2015 listed 59,383 international NGOs versus 7,756 International Organisations (Union of International Associations 2014). These numbers should be treated with some caution: critics have argued that the phenomenon of international private organisations predates the introduction of the term NGO, so speaking of a new, unprecedented phenomenon is not entirely just (Davies 2014). Nevertheless, there are now seven times as many INGOs as International Organisations, so INGOs are prevalent global actors. Through their participation in global political debates and through their engagement with citizens, they influence social, political and economic global processes.

The geopolitical position of international NGOs has not gone uncriticised. Firstly, their ability to represent those living in poverty and suffering human rights abuses is frequently questioned, given that many INGOs do not have members and they often lack internal democratic processes for leader election (Willetts 2011: 2). Secondly, as organisations that traditionally have their roots in countries in the Global North and that receive funding from powerful Northern-based governmental donors, such as USAID, questions have been raised on whose agenda they serve, i.e., that of their so-called beneficiaries, or that of their donors? (Banks, Hulme, & Edwards 2015). In addition, the traditional lingua franca of the INGO sector is English, which raises further questions on representation, inclusivity, and social justice. Therefore, there is a need for research on INGOs' translation and interpreting practices to better understand how these organisations influence global sociocultural, economic and political processes.

2. NGOs and translation

Over the last two decades, research that explores aspects of translation and interpreting in the context of NGOs has been on the rise. Phenomena that have been investigated include Community interpreting[1] in contexts where charities and humanitarian organisations are active, as well as activist networks of translators and interpreters that support NGOs in their work (see Committed approaches and activism[1], Networking and volunteer translation[1], Non-professional translation and interpreting[5]). More recently, the translation and interpreting practices of international NGOs themselves have become the topic of in-depth investigation. This growing body of research generally draws on sociological approaches (see Sociology of translation[1]) to investigate various aspects of multilingual work in INGOs, including the role of translators/interpreters, the process of translation/interpreting in its institutional and sociopolitical context, and translation products.

The UK-based “Listening Zones of NGOs” project was one of the first major research investigations that explored the role of languages and cultural knowledge in the work of international development NGOs (Footitt, Crack, and Tesseur 2018, 2020). Key findings of the research include that languages tend to have a low profile in international development NGOs, with English serving as the Lingua franca[5]. Translation and interpreting needs are often not taken into account in project plans and budgets, nor in project monitoring and evaluation. This is despite the fact that some of the largest INGOs such as Save the Children, Oxfam and Tearfund have institutionalised their translation services over the course of the last decade or so by establishing small internal translation teams in their organisational headquarters (Footitt, Crack, & Tesseur 2018, 2020). These findings echo those of Tesseur (2014), whose doctoral dissertation on translation in Amnesty International describes a similar paradox: on the one hand, Amnesty had been institutionalising its approach to translation by establishing its own Language Resource Centre, while on the other hand, translation was described by Amnesty staff as an “afterthought” when planning human rights investigations.

To explain this seeming paradox, it is important to note that INGOs’ internal translation services largely translate documents targeted at an external audience, such as media materials and reports intended for institutional donors, academics and journalists. In addition, internal services do not tend to provide interpreting support, and usually only provide translation in a handful of languages. These typically include European and former colonial languages, i.e., English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, although the need for Arabic has increased in recent years due to prolonged conflict in the Middle East.

Given the limited focus of INGOs’ internal services, the actual translators and interpreters of much NGO material are usually not the professional translators based in INGO headquarters. Research by Heywood and Harding (2020), Tesseur and Footitt (2019) and Delgado Luchner and Kherbiche (2018) provides more insight into who these translators and interpreters are, i.e., a mix of NGO staff and other professional development practitioners who have the appropriate language skills (although have not been trained in translation or interpreting), volunteers, or locally recruited and trained translators/interpreters, sometimes themselves belonging to the NGOs’ so-called beneficiaries (e.g., refugees or local citizens).

The fact that many of the actors who conduct translation and interpreting work are not language professionals raises a need for training. Some academically-led initiatives on translation and interpreting in conflict and crisis settings have started to address this need. The InZone Centre at the University of Geneva is well-known for its ground-breaking work on training interpreters in conflict zones (Moser-Mercer, Kherbiche, & Class 2014), and has trained interpreters for the UN Refugee Agency (UNCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross. Another example is the work of the International Network on Crisis Translation (INTERACT), which has aimed to address the need for translation training in crisis settings by amongst others working with the New Zealand Red Cross to develop training materials for quickly recruited "citizen translators" in crisis situations (Federici & Cadwell 2018).

Some researchers have also started exploring the potential use of Machine Translation[1] to assist NGOs in their translation and interpreting needs, particularly in crisis contexts (Federici & O'Brien 2020; Cadwell, O'Brien, & DeLuca 2019). The use of these tools by INGOs is limited at the moment. Given the rapidly evolving nature and quality of Machine Translation and other language technologies, such as speech recognition and interpreting tools, this is an area of great potential for future research and applicability in the international NGO sector.

Finally, some research has focused on the translated products and processes of meaning construction in translating NGO material, such as Hawker's (2018) description of the journey of human rights testimony from the witness's spoken language to the final written translations, and Tesseur's (2014) analysis of a corpus of source and target texts of NGO media and campaigning materials. Furthermore, the difficulty of translating many of the concepts that are central to the work of NGOs is an issue that has started to be explored in Todorova (2018) and in Footitt, Crack and Tesseur (2020). These contributions lay bare the challenges involved in translating concepts that are central to NGO work, such as advocacy, gender and accountability, which stem from a particularly Western view of the world and are therefore often challenging to translate. Translation here thus illustrates wider geopolitical tensions, i.e., the fact that concepts tend to travel together with the financial support from powerful donors in the Global North to the countries in which INGOs conduct their work.

In conclusion, research on translation and interpreting in INGOs is a recent development, and there remains much scope for future studies. The potential of new language technologies and their applicability to NGO work is one promising avenue for research. Furthermore, up until now studies have represented the limited point of view of INGOs from the Global North. There is thus scope for research that engages with other actors, such as INGOs that have their roots in the Global South, smaller civil society organisations, as well as space for closer engagement with the local communities and citizens that INGOs work with. By exploring these avenues, Translation and Interpreting Studies can add new insights to translation phenomena in today's globalised world that are relevant to the home discipline as well as to others such as Development Studies, International Development, or Global Media and Communication Studies.

References

Banks, Nicola, David Hulme, and Michael Edwards. 2015. "NGOs, States, and Donors Revisited: Still Too Close for Comfort?" *World Development* 66: 707–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.09.028

Cadwell, Patrick, Sharon O'Brien, and Eric DeLuca. 2019. "More than Tweets: A Critical Reflection on Developing and Testing Crisis Machine Translation Technology." *Translation Spaces* 8 (2): 300–333. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.19018.cad

Davies, Tom. 2014. *NGOs: A New History of Transnational Civil Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199387533.001.0001

Delgado Luchner, Carmen, and Leïla Kherbiche. 2018. "Without Fear or Favour? The Positionality of ICRC and UNHCR Interpreters in the Humanitarian Field." *Target* 30 (3): 408–29. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17108.del

Federici, Federico M., and Patrick Cadwell. 2018. "Training Citizen Translators Design and Delivery of Bespoke Training on the Fundamentals of Translation for New Zealand Red Crossangel." *Translation Spaces* 7 (1): 20–43. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00002.fed

Federici, Federico M., and Sharon O'Brien, eds. 2020. *Translation in Cascading Crises*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Footitt, Hilary, Angela Crack, and Wine Tesseur. 2018. "Respecting Communities in International Development: Languages and Cultural Understanding." http://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/modern-languages-and-european-studies/Listening_zones_report_-EN.pdf.

Footitt, Hilary, Angela Crack, and Wine Tesseur. 2020. *Listening, Power and Inclusion: Languages in Development NGOs*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51776-2

Hawker, Nancy. 2018. "The Journey of Arabic Human Rights Testimonies, from Witnesses to Audiences via Amnesty International." *Translation Spaces* 7 (1): 65–91. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00004.haw

Heywood, Emma, and Sue-Ann Harding. 2020. "'If You've Done a Good Job, It's as If You've Never Existed': Translators on Translation in Development Projects in the Sahel." *Translation Studies* 12 (1): 18–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2020.1749122.

Moser-Mercer, Barbara, Leïla Kherbiche, and Barbara Class. 2014. "Interpreting Conflict: Training Challenges in Humanitarian Field Interpreting." *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 6 (1): 140–58. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/hut025

Tesseur, Wine. 2014. "Transformation through Translation: Translation Policies at Amnesty International." Unpublished PhD thesis. Aston University. Available at : https://publications.aston.ac.uk/id/eprint/26207/1/Tesseur_Wine_2015.pdf

Tesseur, Wine, and Hilary Footitt. 2019. "Professionalisms at War? Interpreting in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations." *Journal of War & Culture Studies* July: 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/17526272.2019.1644415

Todorova, Marija. 2018. "Civil Society in Translation: Innovations to Political Discourse in Southeast Europe." *The Translator* 24 (4): 353–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2019.1586071

Union of International Associations (ed.). 2014. *Yearbook of International Organizations 2014–2015. Volume 5: Statistics, Visualizations and Patterns*. Leiden & Boston: Brill & Martinus Nijhoff.

Willetts, Peter. 2011. *Non-Governmental Organizations in World Politics*. Global Institutions. Abingdon: Routledge.

Non-professional translators and interpreters

Rachele Antonini
University of Bologna

Non-professional interpreters and translators (NPIT) are bi/multilingual speakers who interpret and/or translate in a variety of formal and informal contexts and settings, who have received little or no formal education or training in translation or interpreting (see Teaching translation/Training translators[3]) and are often not remunerated for their work.

Translation and interpreting are ancient practices, probably two of the oldest human activities. Ever since the need to overcome language barriers emerged, communities and peoples have had the need to rely on the skills of individuals able to speak two or more languages. Hence, throughout history the role they played contributed to facilitating cultural, economic and religious communication and contact. In the past seventy years, the onset and growth of globalization, mobility of people, trade, armed conflicts, and the IT revolution have triggered an exponential rise in the demand for linguistic mediation services in all areas of public and private life. The mismatch between this demand and the reality of the often-insufficient provision of linguistic mediation services has resulted in the increase of the use of non-professionals in almost all the domains where professionals would normally be employed.

1. Definitions

The study of NPIT stemmed in the 1970s from the notion of the Natural translator[2], a theory that conceptualized the ability to translate and interpret as a quasi-universal natural aptitude. According to this hypothesis natural translators mediate "(i) culturally (i.e. in all cultures); (ii) linguistically (in all languages and all registers); (iii) historically (throughout history); or (iv) ontogenetically and linguo-developmentally (from the moment that an individual starts to acquire a second language)" (Harris & Sherwood 1978: 155).

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.non1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

One of the main extensions of the natural translator hypothesis is Harris' (2017) attempt to reconcile Toury's notion of the native translator with the initial concept of the natural translator. Harris conceptualizes a continuum from natural to (beginner and then advanced) native translator to expert/professional translators that offers a more nuanced categorization of the different levels that a bilingual speaker may reach according to the kind of (acquired) competence and expertise they have gained.

Drawing from Harris' concept of the natural translator, Whyatt (2017) applies a cognitive developmental perspective to the innate ability of bilinguals to translate on a continuum ranging from a natural predisposition to translate to untrained ability, trained skill, competence and expertise as the final stage.

Criticisms to the natural translation hypothesis challenged the premise that bilingualism[3] is a precondition for the development of translation competence arguing that this depends on other factors, namely fluency, motivation, specific and specialized knowledge, strategies and techniques used to translate.

The term NPIT has recently gained wider currency and is rapidly surpassing other labels that are used to define this practice and that include, inter alia, ad hoc interpreting, family interpreting, informal interpreting, lay interpreting and translation. Even though, in previous decades, NPIT had been used to describe interpreting and translation practices performed by non-professionals (see, for instance, Knapp-Potthoff & Knapp 1986; Lörscher 1991), it is only recently that this area of translation and interpreting studies has commanded the attention and scrutiny of academia and the public sphere alike. This represents a significant departure from an academic- or professionally-oriented research agenda informed by "institutionalized forms of interpreting practice and learning" (Boeri 2012: 117) which often problematizes the notion of NPIT and its existence by representing it as non-normative, damaging and antithetical to professional practice, norms and skills (see also Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva 2012; Ozolins 2014). Indeed, the characterization of non-professional interpreters and translators generally relies on the juxtaposition with and, by default, the non-compliance to the criteria that are used to denote professionals, according to which "a professional is *recruited* to do a specific job, for which s/he will be *paid* and which s/he will do complying with a specific set of rules, i.e. with a *code of ethics and standards of practice*. Her/his professional status will also normally involve *social prestig*e" (emphasis in the original, Antonini et al. 2017: 7). As pointed out also in other analyses of NPIT (e.g., Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva 2012; Ozolins 2014) these demarcation lines between professionals and non-professionals are blurry and slippery. Moreover, labelling NPIT as the dark side of its professional counterpart is no longer adequate to define and describe a complex and distinct phenomenon that is emerging as an area of study in its own right.

2. Domains of NPIT

Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva (2012) provide a comprehensive analysis of the *raison d'être* of NPIT, which encompass geopolitical, socio-economic and/or socio-professional reasons (Boeri 2012), as well as undeveloped language services and/or negative or hostile institutional attitudes that create a situation in which "non-speakers of the majority language must provide their own solutions to communication" (Ozolins 2014: 32).

In terms of impact, visibility and research, NPIT is still a submersed phenomenon. While there are no data on the amount of non-professional activities that are carried out nor any available estimates on its economic value, on the basis of extant literature and resources it can be safely assumed that professional and non-professional mediation practices (for all modes and types of interpreting and translation) coexist in all those domains where language services are needed.

NPIT is practiced in sectors that include, but are not restricted to business, community, public and community services, conflict/war and crisis management, the judicial/legal sector, media, religion, sports, tourism. In these domains, NPIT is either performed at an individual level, as an alternative option to professional interpreting and translation or as a form of unrecognized translation,[1] or through collective efforts as is the case with crowdsourcing and volunteer interpreting/translation (see Collaborative translation ②).

What is also worth noting is that for all the domains listed above and which are described below there is great potential for broader research efforts.

2.1 Non-professional interpreters and translators in the media

The role and activities of non-professional interpreters and translators in the media ① have been the focus of a growing body of studies. Research has focused on the occurrence of NPIT in terms of modes of interpreting/translation, genre ④ (fictional, non-fictional, reality shows, etc.), type (live or recorded events and programmes), and broadcast medium (cinema, television, radio) (Antonini & Bucaria 2015). NPIT in the media may take the form of, among others, community translation (the translation by non-professionals of software or websites also referred to as collaborative translation, crowdsourcing, and user-based translation); fan dubbing and subbing

---

[1] Brian Harris uses unrecognized translation in one of the posts in his blog Unprofessional Translation (3 March 2010). This term denotes those NPIT practices that occur within the practice of other jobs, such as journalism or academia. This blog is to date one of the main resources for information on natural translation, native translation and language brokering, with posts and threads that provide a current perspective on initiatives, events, and trends in the world of NPIT.

(fan-made dubbing and subtitling[1] of films, TV and web programmes and series); fun dubbing and subbing (dubbing and subtitling created with humorous purposes; see Voiceover and dubbing[1]); videogame localization[1] (gamer-made localization of computer and smart device videogames); scanlation (the scanning, translation, and editing of comics by fans); media interpreting/translation (non-professionals who interpret/translate in entertainment, journalism, sports).

2.2 Non-professional interpreters and translators in community and public services

The community[1] and public services domain is where non-professionals (adults and children alike) are extensively and increasingly involved as interpreters and/or translators. In many countries, the emergence of super diverse linguistic landscapes has not been met with an adequate provision of language services to allow foreigners and immigrants to access public and community services and interact with mainstream institutions of the host country. Whenever professional services are either not available or provided, these people will rely on the help of family members (adults but also children) and friends, or on the cultural and linguistic mediation by the members of their ethnic/linguistic community. In this specific domain, non-professionals are not only likely to act prevalently as liaison and community interpreters in formal settings such as education, health, public offices, police, prison, but also informally in a huge range of situations (see, for instance, Baraldi & Gavioli 2012; Schouten 2012).

2.3 Non-professional interpreters and translators in conflict and war

The study of the work of non-professional interpreters and translators in conflict[4] and war as well as crisis and disaster management is quite recent and has thus yielded a scattering of publications. Research on NPIT in conflict and war has focused mainly on the role played by civilians involved as interpreters during past and present conflict situations in aiding foreign armies in communicating with local populations (Ruiz Rosendo & Barea Muñoz 2017). Studies on NPIT in crisis and disaster management (also labelled humanitarian translation) have looked at the involvement of volunteer/activist interpreters and translators' networks in providing urgent language services (Federici & O'Brien 2019).

2.4 Child language brokering

Language and cultural mediation activities performed by children and adolescents fall under the rubric of child language brokering (CLB). CLB refers to the linguistic and cultural mediation activities performed by bilingual children who, in formal and informal contexts and domains, mediate for their family, friends, as well as members of the linguistic community to which they belong. Though these activities are generally associated with the children of immigrant groups, in reality, CLB takes place within all linguistic minority groups (including, for instance, signing communities and heritage linguistic minorities), namely, in all those situations in which people who do not share the same language and culture come into contact and need to communicate. Within NPIT studies, this area of research is perhaps the most developed and multidisciplinary. Research on CLB gained momentum in the 1990s and over the past three decades it has not only contributed to giving visibility to this phenomenon to the research world, but also and foremost, to educators, social service providers and policy makers. The study of CLB can be subsumed into specific thematic areas that have developed over the past five decades that focus specifically on the outcomes of CLB practices rather than the setting of the domain in which it takes place: (i) CLB and academic performance; (ii) cognitive and sociolinguistic outcomes of CLB; (iii) CLB and parent-child relationship; (iv) psychological outcomes of CLB; (v) CLB and language racialization and socialization in immigrant communities (Antonini 2019).

There are several interesting and emerging avenues of research that would benefit from increased investigation. They are related to the role played by non-professional interpreters and translators in religious contexts (e.g., church interpreting and religious[1] translation), in the judicial/legal sector, sign language interpreting (as performed by both adults and children of deaf adults – Codas), business and tourism[5] (Baraldi & Gavioli 2012).

References

Antonini, Rachele. 2019. "Children as Language Brokers." In *Oxford Bibliographies in Childhood Studies*, ed. by Heather Montgomery. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199791231-0217

Antonini, Rachele, and Chiara Bucaria (eds). 2015. *Non-professional Interpreting and Translation in the Media*. Warszawa: Peter Lang. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-04731-8

Antonini, Rachele, Letizio Cirillo, Linda Rossato, and Ira Torresi. 2017. "Introducing NPIT studies." In *Non-professional Interpreting and Translation. State of the Art and Future of an Emerging Field of Research*, ed. by Rachele Antonini, Letizia Cirillo, Linda Rossato, and Ira Torresi, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.129.01ant

Baraldi, Claudio and Laura Gavioli. 2012. *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.102

Boéri, Julie. 2012. "Ad Hoc Interpreting at the Crossways between Natural, Professional, Novice and Expert Interpreting." In *Interpreting Brian Harris. Recent Development in Translatology*, ed. by María Amparo Jiménez Ivars, and María Jesús Blasco Mayor, 117–131. Bern: Peter Lang. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0381-6

Federici, Federico M., and Sharon O'Brien. 2019. *Translation in Cascading Crises*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429341052

Harris, Brian, and Bianca Sherwood. 1978. "Translating as an Innate Skill." In *Language Interpretation and Communication*, ed. by David Gerver and H. Wallace Sinaiko, 155–170. New York: Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-9077-4_15

Knapp-Potthoff, Annelie, and Karlfried Knapp. 1986. "Interweaving Two Discourses. The Difficult Task of the Non-professional Interpreter". In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, ed. by Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 151–168. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.46.3.570

Lörscher, Wolfgang. 1991. *Translation Performance, Translation Process, and Translation Strategies. A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.38.4.16dan

Ozolins, Uldis, 2014. "Descriptions of interpreting and their ethical consequences." *FITISPos International Journal* 1 (1): 23–41. https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2014.1.0.9

Pérez-González, Luis, and Şebnem Susam-Saraeva. 2012. *Non-professionals Translating & Interpreting. The Translator* 18 (2). https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799506

Ruiz Rosendo, Lucía, and Manuel Barea Muñoz. 2017. "Towards a typology of interpreters in war-related scenarios in the Middle East." *Translation Spaces* 6 (2): 182–208. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.6.2.01rui

Schouten, Barbara, Jonathan Ross, Rena Zendedel, and Ludwien Meeuwesen. 2012. "Informal interpreters in medical settings: A comparative socio-cultural study of the Netherlands and Turkey." *The Translator* 18 (2): 311–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799513

Whyatt, Boguslawa. 2017. "We are all translators: Investigating the Human Ability to Translate from a Developmental Perspective." In *Non-professional Interpreting and Translation. State of the Art and Future of an Emerging Field of Research*, ed. by Rachele Antonini, Letizia Cirillo, Linda Rossato, and Ira Torresi, 45–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.129.03why

Post-editing

Sharon O'Brien
Dublin City University

1. Historical context

"Post-editing" is the term used to describe the activity of revising a text that has been translated automatically by a Machine Translation① (MT) system. A basic description of the activity is that the editor, who is typically a trained translator, compares the source text with the "raw" translation produced by the MT system, identifies any errors, including omissions, unwanted additions, grammatical and stylistic problems and fixes them by revising the translation. While MT has been in development for very many years, it really only became sophisticated enough in the 1980s to warrant application in real-world translation settings, and this is the era in which we start to hear about post-editing in practice (see, for example, Vasconcellos 1985, Wagner 1985). At that time, the most common process involved sending text to the MT system and then editing it post-MT, hence the affix "post" in post-editing. At the time of writing, new ways of interacting with MT systems have been developed, which calls into question the appropriateness of the term (see Section 2.4 for further discussion). Nonetheless, the term is still very common and will probably continue to be so for some time to come. Post-editing is basically a form of translation revision②, except that the post-editor is revising translation produced automatically by an MT system, rather than translation produced by a (human) translator.[1] The task differs from the traditional notion of revision in that the types of errors generated by an MT system will differ from those created by a translator.

---

[1] The meaning of the terms revision, proofreading and editing can overlap. Paraphrasing Mossop (2011), revision is the process of looking over a translation to check its quality, whereas proofreading often signifies a monolingual re-reading of the text. Editing can refer to implementation of edits and/or formatting a text.

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.pos3

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

2. Issues and debates

Demand for post-editing is rising. This is due to the fact that significant advances have been made in MT technology since the early 2000s. First, a new approach to MT was introduced called Statistical Machine Translation (SMT), which used previous translations to learn about translation and, in so doing, produced raw MT output that was significantly better than previous types of MT systems. In the mid-2000s, SMT was overtaken by another approach called "Neural Machine Translation" (NMT – see Forcada 2017), which raised the quality[1] level again. As a result of this new level of quality, post-editing became even more common in the translation industry. More and more companies started using MT and post-editing (often abbreviated to MTPE) as a way of producing translation faster and for lower cost. Needless to say, this has created a number of significant issues for translators and for companies who want to implement this new way of working. The main issues have to do with productivity, cost, quality, technology and training.

2.1 Productivity

The term productivity refers to how quickly a translation can be produced. Although there are many stages involved in the production of a translation (e.g., source content creation, glossary and style guide creation, translation, proofing etc.), when it comes to post-editing the productivity debate focuses on how many words a translator can edit to an agreed level of quality in one day. Expectations about translation productivity vary depending on the language pair, the content type, what technological support the translator is using etc., but, generally speaking, a translator would be expected to produce between 2,000 and 3,000 words per day without using a computer-aided translation tool. With machine translation doing some of the work, expectations are that post-editing would lead to increased productivity. A significant issue in the early days of post-editing was what level of productivity increase could be realistically expected? Commercial companies sometimes had unrealistic expectations about this. On the other hand, translators tended to underestimate what could be achieved. A considerable amount of research has been done on post-editing productivity. In general, this research suggests that it is not unrealistic to expect gains of 30% on average in translator productivity with MTPE (see, for example, Plitt & Masselot 2010; Guerberof Arenas 2014; Gaspari et al. 2014; Koponen 2016). However, we need to treat this generalisation carefully, because research has also shown that this depends on a number of factors including the language pair, the MT system, the content type and the individual translator. In summary, with a good MT system, trained with a large volume of appropriate and high-quality data, and with an enthusiastic and trained translator, post-editing can be faster than translating without computer-aided translation tools. An important question to add here, however, is what does this increased productivity do to the quality of the translation and to cost?

2.2 Quality and cost

As mentioned above, the quality produced by MT systems has been improving over the past two decades with the adoption of statistical and neural approaches to MT. Initial assumptions by professional translators were that the quality produced through MTPE could not possibly be as good as that produced in more traditional ways. However, research has again demonstrated that the quality produced via MTPE is not necessarily inferior, and this is not because translators simply delete and retranslate the MT output (Guerberof Arenas 2009).

NMT systems are acknowledged as having created a significant improvement over SMT. Yet, it is very important to acknowledge that errors can still exist in NMT output and so post-editing is required if a publisher of information wishes to be assured of the quality. One of the interesting dilemmas associated with the improvements brought about by NMT is that the raw MT output can read very fluently, but may still have mistakes. Arguably, the task of post-editing may have become more challenging with NMT; the errors produced by SMT and older types of MT systems were what one might call “glaring” – i.e., errors that a trained translator would not normally make and are relatively easy to identify. With increased fluency in NMT output, it is more difficult now to identify errors.

When post-editing started to become more common, a differentiation was made between levels of post-editing, with two concepts coming to the fore: “light post-editing” and “full post-editing”. Some guidelines were developed to try to differentiate between the two (see TAUS: Online). A light post-edit was, as the name suggests, a light touch edit where only the most serious errors in meaning and grammar were fixed. A full post-edit, on the other hand, fixed not only errors in meaning and grammar, but also stylistic errors. The main objective of the full post-edit was to produce a translation that was more or less equivalent to what a professional translator might produce, whereas the light post-edit was to ensure that the translation could be understood, that there were no serious errors, but it was accepted that it might not be stylistically perfect. As post-editing has gradually become a more mainstream task in the production of translated content, however, most companies claim that they do not want any compromise in their quality and so full post-editing is the most common type.

An issue that is very closely linked with quality is that of cost, specifically what price is paid for the task of post-editing. When translation memory (TM) tools were introduced (see Section 2.4 as well as Computer-aided translation[1] and Translation tools[1]), the translation industry needed time to adjust to an agreed pricing system for editing exact matches, fuzzy matches etc. Similarly, as post-editing has become more mainstream, a debate on how the task should be remunerated is ongoing. Most translation clients took the initial view that a price per word was the best way to remunerate the task. However, this met with resistance among translators who found that productivity varied greatly depending on the MT system, language pair, type of content and so on. At the time of writing, there is some discussion ongoing about the feasibility of a model that would remunerate per hour worked. However, these thorny pricing issues have not yet been resolved.

2.3 Training

The task of translation has become increasingly technologised over the past two decades (O’Brien 2012; Doherty 2016). The introduction of computer-aided translation (CAT) tools, notably translation memory tools, had a significant impact on how translation is produced in the translation industry. When these tools were invented in the early 1990s, professional translators needed to be trained in how to use them. Eventually, academic translator training programmes also started to train students in these tools, their pros and their cons (see also Teaching translation/Training translators[3]). CAT tools, and TM tools in particular, are now a standard part of the professional translator’s toolbox and a standard component in many modern translator training programmes (O’Brien & Rodríguez Vázquez 2019). Machine translation has followed a similar trajectory and is now a core component in translator training programmes.

There is general agreement that teaching about MT necessarily includes teaching about post-editing. However, there is no agreement on where this is best placed in the curriculum (before or after acquisition of fundamental translation competence, at undergraduate or post-graduate level, early or later in the programme etc.). Some programmes have courses dedicated to post-editing, others incorporate it into the translation technology coursework, yet others include it in a course dedicated to revision skills. Where this training is placed in the translator training curriculum is not so important. What is important is that training in post-editing *is* included because it is a skill set that is required by many in today’s translation landscape. The focus ought to be on post-editing as a form of revision as well as a form of computer-aided translation, however, rather than on post-editing as a task that replaces the traditional task of translation and reduces the status of the translator (see Section 3).

2.4 Tools

As mentioned above, TM tools have been an important part of the modern translator’s toolkit for some time. MT, on the other hand, has matured only more recently.

Consequently, TM and MT have always been thought of as separate technologies. In fact, the term "computer-aided translation", or CAT, tends to include TM, but not MT. That situation is changing. MT as a feature has become integrated into TM tools. If there is no match in the TM above approximately 70-75%, a machine translated version of the sentence will appear, if that feature is enabled. The implications of this are significant, because for one segment of text the translator is editing a fuzzy match, or checking an exact match, for the next segment the translator might be post-editing. The tasks of proof-reading, revising, fuzzy match editing and post-editing are now integrated in one editing environment. Not only that, but tools developers have come up with advanced features such as "fuzzy match repair", which automatically fixes, or revises, a fuzzy match using information from the translation memory, from a glossary or from an MT engine. This means that fuzzy matches might also make use of MT.

Within some TM tools currently, adaptive MT is available – these are personalised MT engines built from a translator's own TM data. Furthermore, "interactive MT" is a feature that is built into some tools. Interactive MT involves editing the machine translated suggestion in real time. As the translator accepts or edits a word, the MT suggestion adapts to the translator's decisions. Clearly, this way of working brings into question the validity of the term *post*-editing as the editing is, in this context, happening on the fly. These are the relatively new features on offer at the time of writing. No doubt, there will be even more features in the very near future that serve to bring traditional TM and MT technologies closer together, fusing the tasks previously understood to be different. In fact, one of the original developers of TM technology has predicted that "CAT tools" (by which presumably is meant TM tools) will become obsolete, as NMT becomes the centre of the workflow (see: https://slator.com/people-moves/creator-of-trados-joins-summa-linguae-board-says-cat-tools-will-become-obsolete/).

3. Future outlook

At the time of writing this chapter, we are in a period of major transition and significant technological change. One could say that we are always in a period of transition, but significant strides have been made recently within the domain of artificial intelligence that seem to increase the speed of technological change, including within the translation landscape. We can reasonably expect MT to improve further. There is a certain sentiment of fear among the professional translator community about what impact this might have on the profession, about whether it will mean that translators will "only post-edit" in the future. This fear is not the preserve of professional translators. Many other professions are asking similar questions (Newman & Blanchard

2019). The general consensus is that AI will impact on jobs, including – as is already the case – the job of the professional translator. However, it will not make translators redundant, but the task will continue to change. MT has not reached a stage where it can produce error-free output and, due to the rich complexity and evolutionary nature of language, it is not expected that MT will get to that point any time in the near future. Any publisher who wants to stand over the quality of their content will need a translator to audit that content. There is evidence that, with the increased success of MT, comes a parallel growth in the volume and demand for translation globally. While more content is being machine translated, and sometimes published even without post-editing, ever more content is also being translated without MT. In fact, while MT might serve the need for informative or instructional content, it will not for the foreseeable future be able to provide creative content that "speaks" to a specific end user. Humans, with their superior emotional and creative intelligence, will have the upper hand for some time to come. This does not mean that MT cannot be used for creative content. It can in fact be used as a primer – a type of cognitive launchpad – rather than as a draft that needs revision. Some translators will not find it useful for this purpose, perhaps feeling that they cannot unchain themselves from the suggestion, but others might be able to use an MT suggestion as a launchpad, to create something very different from the original MT suggestion.

To conclude, MT post-editing is likely to become more and more common and will be seamlessly integrated into translation editing environments such that translators may no longer know the origin of the suggestions on offer to them within their editing tools. When this happens, the term "post-editing" might no longer be required. Instead, we will be writing about machine-augmented human translation.

References

Doherty, Stephen. 2016. "The Impact of Translation Technologies on the Process and Product of Translation." *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): 947–969.

Forcada, Mikel. 2017. "Making Sense of Neural Machine Translation." *Translation Spaces* 6 (2): 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.6.2.06for

Gaspari, Federico, Antonio Toral, Sudip Kumar Naskar, Declan Groves, and Andy Way. 2014. "Perception vs. Reality: Measuring Machine Translation Post-Editing Productivity." In *Proceedings of the 11th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas: Workshop on Post-editing Technology and Practice (WPTP3)*, ed. by Sharon O'Brien, Michel Simard, and Lucia Specia, 60–72. Vancouver, Canada.

Guerberof Arenas, Ana. 2009. "Productivity and Quality in MT Post-Editing." In *XII MT Summit Workshop: Beyond Translation Memories, 26–30 Aug 2009, Ottawa, Canada*. Available online at: http://doras.dcu.ie/23674/ (last checked on 27/03/2020).

Guerberof Arenas, Ana. 2014. “Correlations between Productivity and Quality when Post-Editing in a Professional Context.” *Machine Translation* 28: 165–186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10590-014-9155-y

Koponen, Maarit. 2016. “Is Machine Translation Post-Editing Worth the Effort? A Survey of Research into Post-Editing and Effort.” *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 25: 131–148.

Mossop, Brian. 2011. “Revision.” In: *Handbook of Translation Studies*, *Vol. 2*, ed. by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 135–139. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.2.rev1

Newman, Daniel and Olivier Blanchard. 2019. *Human/Machine: The Future of our Partnership with Machines*. London: Kogan Page.

O’Brien, Sharon. 2012. “Translation as Human-Computer Interaction.” *Translation Spaces* 1:101–122. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.1.05obr

O’Brien, Sharon and Silvia Rodríguez Vázquez. 2019. “Translation and Technology”. In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, ed. by Sara Laviosa and Maria González-Davies, 264–277. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367854850-17

Plitt, Mirko and François Masselot. 2010. “A Productivity Test of Statistical Machine Translation Postediting in a Typical Localisation Context.” *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 93: 7–16, 2010. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10108-010-0010-x

TAUS (Online). “MT Post-Editing Guidelines.” https://www.taus.net/academy/best-practices/postedit-best-practices/machine-translation-post-editing-guidelines.

Vasconcellos, Muriel. 1985. “Management of the Machine Translation Environment: Interaction of Functions at the Pan American Health Organization.” In *Tools for the Trade*, ed. by Veronica Lawson. Translating and the Computer 5, 115–129. London: Aslib.

Wagner, Elizabeth. 1985. “Rapid Post-Editing of Systran.” In *Tools for the Trade*, ed. by Veronica Lawson. Translating and the Computer 5, 199–213. London: Aslib.

Publishing in Translation Studies

Roberto A. Valdeón
South China Business College (SCBC)/University of Oviedo

1. Introduction

In a 2010 article aptly entitled “Bibliometrics as weapons of mass citation”, Molinié and Bodenhauden wrote that in the same way “as the ‘value’ of financial products is assessed by irresponsible ranking agencies, the value of scientific research is assessed by ill-conceived parameters such as citation indices, h-factors, and worst of all impact factors of journals” (2010: 78). Although Molinié and Bodenhausen focused on the hard sciences and noted that the social sciences and the humanities may in fact differ, the truth remains that contemporary translation studies (TS) scholars are under pressure to publish in international journals and prestigious book series in order to have access to stable academic positions or to be promoted. It has also produced a paradox: for a discipline that looks at translation in its various forms and language combinations, most high-ranked periodicals publish only in English, even if the language pair involved is, say, Chinese-Korean or Finnish-Swedish.

In addition to this, the popularity of translation and interpreting programs in countries such as China and Australia has meant an increase in the number of teaching and research staff wanting to secure their jobs. As a result, universities and other higher education institutions as well as national and regional departments of education have enforced strict measures to hire new staff. In many countries this is tantamount to publishing research outputs in specific outlets, be it international journals or book series, if scholars want to retain their contracts. This has created an asymmetrical relationship between the different agents involved, which Valdeón (2019) has classified into two groups, namely institutional agents on the one hand and individual agents on the other. The next two sections discuss these two categories.

2. Institutional agents

It is generally assumed that the market-driven nature of the contemporary academic system is a relatively new trend. However, authors like Wellmon (2015: 159) trace it back to the late nineteenth century following the German move to turn tertiary

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.pub1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

education institutions into research universities. Be that as it may, the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries have witnessed the appearance of numerous rankings aimed at evaluating universities on the one hand and their research units and academics on the other. For example, the QS World University Ranking, the Times Higher Education World University Ranking and the Best Global University Ranking publish annual lists of the best universities worldwide, considering, amongst other factors, the number and quality of their publications (see Bibliometrics[4]). In all these cases, the quality factor is associated with the major international journals of every discipline. Typically, this entails high impact factors based on the listings of the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) or the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI), both belonging to the Clarivate conglomerate. In Europe, the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR), developed by a public research group based in Spain but with strong links with Elsevier publishers, is also used as a reference. Europe's ERIH PLUS (a joint effort of the European Science Foundation and the Norwegian Centre for Research Data) also assesses international periodicals.

The latter in fact serves to exemplify the strong connection between public and private institutions in the consolidation of international journal rankings as one of the main factors, if not the main one, in the assessment of a researcher's scientific output. Many countries have established research assessment exercises to evaluate individual or departmental outputs. Spain's National Evaluation Agency, for instance, assesses publications by individual researchers, who can submit applications of six-year periods for evaluation, whereas the UK's REF (Research Excellence Framework) carries out evaluation through four national bodies aiming at measuring the impact of research units and elaborate university rankings. While both processes take into account a number of elements, journal impact factors are of great importance. This is also the case of Poland's Ministry of Science and Higher Education, which assigns points (20, 40, 70, 100, 140 and 200) to a list of international journals, and where a small number of TS journals are included (*Perspectives*, *The Translator and Interpreter Trainer* and *Translation Studies*, for example, occupy the first positions but none of them are granted 200 points).

Outside Europe, publishing in highly ranked journals is also recommended or expected. In China, for instance, Project 985 and Project 211 universities tend to hire staff who commit themselves to publish a certain number of articles in internationally recognized periodicals. In theory, researchers who do not meet those requirements can be dismissed, whereas those who manage to place their research in journals ranked in the Journal Citation Reports (owned by Clarivate) are more likely to retain their jobs and be promoted. In connection with this, Tian, Su and Ru (2016) found that young scholars in China are under great pressure to publish or perish to the detriment of other important activities, including teaching.

The focus on research papers published in highly-indexed journals has been highlighted by authors such as Franco and Rovira (2015), who have questioned the validity of using impact factors as the only method to assess the quality of an author's research or a department's output, particularly in a relatively small discipline such as TS (2015: 276). In their view, good research might also appear in less popular journals as well as in book collections and book series. However, in many academic traditions publishing in highly ranked journals continues to be the norm, which may explain the existence of a small number of highly competitive periodicals where most researchers would like to publish in order to further their academic careers. To counteract this tendency, some universities have their own depository of publications and require their staff to deposit pre-publication versions of their articles, which are then made available online.

This takes us to the second major institutional agent: the publishers. With the notable exception of *Meta*, funded by the University of Montreal, all the major international journals are published by private corporations. Huang and Liu (2019), who have recently surveyed the impact of the main international TS journals (listed in A&HCI, SSCI or both) for the period 2014–2018, mention a total of thirteen periodicals: three are published by research institutions (*Meta*, *Translation and Literature* and *Linguistica Antverpiensia*) and the rest by privately owned companies (Routledge, part of the Taylor and Francis group, publishes *Perspectives*, *The Translator*, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *Translation Studies* and *Translation Review* and John Benjamins publishes *Target*, *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *Babel*, and *Interpreting*). This means that the main bulk of TS research is in the hands of two publishing houses, which also publish other TS journals as well as book series (such as Routledge's Translation Practices Explained and the Benjamins Translation Library). Also worth noting is the fact that, although the major periodicals are available in print as well as electronic versions, journals are sold in packages together with related and unrelated journals. This means that access to TS journals by researchers will depend on the packages that their university or higher education institution has purchased.

Research output has, thus, become a commodity with a price tag attached to it. This has caused controversy in some countries, where universities no longer subscribe to expensive science publishers. In Finland, for instance, subscriptions to major publishers have been discontinued as a result of the increased costs, and also because it is argued that research is ordinarily funded by public institutions. Then major publishing companies make a profit by selling the findings to a large international readership. Paradoxically, many Nordic researchers use part of their project funds to cover the costs of making their research freely available through the Open Access options provided by the major publishers. This in turn is related to the so-called Plan S. Announced in September 2018, this initiative, put forward by a group of national funding organisations and supported by the European Commission and the European Research Council, aims to make research outputs funded by European funding bodies available to everyone "in Open Access Journal or through

Open Access Repositories without embargo" starting in 2020 (European Science Foundation 2018). This type of initiatives together with the continuous advances in technology applied to academic publishing will undoubtedly determine the future of TS research and its dissemination.

3. Individual agents

In the previous section I have argued that the requirements of research institutions have allowed private publishing companies to become the great repositories of research in general, and of TS research in particular. However, researchers can also choose to publish their work in other outlets. For example, the Language and Linguistics section of the SJR includes Open Access journals such as *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpreting* (published on behalf of the Slovak Association for the Study of English), *Translation & Interpreting* (hosted by Western Sydney University, Australia), *Sendebar* (published by the University of Granada, Spain), *Mutatis Mutandis* (published by the University of Antioquia, Colombia) and *inTRAlinea* (published by the University of Bologna, Italy), all of them with reliable editorial teams that ensure a fair peer review process. Thus, academics can be proactive in moving towards Open Access options and contribute to gradual changes in publication trends.

However, as many universities expect their staff to publish, preferably but not only in highly ranked journals and, as the number of good Open Access periodicals is still limited, many scholars have fallen prey to a large number of companies that take advantage of the inexperience and vulnerability of young researchers but also of the pressure to publish. These journals, referred to as predatory journals contact authors via email and offer to publish articles in a rapid manner for a huge fee. Papers published in these outlets cannot guarantee a reliable peer review process as they tend to go from submission to publication in a matter of days. And worst of all, they do not serve to meet the criteria of research institutions and assessment agencies.

In addition, as the pressure to publish fast or perish (Valdeón 2019) keeps mounting, authors are more likely to take risks such as the submission of substandard material, multiple submissions, plagiarization and self-plagiarization and other unethical practices. For this reason, steps are being taken worldwide to ensure quality and accountability. For instance, a consortium of European Academies elaborated the *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*, which puts emphasis on three axes: fabrication, falsification and plagiarism (ALLEA 2017: 8). Although it may seem that the first two are specifically conceived for the hard sciences, as empirical research in TS keeps growing (especially in some subareas), fabrication and falsification have also become serious issues in our field. Also relevant is the issue of authorship, increasingly applicable to TS research as co-authored papers are becoming more common. The Code clearly emphasizes the fact that co-authorship should be understood as equal participation and accountability in the research output. This runs counter to certain academic traditions that have a tendency to include doctoral supervisors as co-authors of articles, a practice that should be discouraged in international journals even though it is difficult to detect. Alternatively, co-authors may indicate their actual contribution to the article in footnotes.

The constant increase in the numbers of submissions of both articles and book proposals is reflected in the appearance of new journals and book series. However, this has not meant a similar increase in terms of quality and innovation. In some cases, submissions comply with some basic standards in terms of structure, theoretical background, analysis and language. However, they fail to provide any innovative results: they simply reiterate previous studies without advancing them in any meaningful manner. In the worst cases, submissions are of substandard quality: articles fail to engage with previous publications, lack clear objectives, provide a superficial analysis and, often, language issues impede communication. Once again this might result from the pressure to publish as well as from certain academic conventions which encourage undergraduate students to submit essays in order to receive feedback from editors and reviewers.

Consequently, the constant increase in the number of submissions has put editors and referees under strain. As the time and effort required to process and review articles is usually unpaid, they need to accommodate this task in a usually packed schedule including teaching, administrative work and their own research. As a result of this, the process in the major journals begins by screening articles in order to identify those submissions with a greater potential or that fall within the scope of the journal before referees are invited to review papers. Ethical considerations are also of paramount importance in the case of editors and referees. In fact, it has been claimed that some editors might rule journals like little dictators (Moosa 2018). In addition, it has been argued that editors and referees may also recommend certain sources in order to increase citations of the journals or of themselves. While this may be occasionally true, there is little, if any, empirical evidence to support this claim in the case of TS journals.

As a result of the ever-increasing number of submissions editors, co-editors and referees might not provide useful feedback, even in the case of potentially good submissions. Peer review training and some kind of compensation for their work (financial or otherwise) might make the task more appealing since most universities do not give recognition to this essential academic activity. As Paltridge writes, learning "how to do peer reviews is also important for early career researchers in that it provides a way of giving them expertise that they need to draw on as they become members of their particular academic communities" (2017: 145), although training would also benefit more experienced scholars. For this reason, publishers are now providing webinars and guidelines to assist reviewers in order to avoid some of the more offensive reports.

Finally, it should also be noted that, as the number of publications has increased exponentially, the quest for meaningful research and innovation has become more challenging. While researchers may produce reasonably good articles or books, it is not always clear in what ways these outputs advance the discipline. This is not applicable only to young researchers but also to experienced authors, who tend to *recycle* material in several publications. On a more positive note, as translation scholars attempt to start new avenues of research by reaching out to other fields (Gambier & van Doorslaer 2016), interaction with other disciplines is not only desirable (Hyland 2009: 59) but also promising. As a result, TS authors are now turning to periodicals specializing in other disciplines such as discourse analysis, pragmatics, cultural studies, journalism and so on, thus opening new channels of communication, creating novel research opportunities and promoting interdisciplinary interaction.

References

ALLEA. 2017. *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*. Berlin: ALLEA.

European Science Foundation. 2018. Plan S. Making Full and Immediate Open Access a Reality. https://www.coalition-s.org/about/ (Accessed April 2020).

Franco, Javier, and Sara Rovira-Esteva. 2015. “Publishing and Impact Criteria, and Their Bearing on Translation Studies: In Search of Comparability.” *Perspectives* 23 (2): 265–283. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.972419

Gambier, Yves, and Luc van Doorslaer (eds). 2016. *Border Crossings. Translation Studies and Other Disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.126

Hyland, Ken. 2009. *Academic Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Huang, Qin, and Furing Liu. 2019. “International Translation Studies from 2014 to 2018: A Bibliometric Analysis and Its Implications.” *Translation Review* 105 (1): 34–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2019.1664959

Molinié, Antoinette, and Geoffrey Bodenhauden. 2010. “Bibliometrics and Weapons of Mass Citation. La bibliométrie comme arme de citation massive.” *Chimia* 64 (1/2): 78–89. https://doi.org/10.2533/chimia.2010.78

Tian, Mein, Yan Su, and Xin Ru. 2016. “Perish or Publish in China: Pressures on Young Chinese Scholars to Publish in Internationally Indexed Journals.” *Publications* 4 (2): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4020009

Paltridge, Brian. 2017. *The Discourse of Peer Review. Reviewing Submissions to Academic Journals*. London: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-48736-0

Valdeón, Roberto A. 2019. “Translation Studies and the Ethics of Publishing.” *Perspectives* 27 (5): 761–775. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1631861

Wellmon, Chad. 2015. *Organizing Enlightenment. Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Religious texts and oral tradition

Jacobus A. Naudé
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein

1. Oral-written religious traditions

When dealing with religious texts, the interrelationship of oral and written must be clearly articulated (see also Orality and translation[2]). The oral and written cannot be absolutely separated, either chronologically or in terms of importance, as done, for example, in the oral formulaic theory of Milman Parry (1902–1935) and Albert B. Lord (1912–1991), which espoused an absolute and universal dichotomy between oral cultures and literate cultures. De Vries (2012: 68–98) describes oral cultures as involved in an oral-written interface with locally determined features; these features may vary with respect to time, place or genre within a single culture. Furthermore, the oral and written coevolve through many points of contact (De Vries 2012: 74–75). With respect to the ancient Near East, Walton and Sandy (2013: 18) contrast hearing-dominant cultures, where traditions were mainly transmitted by word of mouth, with text-dominant cultures, where traditions were transmitted primarily by texts. In hearing-dominant societies, cultural traditions were internalised while texts were written for archives and libraries to serve as reference points for memorisation and recitation of the tradition (Walton & Sandy 2013: 21). Dissemination of knowledge is typically done orally, though it is preserved in written documents by the transmitters of the tradition.

These aspects of the oral and written are also true for religious communities. By adapting Naudé and Miller-Naudé (2016: 2–6), the following typology is suggested for the intersection of religious texts and oral-written traditions:

- religions with dominant written traditions, namely the monotheistic religions: the Jewish religion (0.2% globally), Christianity (32%) and Islam (23%) (Pew Research Center's Forum 2012: 9, 10, 12; see Religious translation[1]; Naudé 2018: 389–395).
- religions with a dominant oral tradition, namely African traditional religions, Chinese folk religions, Native American religions and Pacific indigenous religions (6% globally) (Pew Research Center's Forum 2012: 9, 34–37).

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.rel5
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

- religions with oral tradition and foundational religious texts namely the Hindu religion (15% globally), the Buddhist religion (7%), Baha'i, Jain, Sikh, Shinto, Taoist, Tenrikyo, Wicca and the Zoroastrian religions (0.8%) (Pew Research Center's Forum 2012: 9, 10, 12, 28–33, 40–41, 45–50).

The examination here is restricted to the last category (religions with oral tradition and foundational religious texts) and focuses on three religions as representative – the two largest religions (the Hindu and Buddhist religions) and a religion which has significant influence in China and East Asia and which, alongside the Buddhist religion, is the most popular in China (the Taoist religion).

2. Hindu oral tradition and religious texts

Without a founder, the Hindu religion assumed many shapes over the centuries as it absorbed various Indian religious and cultural traditions from as many as three hundred languages, but certain practices from earlier stages persist through to the present (Bowker 1997: 430). This religious tradition seems initially to have been predominantly oral for several hundred years. Religious texts, which preserved in writing many of the elements of the oral style, are divided into two distinct categories.

The *śruti* ("that which has been perceived through hearing", viz. revelation) texts refer to the divine revelation orally transmitted after intense meditation by ancient sages, which has also been written down secondarily (Flood 1994: 72–86) intended to be read and heard only by the higher castes. They include the four Vedas (the Rig-Veda ["Veda of Praise"], the Yajur-Veda ["Veda of Sacrifice"], the Sāma-Veda ["Veda of Stanzas"] and the Atharva-Veda ["Veda of Atharvan Priests"]). As the oldest layer of Sanskrit texts, the Vedas originated from about 1200 BCE until about 300 BCE (Flood 1994: 73) and constitute the Hindu canon. Each Veda ("knowledge, wisdom") contains devotional hymns (the Saṁhitās ["collections"]), priestly texts (the Brāhmaṇas), magic texts or forest-books (the Āraṇyakas), and philosophical texts (the Upanishads ["sitting down near," referring to the student sitting near the guru while receiving knowledge]). The Vedānta, the final teachings of the Vedas, mainly consisting of the Upanishads, are considered revelation par excellence and are the most important literature in the religion (Flood 1994: 83–86; Zaehner 1966: 39). The principal Upanishads contribute to the preservation of central spiritual ideas, some shared with the Buddhist religion, as well as the Jain and Sikh religions. In modern times, the ancient Upanishads were detached from the Vedic texts, translated and collected in anthologies[4]; major English translations include Hume (1934) (13 Principal Upanishads) and Radhakrishnan (1953) (18 Upanishads).

The *smṛti* (“that which has been remembered”, viz. tradition) texts are attributed to authors, and as derivative works, they are considered less authoritative than the Vedic corpus (Flood 1994: 87–97) and are accessible to all. They include the Sūtras (compilations of technical or specialised knowledge), the Śāstras (Law Books), the Purāṇas (“ancient, former”, which cover inter alia myths and legends about royal lineage), the epic *Mahābhārata* (which includes the *Bhagavad-Gītā* “Song of the Lord”), and the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* (Flood 1994: 87–97; Zaehner 1966: 10).

The *Bhagavad-Gītā*, the most revered and influential text among Hindus, is an example of a popular religious text which encapsulates the oral stylistic elements of Sanskrit literature, namely certain formulaic techniques such as a dialogue within a dialogue, use of imagery (including simile, comparison and metaphor), use of honorific names and numbers as mnemotechnical devices, parallelisms, repetition of key words, alliteration and assonance. It was first translated into English in 1785, and by the end of the twentieth century more than 300 further translations appeared in English alone. It is also translated into more than 75 languages worldwide. The popular English translation by the guru A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON), which includes the Sanskrit source text, transliteration in Roman characters (to preserve the original Sanskrit sound), word-for-word translation, idiomatic translation and commentary, is viewed as sufficient, because it is the essence of all Vedic literature and especially because it is believed to have been spoken by the Godhead (Dennill and Naudé 2009: 17).

The idea of a person as a channel for divine knowledge is found in the Vedas with *ṛṣiṣ*, the visionary authors of the Vedas and other sacred literature. The guru (a personal teacher who is concerned with social and spiritual enlightenment rather than academia) is the means whereby the tradition is conveyed through the generations and teachings are authenticated through the guru lineage. Through his lineage the guru’s authority as a channel for divine grace is vindicated and his action constrained. To hear words from the mouth of a guru and learn them by heart in order to repeat them to the next generation was for centuries of greater value than to simply read a religious text (Bowker 1997: 394).

3. Buddhist oral tradition and religious texts

As a reaction against ritual and the authority of the castes of the Hindu religion, the Buddhist religion – with followers in northeast and southeast Asia, Mongolia and Tibet – was founded on the teachings of Siddhārtha Gautama (born a Hindu about 560 BCE and later called Buddha “the enlightened one”) (Abe 1993: 101–106; Swearer 1977: 1–8).

The Buddhist religion began as an oral tradition without written texts for the first four centuries. Although the Buddha himself wrote nothing, his words were preserved orally by his monks until the first century BCE (Lopez 2004:xi; Pagel 1994:35). However, the words/discourses of the Buddha himself or spoken with his sanction have been a source of controversy (Lopez 2004:xii) and at least two major lineage groups developed, namely Hināyāna "low vehicle" (of which the orthodox Theravāda "School of the Elders" is the only surviving exponent and is prevalent in Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia and Laos) (Swearer 1977:8–24), and the more widespread Mahāyāna "great vehicle" (prevalent in Tibet, Mongolia, China, Korea and Japan).

According to the Mahāyāna ("great vehicle") variety the *sūtras* are viewed as the words/discourses of the Buddha himself or spoken with his sanction. More and more texts were composed that claimed to be authentic, so that the collections of texts became gigantic and incomprehensible. The Taishō printed edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon contains 2184 texts in 55 volumes, with a supplement of 45 volumes, while another edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon contains 1108 works and an additional 3461 treatises by Indian Buddhist masters (Abe 1993:100; Lopez 2004:xviii). These canonical works do not include the thousands of other texts written in languages such as Sanskrit, Pāli, Chinese, Tibetan, the forgotten languages Tangut and Tokharian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Thai, Burmese and Vietnamese (Lopez 2004:xviii). There is thus no single original language of Buddhist religious texts, nor is there preference for any one language; as a result, the concept of a sacred language in this sense does not apply (Pagel 1994:37–39). Much of the earlier Buddhist literature exists only in Chinese and Tibetan translations (Holm 1994:5). No individual could know such a massive amount of *sūtras*. In an attempt to make *sūtras* accessible, some are therefore selected and systematised into the format of anthologies since the second century CE (Abe 1993:96–100; Lopez 2004:xiii–xiv; Swearer 46–56).

A tiny portion of Buddhist religious texts has been translated into European languages mostly to serve a specific purpose (Lopez 2004:xviii). For example, in the nineteenth century the study of the Buddhist religion in the Western world was connected to philology and the history of colonialism. Two English translations apply in this regard: Firstly, an anthology of ten volumes translated from Pāli, Sanskrit and Chinese appeared in 1894, edited by Friedrich Max Müller, Oxford's first professor of comparative philology. The belief was that these texts figured in the larger history of the progress of human religious consciousness and the development of human thought with the hope that religions could be classified genealogically in the same way as languages. Secondly, by relying entirely on previously published work, in 1895 Paul Carus published his anthology in the United States, which was arranged like the Christian Bible with numbered chapters and verses and included a table listing parallel passages from the Christian New Testament to show the many connections between the Buddhist religion and the "nobler" Christianity (Lopez 2004: xv–xvi). The anthologies of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are organised either chronologically or geographically with emphasis on doctrine and philosophy. The anthology of Donald Lopez (2004) expands the genres and the selection of languages of the source texts beyond Pāli and combines the translations of these new source texts with existing translations that appeared in previous anthologies in order to be more representative of the spectrum of the tradition than previous anthologies.

The written tradition does not comprise a single body of texts, but as indicated above it is extensive and inaccessible. However, the development of scriptures in both the Mahāyāna and Theravāda traditions did not compromise the significance of living communication of the message, including transmission by the spoken word. The written word, although highly regarded, only has derived significance. This is emphasised by the first line introducing written Pāli *sūtras*: 'Thus have I heard'. Emphasis on the living word still inspires the discipline of memorising the original oral transmission, entrusted to specialists for centuries to come. A Buddha, an enlightened person and one who has awakened to the truth, teaches by oral performance encompassing both words and accompanying embodiment (appearance, movements, and ethical conduct), and all of these are the expression of an enlightened mind (Bowker 1997: 179). A typical Zen Buddhist teaching session is a progressive unfolding of a portion of the words of the historical Buddha through the authorised commentaries of a particular lineage and culminating in the teacher's own experience and explanation. Even heavily textual traditions, such as the Theravāda and Tibetan traditions, emphasise the importance of the quality of the life of the teacher who expounds the texts (Bowker 1997: 179).

4. Taoist oral tradition and religious texts

As an indigenous religio-philosophical tradition, Tao (pronounced *dow*) has a philosophical (*tao-chia*) and religious (*tao-chiao*) form, which are intertwined (Xiaogen 1993: 231–233). The founder of Tao is the sage Lao Tzu (Lao Zi), perhaps a legendary figure shrouded in mystery, who was born about 604 BCE, and who probably according to tradition wrote down his teachings in *Tao-Te Ching,* ("The Book of Tao and Teh" or "The Book of the Way and of Virtue"), consisting of two volumes of 37 and 44 chapters respectively (Bowker 1997: 570–571; Xiaogen 1993: 232, 240–244), which became the foundational authoritative texts in the Taoist canon with translations in English (for example, Zhengkun 1995). Another canonical work was started by Chuang Tzu (350–275 BCE), which bears his name and consists of three parts: Inner Chapters (written by Chuang Tzu), Outer Chapters, and Miscellaneous Chapters (written by his followers) (Xiaogen 1993: 245–254). Additional authoritative texts (nearly 8000 scrolls) appeared until the Ming dynasty (1368–1644) with no organising principle (Bowker 1997: 953). The contribution of Taoist ideas in an adapted translation form for popular Western culture has become increasingly widespread, for example in bestseller books such as *Lao Tzu Speaks* and *Tao of Pooh* (Xiaogen 1993: 285–286; Hoff 1982).

After the philosophy of Tao came the religion, when Lao Tzu was deified and the theory of Tao became transformed into a religion by Chang Tao Ling (34–156 CE) (Xiaogen 1993: 258–259). The most dramatic element of Taoist religious activity is the vast liturgical ceremonies orally performed by Taoist priests, which are concerned with the practices/rituals relating to longevity and immortality of the human life through revalorisation of the body (Xiaogen 1993: 285). Authority is not connected to a religious text, but to the priest as the authoritative person behind the tradition itself. Rituals are complicated and last from a couple of days to sixty days and include the oral recitation of selected canonical texts, some of which may be newly created by the priest for the occasion.

5. Conclusion

The three oral-dominant religious traditions considered here – the Hindu religion, the Buddhist religion, and the Taoist religion – share similar approaches to sacred texts with respect to canon (all have an open canon of foundational written texts), authoritative texts (all have Scriptures but they are secondary to the oral mediation of written Scriptures), revelation (all view revelation as primarily oral through the mediation of religious personnel such as buddhas, gurus, and priests), and transmission traditions (all view oral transmission as primary and written textual transmission as secondary). These three religions also exhibit considerable diversity in that the sacred nature of the language in which sacred texts are written is not viewed in the same way or to the same degree – Buddhists and Taoists do not have a sacred language, whereas Sanskrit is sacred to Hindus. However, with respect to language use and translation, none of the three religions promotes translation of their sacred writings. Most translations were done by outsiders for outsiders who wished to gain insight into these religions through access to their sacred writings.

References

Abe, Masao. 1993. “Buddhism.” In *Our Religions*, ed. by Arvind Sharma, 69–137. New York: HarperCollins.

Bowker, John (ed.). 1997. *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dennill, George B., and Jacobus A. Naudé. 2009. "A Comparison of the Qumran Community and Hare Krishna Movement Regarding Ritual Impurity, Its Sources and Rectification." *Journal for Semitics* 18 (1): 15–33.

De Vries, Lourens J. 2012. "Local oral-written interfaces and the nature, transmission, performance, and translation of biblical texts." In *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance: New Directions in Biblical Studies*, ed. by James A. Maxey and Ernst R. Wendland, 68–98. Biblical Performance Criticism 6. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books.

Flood, Gavin D. 1994. "Hinduism." In *Sacred Writings*, ed. by Jean Holm and John Bowker, 71–100. London: Pinter.

Holm, Jean. 1994. "Introduction: Raising the Issues." In *Sacred Writings*, ed. by Jean Holm and John Bowker, 1–9. London: Pinter.

Naudé, Jacobus A. 2018. "History of translation knowledge of monotheistic religions with written tradition." In *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge*, ed. by Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier, 389–395. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.142.54nau

Naudé, Jacobus A. and Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé. 2016. "The translation of *biblion* and *biblos* in the light of oral and scribal practice." *In Luce Verbi* 50(3): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v50i3.2060

Pagel, Ulrich. 1994. "Buddhism." In *Sacred Writings*, ed. by Jean Holm and John Bowker, 10–43. London: Pinter.

Pew Research Center Forum. 2012. *The Global Religious Landscape. A Report on the Size and Distribution of the World's Major Religious Groups as of 2010*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Swearer, Donald K. 1977. *Buddhism*. Niles, IL: Argus Communications.

Walton, John H., and D. Brent Sandy. 2013. *The Lost World of Scripture*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic.

Xiaogan, Liu. 1993. "Taoism." In *Our Religions*, ed. by Arvind Sharma, 229–290. New York: HarperCollins.

Zaehner, R.C. 1966. *Hinduism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Texts/Translations

Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada, A.C., trans. 1986. *Bhagavad-Gītā As It Is*. Los Angeles: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2002. *Bhagavad-Gïtā*. Stepney: Axiom.

Hoff, Benjamin. 1982. *The Tao of Pooh*. London: Penguin.

Hume, R. Ernest. 1934. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lopez, Donald S. (ed.). 2004. *Buddhist Scriptures*. London: Penguin.

Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. 1953. *The Principal Upanishads*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Zhengkun, Gu. 1995. *Lao Tzu: The Book of Tao and Teh*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Further essential reading

Johnson, Will J. 2005. “Making Sanskritic or Making Strange? How Should we Translate Classical Hindu Texts?” In *Translation and religion. Holy Untranslatable?* ed. by Lynne Long, 65–74. Cleveland: Multilingual matters.

Jousse, Marcel. 2018. *Memory, Memorization, and Memorizers. The Galilean Oral-Style Tradition and Its Traditionalists*. Biblical Performance Criticism 15, Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books.

Makutoane, Tshokolo J., Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé, and Jacobus A. Naudé. 2015, “Similarity and alterity in translating the orality of the Old Testament in oral cultures.” *Translation Studies* 8: 156–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2014.992462

Naudé, Jacobus A. and Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé. 2018. “Sacred writings.” In *Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation*, ed. by Kelly Washbourne, and Ben Van Wyke, 181–205. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315517131-13

Zhang, Wei. 2016. Translating *Dao*. “Cross-Cultural Translation as a Hermeneutic of Edification.” In *Translating Religion*, ed. by Michael DeJonge, and Christiane Tietz, 13–28. London: Routledge.

Risk in translation

Kayo Matsushita
Rikkyo University

1. Introduction

From COVID-19 to climate change, the society we live in today is filled with uncertainty. The need for risk management has never been higher and translation is no exception. Since the mid-2000s, translation studies (TS) has seen a slow but steady increase in the number of researchers interested in exploring the relationship between risk and translation. Among them, two approaches have emerged. One focuses on the influence of risk on translator decision-making (e.g., Pym 2015; Pym and Matsushita 2018; Matsushita 2019; Pym 2020), and the other centers around the economic implications of risk management in the translation industry (e.g., Lammers 2011; Nitzke, Hansen-Schirra, and Canfora 2019; Nurminen 2019; Canfora & Ottmann 2020). The former has raised many questions worthy of scholarly attention which will be the main focus of this entry. The latter includes practical advice to the stakeholders of translation projects (e.g., project managers, clients, translators, post-editors), which will also be discussed though to a lesser extent.

2. A brief history

Although research on risk and translation is relatively new, the history of the study of risk itself is centuries old. According to Bernstein (1998), the modern concept of risk stemmed from the Hindu-Arabic numbering system, which was introduced to the West during the Crusades to the Holy Land. During the Renaissance, risk became a subject of serious study, especially among mathematicians. Initially starting from an intellectual exploration to solve a famous puzzle – how to divide the stakes of an unfinished game of chance – mathematicians discovered the theory of probability, which Bernstein (ibid.: 3) describes as “the mathematical heart of the concept of risk”. As mathematicians enthusiastically explored ways to “forecast the future with the help of numbers” (ibid.), their inquiry, along with advances in calculus and algebra, eventually led them to create methods of measuring risk quantitatively.

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.ris1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

What mathematicians had discovered about probability through sampling and measuring averages contributed to the establishment of the insurance industry in seventeenth-century Europe. In order to protect businesses and individuals from probable yet unpredictable accidents and incidents, insurance agents emerged and flourished. Starting from insuring vessels and cargo for the shipping trade, their scope gradually expanded to other realms of human activity, including crime and infidelity (Bernstein 1998). By the eighteenth century, the insurance industry also began to develop in the American colonies. As America became the economic leader of the world, research on risk burgeoned and continued to attract attention from economists and beyond for the coming centuries.

Among them was American economist Frank H. Knight, who published *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit* in 1921. Knight's book is considered to be one of the landmarks in the study of risk and has been described as "the first work of any importance, and in any field of study, that deals explicitly with decision-making under conditions of uncertainty" (Bernstein 1998: 219). In Knight's ([1921]2014) words, "risk" is "*measurable* uncertainty" (ibid.: 20) in which the "distribution of the outcome in a group of instances is known" (ibid.: 233) as in the case of calculating life expectancy. One of his unique contributions was that he differentiated risk from "*unmeasurable*" (ibid.: 20) uncertainties which are too unique to generalize, categorize and measure objectively.

Another key distinction regarding risk can be seen in one of the classic books on insurance management, from which the term "risk management" is said to have evolved. The book, *General Insurance*, originally written by Magee in 1936 and later co-authored by Magee and Bickelhaupt (1964) names and describes two types of risk to explain risk management: speculative risk and pure risk. The former involves opportunities for both loss and gain (e.g., investing in the stock market), while the latter entails only loss or no loss (e.g., insuring against car theft). Only pure risks are considered insurable. Magee and Bickelhaupt (ibid.) outlines five basic methods of handling pure risk: (a) avoiding risk, (b) ignoring risk, (c) retaining risk, (d) preventing loss, and (e) transferring risk. Some of these risk management strategies can also be seen in the case of risk management in translation.

3. The concept within translation studies

In the case of translation, however, both loss and gain need to be considered. Gile ([1995]2009) was one of the first researchers in TS to acknowledge these two sides of risk. In explaining the decision-making by translators, Gile (ibid.: 108) clearly mentions that "[t]hese decisions involve expected gain and possible loss". Gain is described as "increased clarity, more readable and convincing texts, a lower probability of misrepresenting the author's ideas etc." and loss as "loss of information, lessened credibility because of inappropriate terminology, lower cultural acceptability" (ibid.). The acknowledgement that risk in translation involves both loss and gain has opened doors to the creation of different risk management strategies more suitable for translation.

Alexander Künzli may have been the first to write an academic article with the word "risk" in the title (Künzli 2004). The article, "Risk taking: trainee translators vs. professional translators", focused on "risk-taking", a strategy not included in Magee and Bickelhaupt's (1964) categorization. The article was based on an experiment Künzli conducted to compare the level of risk students and professionals are willing to take. Using an ambiguous source text in French (a user guide of a telephone/fax machine), Künzli (ibid.) had five students and five professionals translate the text into German while thinking aloud. The experiment revealed that students are more likely to take risks. However, it was not necessarily for gain. Some of the reasons identified were the students' tendency to "fear less a possible loss of credibility" or lack of knowledge on "how to distinguish between cases where risk-taking is inevitable and where it may or even should be avoided" (ibid.: 45).

Anthony Pym, who also started to investigate the relationship between risk and translation in the mid-2000s, was probably the first to explicitly acknowledge the positive aspect of risk in translation. In 2005, he published an article titled "Text and risk in translation", in which he introduced the idea that "translators distribute their effort in terms of the risks involved in rendering different textual elements" (Pym 2005: 69). The major contribution that this article made was to provide an overview of the relationship between the levels of risk and the efforts exerted to manage them. He explains, "In sum, problems are high-risk or low-risk; solutions can be high-risk or low-risk; strategies are different ways of expending effort to manage risk; and the translator's efforts should ideally correlate with degrees of risk" (ibid.: 73). It is worth noting that, at this (early) stage, Pym (2005) regarded risk as something negative. However, he did refer to the "creative virtues of taking risks" (ibid.: 81) as one of the criticisms of his understanding of risk in translation. Interestingly, risk-taking was identified as a risk management strategy in his later works.

Before looking into some of the more recent publications by Pym and those that followed, it seems necessary to point out that Wolfram Wilss also published an article on the topic of risk and translation in the mid-2000s in which he depicted translation as a special form of risk management (Wilss 2005). However, the focus of this article was the decision-making of translators in an environment involving risk that primarily arises from the dependence on the source text over which the translator has no control. No fresh insight into the actual risk management strategies adopted by the translators was presented.

As explained earlier, Pym has produced numerous publications on risk and translation since the mid-2000s refining his ideas (see Matsushita 2019 for a detailed overview of some of Pym's earlier works). One of his signature works is Pym (2015), which details two important developments in his conceptualization of risk. First, it introduced a new categorization of risk, dividing it into three types: (1) credibility risk, (2) uncertainty risk, and (3) communicative risk. Second, it outlined three risk management strategies that can be applied to translator decision-making: (1) risk avoidance, (2) risk transfer, and (3) risk taking.

Credibility risk is defined in Pym (2015) as the probability of the translator "losing a translation-specific kind of credibility" (ibid.: 67). This is important because when the credibility is lost, "you could lose your money, your clients, your job, or all those things at once" (ibid.: 69). The second type, uncertainty risk, is defined as the one that "ensues from the translator's uncertainty when making decisions about how to render an item" (ibid.: 67) and is "internal to the translator's decision-making processes" (ibid.: 71). The third type, communicative risk "has to do with the way texts are interpreted and used in contexts," where the level of risk for each element is dependent upon whether they are key to communicative success or not (ibid.: 67).

Regarding risk management strategies, Pym (2015: 72) claims that there are "at least" three: risk avoidance, risk transfer, and risk taking. It is interesting to see that, in the ten years since Pym (2005), "risk-taking" has become one of the key strategies that translators can adopt when faced with risk. Pym (2015: 72) further emphasizes that "Translators should be prepared to take risks, and reap the consequences", stating that risk-taking can be a "deliberate gain-seeking act" (ibid.) and "an active *positive* option, corresponding to possible enhanced social *rewards*" (ibid.: 71).

Building on Pym (2015), Pym and Matsushita (2018) added a fourth category to the list of risk management strategies: risk mitigation. It is described as "a disposition where the translator incurs one kind of risk in order to reduce another", similar to how the water damage caused by a sprinkler system extinguishing a fire is justifiable because of the difference in the magnitude of the outcome (ibid.: 1). One example of risk mitigation can be seen in Matsushita (2019), which examined the use of "double presentation" (i.e., presenting the English source text along with the Japanese target text) to mitigate the risk of mistranslation by compromising conciseness as well as the readability and comprehensibility of the Japanese readers. The four categories were later refined in Pym (2020) by exchanging "risk avoidance" with "risk reduction" which "accounts for all the preliminary processing, documentation, checking, revision and reviewing that can be done by the translator" (ibid.: 449). Detailed descriptions of the four categories are presented in Pym (ibid.: 449–50).

4. Practical studies

The problem-solving aspect of translation, the second approach mentioned earlier, has attracted a different set of researchers who are interested in the practical benefits of risk management in translation projects. One of the earlier examples can be seen in the field of localization. For example, Lammers (2011) offers a detailed account of the risks identified and managed by project managers for software localization projects. Using Project Management Institute's (PMI) standardized risk management framework, Lammers (ibid.) illustrates how risk can be proactively managed by identifying the nature of the risks (e.g., a schedule delay is categorized as a highly probable and impactful risk) and having solutions ready (e.g., allocate more resources).

Others such as Nurminen (2019) explores the risk assessment criteria used by patent professionals when deciding whether to use Machine translation[1] (MT) or human translation (HT) to obtain a basic understanding of patent documents. Also related to MT, Nitzke, Hansen-Schirra, and Canfora (2019) introduces a decision model for post-editors to use when deciding whether certain translations are appropriate for MT + PE (post-editing[5]) or not, based on the levels of risk associated with the use of MT. Most recently, Canfora and Ottmann (2020) examined the risks specific to neural machine translation (NMT) and proposed the establishment of a "sustainable workflow" that puts data security and end-user safety first.

This recent increase in the number of studies on risk and translation is a clear indication that risks are inevitable in translation; therefore, they need to be identified and managed appropriately in order for translators and other stakeholders of translation projects to achieve their desired outcome without inviting negative consequences. However, as Pym (2020: 455) rightfully points out, basic questions raised by the concept of risk management (e.g., whether translators are actually detecting and managing different levels of risk accurately and consistently) remain unanswered. In addition, more attention needs to be paid to the specific types of risk associated with translation projects that involve non-human aspects including the use of A.I. These are just some of the many remaining questions and emerging areas that make this topic an exciting area for further investigation, one from which both researchers and practitioners can benefit.

References

Bernstein, Peter L. 1998. *Against the Gods: The Remarkable Story of Risk*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Canfora, Carmen, and Angelika Ottmann. 2020. "Risks in Neural Machine Translation." *Translation Spaces* 9 (1): 58–77. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00021.can

Gile, Daniel. (1995) 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.8(1st)

Knight, Frank H. (1921) 2014. *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Reprint, Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino. Citations refer to the Martino edition.

Künzli, Alexander. 2004. "Risk Taking: Trainee Translators vs. Professional Translators. A Case Study." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 2: 34–49. http://www.jostrans.org/issue02/art_kunzli.pdf

Lammers, Mark. 2011. "Risk Management in Localization." In *Translation and Localization Project Management: The Art of the Possible*, ed. by Keiran J. Dunne, and Elena S. Dunne, 211–232. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xvi.11lam

Magee, John H., and David L. Bickelhaupt. 1964. *General Insurance*. 7th ed. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Matsushita, Kayo. 2019. *When News Travels East: Translation Practices by Japanese Newspapers*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Nitzke, Jean, Silvia Hansen-Schirra, and Carmen Canfora. 2019. "Risk Management and Post-Editing Competence." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 31: 239–59.

Nurminen, Mary. 2019. "Decision-making, Risk, and Gist Machine Translation in the Work of Patent Professionals." In Proceedings of the *8th Workshop on Patent and Scientific Literature Translation. Machine Translation Summit* 2019, 32–42. https://fc233576-d4db-4de9-b637-e339437e9442.filesusr.com/ugd/705d57_0700e3a20b954ecdac268e726beaefe7.pdf

Pym, Anthony. 2005. "Text and Risk in Translation." *In New Tendencies in Translation Studies*, ed. by Karin Aijmer and Cecilia Alvstad, 69–82. Gothenburg: Göteborg University.

Pym, Anthony. 2015. "Translating as Risk Management." *Journal of Pragmatics* 85: 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.010.

Pym, Anthony. 2020. "Translation, Risk Management and Cognition." In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*, ed. by Fabio Alves, and Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, 445–458. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315178127-29

Pym, Anthony, and Kayo Matsushita. 2018. "Risk Mitigation in Translator Decisions." *Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (1): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2018.19.1.1.

Wilss, Wolfram. 2005. "Übersetzen als Sonderform des Risikomanagements [Translation as a special form of risk management]." *Meta* 50 (2): 656–664. https://doi.org/10.7202/011009ar

Further essential reading

Angelone, Erik. 2010. "Uncertainty, Uncertainty Management, and Metacognitive Problem Solving in the Translation Task." In *Translation and Cognition*, ed. by Gregory M. Shreve, and Erik Angelone, 17–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xv.03ang

Matsushita, Kayo. 2014. "Risk Management as a Theoretical Framework for Analyzing News Translation Strategies." *Invitation to Translation Studies* 12: 83–96. http://honyakukenkyu.sakura.ne.jp/shotai_vol12/05_vol-12_Matsushita.pdf.

Pym, Anthony. 2008. "On Omission in Simultaneous Interpreting: Risk Analysis of a Hidden Effort." In *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research: A Tribute to Daniel Gile*, ed. by Gyde Hansen, Andrew Chesterman, and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 83–105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pym, Anthony. 2008. "On Toury's Laws of How Translators Translate." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, ed. by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, 311–28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.75.24pym

Pym, Anthony. 2016. "Risk Analysis as a Heuristic Tool in the Historiography of Interpreters: For an Understanding of Worst Practices." In *New Insights in the History of Interpreting*, ed. by Kayoko Takeda, and Jesús Baigorri-Jalón, 247–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.122.10pym

Situated cognition

Ricardo Muñoz Martín
University of Bologna

In order to grasp complex wholes (see Complexity thinking in TS[5]), like the solar system, scientists formulate simplified idealizations or models[1] for them. Scientific models represent such complex wholes to different degrees, but they will only work if (we believe that) there is some correspondence with their counterparts in the world. Such correspondence need not be based on physical or structural resemblance. Scientists may strip away everything they do not deem essential for their interests, or even introduce deliberate distortions they can control and correct later on. Models only need to fit empirical data.

A scientific model entails a particular view on reality, a set of assumptions, tentative constructs and (often implicitly restricted) goals. Many systems, like the human cognitive system, can be modelled in different ways, often for different purposes. We may also use metaphors and analogies as models or as shorthand for other models, like “atoms look like solar systems” or “the human mind is a computer”. When several models exist for one and the same object of study, they may become integrated or compete, transitorily or until one supersedes another. We may also adopt epistemic pluralism – not relativism – and use a model to study one part of the system, and another one for a different part or for the whole.

Situated cognition is a model to study the workings of the mind/brain. It is considered to be an alternative to the mind-as-computer, information-processing model of cognition, which was prevalent in computing, linguistics, psychology and the philosophy of mind before the 21st century and is still advocated by some. These models – information-processing and situated cognition – sustain what seem to be mutually exclusive principles, tenets and views on the nature and workings of perception, memory, thought, language, understanding, the very architecture and components of our cognitive system (such as the mental lexicon) and, crucially, its relationship with the world. These models of cognition are important because they form the basis of all Cognitive approaches[1] to translation. The information-processing model informed most cognitive endeavors in translation studies (TS). Situated approaches, such as cognitive translatology (Muñoz 2010), are now on the rise.

Two notes of caution are called for. First, cognition may be situated to different degrees. Abstract thinking (e.g., considering time or society) is maybe less situated

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.sit1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

than thinking while playing ping-pong. Non-situated cognition is possible, but also the exception – just in some forms of Artificial Intelligence, when you also think that thinking is what they do. Second, *situated cognition* is an umbrella term for a set of empirically supported rejoinders to the information-processing model that are linked by family resemblances. It covers theoretical positions describing cognition as embodied, embedded, extended, and enactive, and also dynamical, distributed, and affective. These positions share a view of cognition as emerging in situ from the interaction with the body and the environment. Rather than swallowing the autonomous, internal symbol-processing approach, situated cognition argues that neither physical nor sociocultural aspects can be factored out when studying mental processes.

Embodied views entail a radical departure from classical understandings of cognition as encapsulated. In embodiment, the biological makeup of the cognizing agent has a direct impact on ways and contents of mental processing. For instance, humans understand words thanks to experience accumulated through our senses (e.g., what is *red?* see Noë 2004) and our motor actions (e.g., what is *back down?* see Jeannerod 2006). Abstract categories and concepts of emotions draw from more concrete, embodied experiences. Even linguistic metaphors are often grounded in embodied experience (e.g., *happiness is up;* see Lakoff & Johnson 1999). This is crucial for translation, where such grounding can provide an individual, transitory, contingent *tertium comparationis* to relate originals to translations. On the other hand, the information-processing view sees thinking as manipulating symbols through their shapes but, how do symbols get their meanings? Machines do not understand. Meanings need to be provided beforehand by humans, and we can only do so through additional chains of symbols, leading to the unsolved problem of an infinite regress, an endless sequence of referrals.

The *embedded* approach focuses on the properties of natural and social environments that enable, shape, and constrain the range of possible behavioral and psychological responses. *Affordances* are inherent properties and conditions of the environment that make it possible for agents to act upon them, when and as perceived (Gibson 1979: 127–143). Humans focus first on objects' affordances and not on their defining qualities. Interpreters and translators need to constantly adapt to environmental constraints and affordances of tools and communicative tasks with different demands. A paramount example is dialogue interpreting, where the exact situation and demands always seem to be unique – e.g., how many parties intervene? Who controls the exchange: A judge, a doctor, a police officer, a client, the interpreter? Do we need to record, transcribe, or repeat it? Etc. (see Arumí & Vargas-Urpi 2017).

Affordances seem to challenge the need for storing complete representations to be used all the time. Non-situated cognition is only possible in computers, where often all you need is rules and propositions, but the bulk of real-world situations does not work that way (Clancey 1997). Storing everything, if possible, would be too inefficient, so we rather reduce it to our interaction patterns. We know how to use our text processor, but we do not always memorize where every single button is.

The *extended* view (see Clark 2008 vs. Adams & Aizawa 2007) is a stronger embedded stance that sees humans externalizing some cognitive functions, such as memory – e.g., using the computer's screen to offload text from working memory and free mental resources that may be applied to assessing the quality of the translation fragment just typed in. *Enactivism* (see Hutto & Myin 2017) goes one step further: all cognition arises through the dynamic interaction of brain, body, and the material environment. For instance, in the information-processing model, sentence meaning is a function of its syntactic structure and the lexical meanings of the words in it. Language symbols are abstract but, when they materialize, other codes come along. Oral exchanges show that meaning is often partly enacted through gestures, and the color of the words in a subtitle lets us know who is speaking. Both oral and written communications are basically multimodal and that affects truth conditions (e.g., Ketola 2016).

Dynamical views (see Port and Van Gelder 1995) on cognition approach it as a complex system whose emergent properties and outcomes exceed the sum of those of its components, so that it cannot be explained by examining them in isolation (Shreve 2020). For instance, a simultaneous interpreter needs to adapt to changing environmental conditions (such as temperature, lighting), manage and coordinate sensorimotor functions (e.g., vision, respiration), and multitask (scribbling and doodling, checking the equipment, seeking information, communicating with the colleague in the booth) while interpreting. These factors converge into a complex, dynamic mental process extending over time (e.g., Chen 2017).

Distributed cognition (see Hutchins 1994) notes that some tasks involve networks of interacting agents and objects (e.g., humans and computers) that share processes and resources to obtain results that individuals could never reach on their own. This view is particularly well tailored to support the study of Human-Computer Interaction. This is no doubt of immediate relevance to cognitive translation studies, since many tasks today comprise both computer-mediated communication (e.g., Remote interpreting[2]) and computer-supported cooperative work – for instance, translation projects with in-house project management of a team of distant freelance translators (see Jiménez 2017). In such scenarios, individual problem-solving is no longer the first option when facing a problem. Team members will first check shared repositories, parts of the translation they did not perform, or ask other team members and their project manager. Distributed cognition is also evident when using translations in areas such as patent professionals (Nurminen 2020)

Affective cognition shows that feeling actually takes precedence over logical thought (Damásio 2005). People steer and evaluate their mental processes in their relationship to their interests, and thoughts get tagged with affective information.

Memory and attention also involve emotional information, and people quickly and subconsciously use what they know from experience when making decisions. Lack of emotions[5] may induce faulty rational thought. Obviously, *cognitive* and *affective perspective-taking* – identifying and appreciating somebody else's point of view – and *empathy*[5] (being able to adopt and simulate the mental states of others) are intertwined and they are extremely important in multilingual communication (e.g., Korpal & Jasielska 2019).

Affective cognition has perhaps been devoted little attention, and labels such as *4EA cognition* (embodied, embedded, enacted, extended and affective) have become common as comprehensive denominations, but *situated cognition* is an easier term for this mesh of interdependent approaches that ultimately draw on the phenomenology of philosophers Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty to think of humans as (inter)active navigators within, and partial managers of, their environment – rather than passive bystanders mechanically and aseptically storing, retrieving and logically manipulating symbols, rules and plans (e.g., O'Hagan & Flanagan 2018).

Adopting a situated approach has two immediate consequences for cognitive translation studies; one in research, and another one in training. Mental processes occur in real situations and many important elements (e.g., mental fatigue, problems with the equipment, workflow interruptions, office politics) are customarily factored out when striving to achieve experimental conditions: often so much that it is not clear whether what remains looks anything like the original environment or task. We need more ecologically-valid ways to study translation tasks. This is especially pressing for tasks such as translating lists of words or very short excerpts, interpreting without an audience, focusing on just a few cases of problem-solving, or disregarding online information needs and search, to name but a few. For certain goals, lab testing may still be adequate but, even then, studies will benefit from combined data-collection instances where results are aligned and interpreted, based on more realistic, situated actions.

As for training, situated views can be traced back to psychologist Lev Vygotsky's tenet that cognitive structures originate in social interaction. Knowledge and skills are thus best acquired and developed in environments that closely resemble those where they will be used. From this perspective, learning amounts to becoming increasingly effective in task performance across situations. Translator and interpreter training programs (and those of related task profiles, such as post-editing[5], subtitling[1], respeaking, etc.) must create learning environments where trainees can come up with their own constructive achievements and where social interactions are closer to those in their future working environments, as suggested in many works by pioneer Donald C. Kiraly and Gary Massey. Classroom activities can be much more similar to and relevant for future work than they often are.

References

Adams, Frederick, and Kenneth Aizawa. 2007. *The Bounds of Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Arumí Ribas, Marta, and Mireia Vargas-Urpi. 2017. "Strategies in Public Service Interpreting." *Interpreting* 19 (1): 118–141. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.19.1.06aru

Chen, Sijia. 2017. "Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting: New data from pen recording." *Translation & Interpreting* 9 (1): 4–23. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.109201.2017.a02

Clark, Andy. 2008. *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, action, and cognitive extension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195333213.001.0001

Clancey, William J. 1997. *Situated Cognition: On human knowledge and computer representations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damásio, António. [1994] 2005. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. Revised edition. New York: Penguin.

Gibson, James J. 1979. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hutchins, Edwin. 1994. *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hutto, Daniel H., and Erik Myin. 2017. *Evolving Enactivism. Basic minds meet content*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262036115.001.0001

Jeannerod, Marc. 2006. *Motor Cognition. What actions tell the self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198569657.001.0001

Jiménez Crespo, Miguel Ángel. 2017. *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations: Expanding the limits of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.131

Ketola, Anne. 2016. "Towards a multimodally oriented theory of translation: A cognitive framework for the translation of illustrated technical texts." *Translation Studies* 9 (1): 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2015.1086670

Korpal, Paweł, and Aleksandra Jasielska. 2019. "Investigating interpreters' empathy: Are emotions in simultaneous interpreting contagious?" *Target* 31 (1): 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17123.kor

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

Muñoz Martín, Ricardo. 2010. "On Paradigms and Cognitive Translatology". In *Translation and Cognition*, ed. by Gregory M. Shreve and Erik Angelone, 169–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xv.10mun

Noë, Alva. 2004. *Action in Perception*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nurminen, Mari. 2020. "Raw machine translation use by patent professionals. A case of distributed cognition." *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 3 (1): 100–121. https://doi.org/10.1075/tcb.00036.nur

O'Hagan, Minako, and Marian Flanagan. 2018. "Gamer emotions in laughter: Towards affect-oriented game localisation." *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 1 (2): 299–318. https://doi.org/10.1075/tcb.00013.oha

Port, Robert F., and Timothy Van Gelder. 1995. *Mind as Motion. Explorations in the dynamics of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Further essential reading

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen. 2019. “Ergonomics and the translation process.” *Slovo.ru: Baltic accent* 10 (1): 37–51. https://doi.org/10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-3

Halverson, Sandra L. 2018. “Metalinguistic Knowledge/Awareness/Ability in Cognitive Translation Studies: Some questions.” *Hermes* 57: 11–28.

O’Brien, Sharon. 2012. “Translation as Human–Computer Interaction.” *Translation Spaces* 1 (1): 101–122. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.1.05obr

Risku, Hanna, and Regina Rogl. 2020. “Translation and Situated, Embodied, Distributed, Embedded and Extended Cognition.” In *Routledge Handbook on Translation and Cognition*, ed. by Arnt Lykke Jakobsen & Fabio Alves, 478–499. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315178127-32

Shreve, Gregory M. 2020. “Translation as a Complex Adaptive System. A framework for theory building in cognitive translatology”. In *Routledge Handbook on Translation and Cognition*. ed. by Arnt Lykke Jakobsen & Fabio Alves, 69–87. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315178127-6

Tourism translation

M. Zain Sulaiman & Rita Wilson
The National University of Malaysia | Monash University

Tourism is a major social phenomenon of modern society with significant economic impact. Over the past two decades, tourist arrivals have increased more than twofold from 664 million in 1999 to 1.5 billion in 2019, while tourism receipts earned worldwide surged from 455 billion in 1999 to USD1.7 trillion in 2019, making the tourism industry the fastest growing industry in the world, outpacing the global economy (www.e-unwto.org).

1. Nature of tourism promotional materials

The survival and growth of the tourism industry is very much dependent on effective promotion and advertising. Accordingly, destination marketers, who need to reach the widest possible audiences, deliberately design campaigns that comprise a variety of promotional and advertising materials ranging from TV commercials to websites, billboards, brochures and posters. There are clichés to be avoided, cultural differences to consider, not to mention the issue of timing. In 2003, the SARS outbreak had a negative impact on tourism around the world. One of the worst hit regions was Hong Kong, not helped by its tourism tagline at the time: "Hong Kong will take your breath away". In another well-known example, Tourism Australia's 2006 tourism tagline "Where the bloody hell are you" caused controversy in several English-speaking markets, including the United Kingdom, and was banned by regulators in Canada. The tagline, which in Anglo-Australian culture implies a casual lifestyle, invoking a sense of friendliness and mateship, did not have the same effect in other English-speaking markets.

Taglines and slogans have never played a more important role in the tourism industry than in 2020 when the world was hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. Interestingly, this time the slogans and taglines were not intended to lure people into travelling to tourist destinations but rather to encourage them to stay away from tourist destinations. In response to the "stay at home" order, imposed by governments across the world to contain the spread of the virus, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) was faced with the apparently paradoxical task of continuing to promote

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.tou1

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

tourism and support the tourism industry while endorsing the stay-at-home edict. The UNWTO accomplished this task by launching an online campaign with the hashtag tagline "stay home today, #traveltomorrow". The hashtag was quickly embraced and disseminated by destinations, tourism organisations and media outlets across the world. Even Saudi Arabia, which only recently opened its doors to wider tourism, was on board with ads saying "Our thrilling adventures are timeless. They're not going anywhere" and "Our heritage has been centuries in the making. It's not going anywhere. #stayhome". The increased global online activity generated by the physical restrictions imposed by the pandemic is revolutionising the way tourism is and will be marketed and promoted. Tomorrow's travellers will be much more digitally literate and will more readily turn to tourism websites (see Web and translation[1]) and social media channels to access information, with multilingual digital marketing initiatives becoming even more essential to successfully attracting international tourists.

Within translation studies (TS), considerable attention has been paid to the topic of Travel and translation[4] in the context of the social and economic effects of globalisation. Relatively, little scholarly attention has been devoted to the narrower topic of tourism and translation within the framework of commercial product advertising[2] (see also Commercial translation[1]) where the product is the tourism experience consumed by tourists at a chosen destination. Despite the differences between the translation of tourism promotional materials and travel narratives in terms of purpose and genre conventions, scholarly research in these two branches of TS share a common interest in dealing with "complex exercises of intercultural communication" (Dimitriu 2012: 313) and exploring the intersections between mobility and translation in a global historical context (e.g., Dimitriu 2012; Sulaiman and Wilson, 2019: 49–63, 144).

Since the late 1990s, the crucial role of translation in the tourism industry has prompted research interest in tourism translation within the broader context of commercial advertising (e.g., Kelly 1998, Sumberg 2004, Durán Muñoz 2011, Agorni 2016, Katan 2016). More recently, studies have widened the areas of focus to include macro-level strategies to improve the quality[1] and accessibility of translations (Sulaiman & Wilson 2018, Woodward-Smith 2019) as well as the importance of developing a good working relationship between client and translator (Cranmer 2019).

Tourism and translation work hand in hand and as the size of the industry expands so does the demand for the translation of tourism promotional materials (TPMs). A common issue highlighted in the literature is the poor quality of translation in the tourism industry. A classic case is the tagline for US-based Braniff Airlines' advertisement in 1987 "fly in leather" intended to promote the airline's new leather upholstery. The Spanish translation of the advertisement for the Mexican market ended up inviting travellers to "fly naked". While this miscommunication could be easily explained as attributable to cross-linguistic ambiguity, mistranslations that are cultural in nature tend to be more complicated and harder to explain. An example is the Malay translation of Tourism Australia's headline "Pedal to paradise in the Blue Mountains", which inadvertently, evoked in the Malay consumer the image of "an exhausted tourist covered in sweat" and made an inappropriate reference to paradise which, in the Malay culture, is strictly a matter of the Hereafter (Sulaiman & Wilson 2018: 636–640).

There is consensus among translation scholars that to produce effective translations there is a need to adopt a functional approach, which focuses on the various factors influencing the production and positive reception of advertising messages in the target market (Sumberg 2004). Such an approach often involves departing from, and recreating aspects of, the source text through cultural adaptation and creative translation (Woodward-Smith 2019: 403, Cranmer 2019: 57, Sulaiman and Wilson 2019: 41). Accordingly, research on tourism is increasingly adopting a more global approach which privileges a comprehensive view of the target text. The importance of this approach lies in the fact that it is the macro-level factors at play that govern and frame the micro-linguistic form of the target text. There has been a concerted effort by translation scholars to promote the potential of such an approach to improve the quality of translation, particularly by studying key textual, cultural and environmental factors that influence both the production of effective TPMs and their translations.

2. Textual functions

A successful TPM translation requires a deep understanding of the text functions involved. TPMs are predominantly persuasive and aim primarily at following the fundamental marketing AIDA formula: that is, capturing Attention, maintaining Interest, creating Desire, and getting Action. Besides the dominant persuasive function, the informative and expressive functions are also evident in TPMs in the sense that they essentially convey information and often rely on distinctly expressive elements such as metaphors, puns and alliterations. It is the interplay between the persuasive and informative functions that has been identified as crucial by a number of scholars (Kelly 1998: 35, Jiangbo & Ying 2010: 36, Sulaiman & Wilson 2019: 21–22, 39–40). Therefore, to produce effective translations, translators must distinguish between these two functions and adapt their techniques not by seeking individual equivalents for each textual element but by moulding the information given in a way that stimulates interest in the target audience.

3. Cultural factors

In general, research on the cultural dimension of tourism translation has addressed three culture-related topics: cultural background of the target market, cultural conventions of language use (including genre conventions) and culture-specific items.

The importance of understanding the cultural background of the tourist market is highlighted in tourism studies (see, for example, Filimonau & Perez 2019). Research shows cultural differences that exist between societies result in different tourist behaviours (Sulaiman and Wilson 2019: 13). Tourists from different cultural environments have different worldviews and values, and therefore demonstrate unique differences in terms of needs, preferences and expectations. As a result, they respond differently to different advertising messages. Sumberg (2004: 332) stresses that "a tourism text cannot be approached without an understanding of cultural differences and the difficulties these can create" and argues that failure to address these cultural differences is likely to result in poor translations that might be linguistically sound but fail to create the desired effects. A case in point is the previous example of the Malay translation of "Pedal to paradise in the Blue Mountains". While the keyword "pedal" is used to evoke the notion of action, performance and challenges in Anglophone cultures, in the Malay culture, these could be perceived as the antithesis of tourism, which is often associated with comfort and relaxation. These differences are driven by different sociocultural and historical factors which influence the way tourism and being a tourist is conceptualised in different cultures (Sulaiman & Wilson 2018: 636). Therefore, in order to produce translations that function effectively in their target cultural environments, the cultural system in which the audience is located must be considered. Judicious use of cultural profiling (Woodward-Smith 2019: 408, Sulaiman & Wilson 2019: 71–88) can help TPM translators understand the underlying cultural values and assist them in effectively (re)creating the appeal of a particular destination for their target audience by implementing various strategies ranging from macro-content changes to micro-linguistic changes depending on the nature of the cultural differences.

Cross-cultural research in TS has established that there are fundamental differences across languages and cultures in the genre conventions and linguistic registers deployed in TPMs. For example, English TPMs tend to be quite colloquial, establishing direct communication with the reader who is often addressed using first and second person forms. In their comparative analysis of English and Malay TPMs, Sulaiman and Wilson (2019: 184) found that English TPMs tend to use the direct imperative style of persuasion, drawing the reader into the discourse. Conversely, Malay TPMs tend to employ an indirect word-of-mouth style of storytelling persuasion where the reader is "unconsciously 'sewn' into the narrative structure, mainly as a privileged spectator and a 'passive actor'". Since cultural conventions are critical to effective message reception, translation scholars stress that TPM translators should be guided by the cultural conventions of TPMs in the target language and that these should prevail in their translations (see, for example, Kelly 1998: 36, Sumberg 2004: 329, Jiangbo & Ying 2010: 36, Hogg, Liao, & O'Gorman 2014: 158, Sulaiman & Wilson 2019: 53–54).

Furthermore, several micro-level studies have focused on the translation of culture-specific items such as words denoting artefacts, types of food, architecture and social customs (for example, Kelly 1998: 37; Sumberg 2004: 349; Jiangbo & Ying 2010: 37; Agorni 2016: 14–18). Depending on the context and intended function, these words could either be localised at the cost of losing appealing exotic flavour (which may be crucial for the tourist experience) or left unchanged with a gloss to clarify them to the target tourists (Sumberg 2004: 349). However, Agorni (2016: 18) stresses that translators should avoid the two extremes of foreignisation and domestication and find "a balance between the need to provide both accessible and appealing content".

The translation approaches adopted, whether at the micro-level of lexical items, stylistic conventions or macro-level content, should all aim towards one purpose, that is, the creation of a favourable destination image that is instrumental for the conversion of readers to tourists. Sulaiman and Wilson, who propose a cultural-conceptual translation (CCT) model for the translation of TPMs, argue that "the effectiveness of TPM translations relies on the (re)construction of 'favourable' destination images based on the cultural conceptualisation of the target audience" (2018: 629). This, however, as evidenced by the implementation of the CCT model, is contingent on a successful collaboration between the translator and the translation commissioner (the client). The notion of destination image employed in the CCT model is drawn from tourism studies. Although in some ways quite similar to the notion of image-building in imagology and literary translation (see van Doorslaer, Flynn, & Leerssen 2016), the creation of a destination image, as understood in tourism marketing, focuses on influencing decision-making processes in choosing a destination rather than representing national characterisations and attendant stereotypes.

4. Environmental/market factors

While the blame for the production of substandard tourism translations usually points to linguistically incompetent translators, there are a range of reasons for the failure of translations in the marketing materials produced by the tourism industry. Studies have found that the role of translation and the translator is often poorly understood and undervalued, resulting in translation commissioners expecting translators to produce work cheaply and rapidly (Woodward-Smith 2019: 408-409).

This phenomenon occurs mainly due to the fact that monolingual and mono-cultural clients lack sufficient understanding of the cultural differences that lie beneath the surface of everyday interaction and the complex misunderstandings these can create.

Cranmer (2019: 56) argues that such gaps in intercultural awareness between tourism translators and their clients create three main challenges for translators: (1) limited receptiveness of commissioners to the idea that source texts might need to be recreated in translation; (2) establishing and maintaining commissioner trust for producing translations that address the needs of the target audience and ensure their inclusion; and (3) the need to know that despite the gap in intercultural awareness, translators have an appropriate level of client consent when interpreting and fulfilling the translation brief in a way which includes the target audience. Accordingly, Cranmer (2019: 62) proposes that tourism translators should develop a capacity to (1) improve the client's cultural and linguistic awareness; (2) exercise a wide range of interpersonal skills across gaps in cultural and linguistic awareness; and (3) establish and work according to a reasoned ethical stance.

In this regard, Sulaiman and Wilson (2019, 206) point out that while some commissioners may lack awareness of cultural differences and the nature of translation practice, others may have developed some degree of awareness. Their findings show that cross-cultural input in TPM translation, apart from being translator-initiated, could also be commissioner-initiated (e.g., instructions by the commissioner in the translation brief on how to deal with a particular cultural issue).

5. Conclusion

While there is a growing effort from within the tourism sector, particularly by the UNWTO, to make tourism info-promotional materials accessible to all, including users with disabilities and special needs, no serious effort is made to ensure either linguistic accessibility or linguistic quality, both key elements for successful communication (Woodward-Smith 2019: 402–403). Making faulty translations available is unlikely to improve overall accessibility or quality, bearing in mind that the lack of foreign language competence could also be considered a kind of "disability" as it does not allow the tourist to function competently in a foreign context. In fact, it could also be argued that the description of disability should not be applied to TPM users but rather to faulty translated products, which lack intercultural adequacy as they are unable to function competently in the target market.

In response to the proliferation of inadequate translations in the tourism industry and the large number of scholarly publications highlighting this deficiency, Woodward-Smith (2019: 406–409) raises the question of who actually acts on such inadequacies. According to her, unlike literary, legal and medical translations which are often subjected to a high degree of quality control (e.g., by publishers, medical practitioners and lawyers), translated tourism texts are not reviewed by experts but are, instead, passed directly into the public domain where they are consumed by potential tourists. She further laments that despite the large number of scholarly publications on substandard tourism translations, the message does not seem to be reaching those responsible. This indicates that there is a pressing need to initiate multilateral dialogues within and between academia and the industry, namely translation and tourism studies as well as the translation and tourism industries. An effort in this direction is Sulaiman and Wilson's work *Translation and Tourism: Strategies for Effective Cross-Cultural Promotion* (2019), which brings together theory and practice in the fields of translation and cross-cultural tourism promotion. The coupling of terms is clearly a suggestive one, encouraging reflection not only on the role of translation in the tourism sector but also on the potential for a cross-cultural approach to inspire fresh forms of creativity both in the act of translation and in its reception on the part of diverse audiences.

References

Agorni, Mirella. 2016. "Tourism Across Languages and Cultures: Accessibility Through Translation." *Cultus: The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication* 9 (2):13–27.

Cranmer, Robin. 2019. "The Inclusion of International Tourists: Developing the Translator-Client Relationship." *Altre Modernita* 21:55–68.

Dimitriu, Rodica. 2012. "When 'We' are 'the Other'. Travel Books on Romania as Exercises in Intercultural Communication." *Perspectives* 20 (3): 313–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2012.702400

Durán Muñoz, Isabel. 2011. "Tourist Translations as a Mediation Tool: Misunderstandings and Difficulties." *Cadernos de Tradução* 1 (27):29–49.

Filimonau, Viachaslau, and Loredana Perez. 2019. "National Culture and Tourist Destination Choice in the UK and Venezuela: An Exploratory and Preliminary Study." *Tourism Geographies* 21 (2):235–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1490342.

Hogg, Gill, Min-Hsiu Liao, and Kevin OGorman. 2014. "Reading Between the Lines: Multidimensional Translation in Tourism Consumption." *Tourism Management* 42:157–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.005

Jiangbo, He, and Tao Ying. 2010. "Study of the Translation Errors in the Light of the Skopostheorie: Samples from the Websites of Some Tourist Attractions in China." *Babel* 56 (1):35–46. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.56.1.03he

Katan, David. 2016. "Translating for Outsider Tourists: Cultural Informers Do It Better." *Cultus: The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication* 2 (9):63–90.

Kelly, Dorothy. 1998. "The Translation of Texts from the Tourist Sector: Textual Conventions, Cultural Distance and Other Constraints." *Trans: Revista de traductología* 2:33–42.

Sulaiman, M. Zain, and Rita Wilson. 2018. "Translating Tourism Promotional Materials: A Cultural-Conceptual Model." *Perspectives* 26 (5):629–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1437193.

Sulaiman, M. Zain, and Rita Wilson. 2019. *Translation and Tourism: Strategies for Effective Cross-Cultural Promotion*. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6343-6.

Sumberg, Carolyn. 2004. "Brand Leadership at Stake: Selling France to British Tourists." *The Translator* 10 (2):329–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2004.10799183.

van Doorslaer, Luc, Peter Flynn and Joep Leerssen (eds). 2016. *Interconnecting Translation Studies and Imagology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.119

Woodward-Smith, Elizabeth. 2019. "Tourism, Translation and Advertising." In *Routledge Handbook of Spanish Translation Studies*, ed. by Roberto A. Valdeón and África Vidal, 398–412. Oxon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315520131-22.

Further essential reading

Agorni, Mirella. 2018. "Cultural Representation Through Translation: An Insider-Outsider Perspective on the Translation of Tourism Promotional Discourse." *Altre Modernita* 20:253–275. https://doi.org/10.13130/2035-7680/10843.

Errasti, Maria Pilar Navarro, Rosa Lorés Sanz, and Silvia Murillo Ornat (eds). 2004. *Pragmatics at Work: The Translation of Tourist Literature*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Federici, Eleonora. 2019. "Translating the 'Other' for the Western World for more than a decade: Incredible India! campaigns." *Altre Modernita* 21:124–139. https://doi.org/10.13130/2035-7680/11640.

Sanning, He. 2010. "Lost and Found in Translating Tourist Texts: Domesticating, Foreignising or Neutralising Approach." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 13:124–137.

Valdeón, Roberto A. 2009. "Info-promotional Material Discourse and its Translation: The Case of the Asturian Tourist Board Texts." *Across Languages and Cultures* 10 (1):21–47. https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.10.2009.1.2.

Transcreation

David Katan
University of Salento

In the translation world, the term “transcreation” began to circulate in the early 2000s in the form of publicity blurb used by language service providers (LSPs) “seeking to distance themselves from traditional translation firms” (Bernal Merino 2006). Many scholars (e.g., Gambier & Munday 2014) and translators feel that transcreation was no more than a “re-branding” (see Katan 2016: 377) of what a good translation should be: a re-creation of a text in another language – in particular where translation is inherently creative, such as in Literary translation[2], advertising[2] or localization[1].

However, transcreation is much more than this. First, it describes a service, with the translator acting as a consultant, actively collaborating with the various partners. As a product, the term describes the fact that the resulting text will display elements of innovative intervention designed to maximise impact while closely recreating the underlying essence and feel of the original.

1. Origins of the term

Transcreation was first used in religious philosophy. Leibniz, who coined the term in 1676 defined it as the guiding hand underlying the change of state between, for example, destruction and resuscitation, which he also described as “a certain middle way between creation and an entire pre-existence” (Cook 2008: 456). The poet Coleridge, also a philosopher, used the term in a similar way to encapsulate the concept of religious conversion whereby a person reborn not only exhibits visibly new behaviour but also that the underlying “root of the qualities [of the person] is transcreated.” (Coleridge [1839] 2004). The term then appears to have remained dormant until its first recorded use for translation by the Indian poet Purushottama Lal in 1957 to describe his approach to the translation of classical Indian drama from ancient Sanskrit into contemporary English: “Faced by such a variety of material, the translator must edit, reconcile and transmute; his job in many ways becomes largely a matter of transcreation” (in Jahan 2004: 77). During the 1990s the term remained in use in India, particularly for the discussion of the historical and cultural divides involved in the translation of classic Indian texts (Mukherjee 1997). The term was used in a

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.tra19
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

similar way by the Brazilian poet Haroldo de Campos to discuss his translation of the 18th century poetic play, *Faust*, for a more mainstream and contemporary Brazilian audience (Ribiero Pires Vieira 1999).

More recently, as noted above, the term has become prominent in the field of Commercial translation[1]; and the only volume to date entirely dedicated to transcreation (by Sattler-Hovdar 2019) is a business companion for LSPs. We will now look in more detail at the defining features of both the commercial and the literary understandings.

2. Creativity and impact

Clearly, transcreation follows a functionalist[1] approach (Morón & Calvo 2018: 130), but rather than just adapting a text so that it fulfils the skopos, transcreation goes one step further. It must encapsulate the emotional feel of the original, and maximise the appeal and impact on the target reader (Gaballo 2012; Rike, 2013; Benetello 2018; Sattler-Hovdar 2019). This idea is inherent in Lal's understanding, when he wrote that the translator's creativity lay in the ability "to mould their versions to the aesthetic and moral taste of their age" (in Mukherjee 1997: 87). This idea was reiterated by de Campos who described his own transcreation, mentioned above, as "a radical translating operation" (Ribiero Pires Vieira 1999: 110).

Clearly, as Gaballo (2012: 104) suggests, a transcreator will need to think laterally and will experiment to create "unheard of solutions", which includes the coining of new terms and neologisms. Benetello (2018: 29) makes the interesting point that a transcreator will actually produce what would normally be regarded as errors if evaluated as "a translation", and that the creation of these formal errors is "the recommended way to proceed in transcreation". This means going against at least some of the hypothesised Translation universals[2], such as simplification and normalization; and grants licence to flout the norms of fidelity to the content of the source text encoded in professional translator codes of practice. Indeed, Mangiron and O'Hagan (2006: 20), early adopters of the term, suggest that "transcreation" replace "video game translation" to justify the "*quasi* absolute freedom to modify, omit, and even add any elements which [translators] deem necessary to bring the game closer to the players and to convey the original feel of gameplay".

This focus on impact helps to explain why transcreation has been readily taken up by the LSPs, and in particular "the creative industries" (Kapsaskis 2018). These industries cover not only audiovisual translation (Chaume 2018), but also the performing and visual arts, design and fashion, and cultural sites and establishments.

So, the term "transcreation" has now spread from what Kapsasis calls the individualistic highbrow end of the creative industries to the more popular communitarian lowbrow end. Indeed, transcreation is seen today mainly in terms of a commercial service (Benetello 2018: 29; Gaballo 2012: 102), while Pedersen (2014: 58) specifically limits transcreation to marketing and advertising, defining it as a process that "seeks to perform all the adjustments necessary to make a campaign work in all target markets, while at the same time staying loyal to the original creative intent of the campaign". The adjustments he mentions include translation not only of the verbal language but also, as many others have noted, the translation of other semiotic modes, such as the design of a website (see, for example, Rike 2013). Indeed, a transcreation project cited in Katan (2016) talks of transcreating (i.e., recreating) the source text vignettes and photographs of an American health booklet for a Spanish readership.

Recent use of the term "transcreation" outside of the lowbrow end of the creative industries is sparse, though references to literary translation (particularly of Children's literature[1]) can be found. Also, apart from the healthcare example, Katan cites the transcreation of an engineering report, while Gaballo (2012) demonstrates that transcreation occurs whenever there is a call for the coining of "new (novel, non-established) conceptual structures and the related terminology" and cites not only intralingual transcreation of poetry but the transcreation of technical terms relating to the aluminium industry into Icelandic and the transcreation of legal terms from Italian into English. Finally, publications referring to transcreation skills in translator training are also surfacing (e.g., Morón and Calvo 2018; Sattler-Hovdar 2019).

3. Collaboration and status

Transcreation clearly rejects the translator's traditional subservient habitus. Instead, a transcreator is seen to be an active agent, "in effect a co-author" (Cisneros 2012: 29), and in commercial translation, "a fully-fledged consultant" (Benetello 2018: 28) with a team mentality working closely with the client (Gaballo 2012: 102; Benetello 2018: 42). As an example, Morón and Calvo (2018: n.p.; also Sattler-Hovdar 2019) stress the importance of working with "creative brief forms … to get as much information as possible on what kind of service is required". This collaboration with others increases when a transcreation brief to provide an impactful single message encompasses plural languages and markets (Pedersen 2019: 43).

This emphasis on soft skills (collaboration and creativity) is time consuming, and transcreators are expected to charge for this. In fact, LSPs offer two different pricing scales, one for translators who work on a "per word basis", reduced according to the use of translation memories (TMs), and one for transcreators who are paid on a "per hour basis" and hardly use TMs (Gaballo 2012: 101). Consequently, transcreation fees closely parallel marketing and publicity consultancy rates (Morón & Calvo 2018).

4. Translator or transcreator?

What makes transcreation stand out from localisation, adaptation[1] and any other freer form of translation is the "back and forth" requirement "to produce a translation where signifier and signified are bound, to the greatest degree possible, in a similar way in the target language as in the source" (Cisneros 2012). Ribiero Pires Vieira (1999: 106), in fact, calls De Campos' translational project "a two-way transcultural enterprise", and Lal himself (in Jahan 2004: 77) is at pains "to correct the impression in some circles that transcreation involves wide departures from the original. Ideally, it, in fact, is the closest to the original". This "closest" is of course problematic, as the criteria are no longer based on the formal features of a text but on the transcreator's ability to allow her commissioner or reader to imagine that her new original creation is equivalent to the original.

Logically, as Katan (2016) suggests, a professional translator would be the ideal candidate to transcreate. Taking this path would give the profession the opportunity to shake off its subservient status. However, according to one survey (Katan 2016, 377), the majority of professional translators themselves do not wish to be transcreators due not only to the "re-branding" issue mentioned earlier but also to their unease with the freedom (or rather uncertainty) that any loosening of the formal ties with the source text necessarily creates.

Partly as a result of this, translators are, in general, only employed at the preliminary stage of any transcreation project (Katan 2016: 375), and Gaballo (2012: 102) actually wonders "whether translators are involved in the process at all". Indeed, according to Benetello (2018: 246), the majority of transcreators are ex-copy editors, while Pedersen's (2019) study of a recent transcreation project appears to confirm the pattern of transcreation without translators. He concludes, though, with Katan's call for a "transcreational turn" (Pedersen 2019: 57), which if heeded by the profession, would effectively empower translators in the way envisaged ever since the cultural turn.

References

Benetello, Claudia. 2018. "When translation is not enough: Transcreation as a convention defying practice. A practitioner's perspective." *JosTrans* (29): 28–44.

Bernal Merino, Miguel. 2006. "On the Translation of Video Games." *JoSTrans* 22–36. Accessed November 14, 2020. https://jostrans.org/issue06/art_bernal.php.

Chaume, Frederic. 2018. "Is audiovisual translation putting the concept of translation up against the ropes?" *JoSTrans* (30): 84 104.

Cisneros, Odile. 2012. "From Isomorphism to Cannibalism: The Evolution of Haroldo de Campos's Translation Concepts." *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 25 (2): 15–44. https://doi.org/10.7202/1018802ar.

Coleridge, Henry Nelson (ed.). 2004 [1839]. Coleridge's Literary Remains. ebook. Vol. 4. Project Gutenberg. Accessed November 22, 2020. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/10801/10801-h/10801-h.htm#section16.

Cook, Daniel J. 2008. "Leibniz on Creation: A Contribution to his Philosophical Theology" in *Leibniz: What kind of Rationalist? Epistemology and the Unity of Science*, ed. by Marcelo Dascal, 449–460. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8668-7_30

Gaballo, Viviana. 2012. "Exploring the boundaries of transcreation in specialized translation." *ESP Across Cultures* (9): 95–113.

Gambier, Yves, and Jeremy Munday. 2014. "A Conversation between Yves Gambier and Jeremy Munday about transcreation and the Future of the Profession." *Cultus* 7: 20–36.

Jahan, Rahmat. 2004. *Comparative Literature: A Case of Shaw and Bharatendu*. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons.

Kapsaskis, Dionysios. 2018. "Translation in the creative industries: An introduction." *JoSTrans* (29).

Katan, David. 2016. "Translation at the cross-roads: Time for the transcreational turn?" *Perspectives* 24 (3): 365–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1016049.

Mangiron, Carmen, and Minako O'Hagan. 2006. "Video Games Localisation: Unleashing Imagination with Restricted Translation." *JoSTrans* (6): 10–21.

Morón, Marián, and Elisa Calvo. 2018. "Introducing transcreation skills in translator training contexts: A situated project-based approach." *JoSTrans* (29): 126–148.

Mukherjee, Sujit. 1997. "Transcreating Translation: An Indian Mode." *Kunapipi*, 85–93.

Pedersen, Daniel. 2014. "Exploring the concept of transcreation – Transcreation as 'more than translation'?" *Cultus* (7): 57–71.

Pedersen, Daniel. 2019. "Managing transcreation projects: An ethnographic study." In *Translation Practice in the Field: Current research on socio-cognitive processes*, ed. by Hanna Risku, Regina Rogl, and Jelena Milosevic, 43–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.105.03ped

Ribiero Pires Vieira, Else. 1999. "Liberating Calibans: Readings of Antropofagia and Haroldo de Campos' Poetics of Transcreation." In *Post-Colonial Translation*, ed. by Susan Bassnett, and Harish Trivedi, 95–113. London: Routledge.

Rike, Sissel Marie. 2013. "Bilingual corporate websites – from translation to transcreation?" *JoSTrans* (20): 68–85.

Sales, Salvador Dora. 2005. "Indian fiction in English as transcreation?" In *Less Translated Languages*, ed. by Albert Branchadell, and Lovell Margaret West, 189–206. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.58.17sal

Sattler-Hovdar, Nina. 2019. *Get Fit for the Future of Transcreation: A Handbook on How to succeed in an Undervalued Market*. Independently published.

Further essential reading

Gaballo, Viviana. 2012. "Exploring the boundaries of transcreation in specialized translation." *ESP Across Cultures* (9): 95–113.

Kapsaskis, Dionysius (ed.). 2018. *Translation in the creative industries. Special issue of JoSTrans, issue* 29.

Katan, David, and Cinzia Spinzi (eds). 2014. *Transcreation and the professions. Special issue of Cultus, issue* 7.

Katan, David. 2016. "Translation at the cross-roads: Time for the transcreational turn?" *Perspectives*, 24 (3): 365–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1016049

Translating popular fiction

Federico Zanettin
University of Perugia

The label popular fiction has been used, together with terms such as "popular literature" and "paraliterature", to refer to texts perceived as less "worthy" than other texts that have the official approval of the cultural establishment, and which are considered part of the "serious" Literature, with a capital L (see Literary translation[2]). Popular fiction is also often equated to "genre fiction" (Murphy 2018: 5), that is texts usually having a formulaic nature and which rely on standardized characters and plots, belonging to genres such as detective stories, science fiction, romance and comedy. Given the high sales figures which typically characterize popular fiction, translated and not, the term has also been used as a synonym of "mass-market literature" and "bestsellers". It has been noted, however, that "literary", rather than "popular", novels can also be bestsellers (Gelder 2004: 13), and classic literature can also, in fact, be translated for the mass market (Milton 2001).

1. Cultural studies and popular fiction

Interest in the study of popular fiction was sparked in the 1980s, as researchers in the newly formed discipline of cultural studies set about to investigate and explain the central role played by popular fiction in people's cultural life (see also Cultural translation[3]). Bassnett (1998: 126) pointed out that translation studies (TS) and cultural studies followed a parallel route, as they both started to question "the distinction made within traditional criticism between "high" and "low" culture; both mounted a challenge to the concept of the literary canon; both urged a broadening of the study of literature to include the functions of a text in a given context". Translation and popular genres found themselves side by side as translation scholars listed the subjects and texts neglected by an elitist literary tradition. However, while research into popular literature has become one of the main areas within cultural studies, in TS, popular fiction still occupies a rather peripheral place with respect to canonical literature. Equally surprising is the fact that studies on popular fiction hardly mention translation practices and issues in their treatment of the field.

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.tra20

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

2. Media and genres of popular fiction

Popular fiction includes narrative texts in different media and belonging to different genres. Most studies explicitly dealing with popular fiction in translation have investigated written literature, but research has also been conducted regarding popular narratives in other media, including films, TV series and comics. The most examined genre of popular fiction in translation is probably crime fiction, though other studies have focused on romance (in particular, Harlequin novels), science fiction, fantasy, horror, Western and martial arts. Most research has considered translation from or into English, though other language combinations are also included, with languages ranging from German, French, Spanish, Italian and Greek to Brazilian Portuguese, Turkish and Chinese (see Bianchi & Zanettin 2018 for an overview). The popular fiction industry, fluctuating between globalization and cultural specificity, is characterized by complex dynamics between the various agents and institutions involved. Research thus needs to consider various practices and processes which characterize the production and marketing of popular fiction, including team translation, short deadlines and the reuse of existing translations, as well as new forms of non-professional translation associated with fan culture and social networking (see also Web and translation①), such as fansubbing, fundubbing, scanlation, and fan translation (Carter 2018).

3. Censorship and popular fiction in translation

A number or research themes repeatedly emerge in connection with popular fiction in translation. Perhaps the most recurrent observations relate to issues of censorship① since popular literature in translation is often subjected to radical manipulations. These can be due to the low cultural status attributed to popular texts, which are perceived as “commodities” rather than as works of art. Thus, for instance, translated novels are often published in book series of standard prize and length, this latter being a criterion prevailing over authorial integrity, and manipulations such as cutting, condensation and abridgement are not only tolerated but also sometimes required by marketing and packaging strategies. However, though the complexity of practices, agents and motives involved in the production of popular fiction is often difficult to disentangle, in many instances the widespread use of manipulative practices can be seen as a result of acts of censorship or self-censorship, and more in general of controlling strategies.

Since the emergence of its modern forms at the end of the nineteenth century, thanks to increased levels of literacy and urbanization and the new technologies of industrial publishing, popular fiction has frequently been under a regime of “surveillance", supposedly aimed at protecting the "masses" from reading material which was often branded as corrupting and degenerate. The perception of popular texts as innately "dangerous" has led to different forms of social control and censorship, conducted by governments, private organizations or individuals, and at different stages of the publication cycle. Preventive censorship is applied prior to the introduction of new material and may be motivated by cultural and/or economic factors, i.e., to protect traditional values or to protect national production. It is usually aimed at cleansing texts of "unsuitable" elements, in order to prevent either pre- or post-publication institutional censorship. Post-censorship takes place after publication when a product is either boycotted, formally banned, or even destroyed. For instance, various European countries imposed a ban on foreign comics both during dictatorial regimes and under democratic governments (Zanettin 2017); see also Comics in translation[1].

Preventive censorship, on the other hand, often takes the form of self-censorship, either through self-regulations by the publishing industry, or as exerted by individual translators or editors, and can thus be considered a more internalized form of censorship. Thus, a publisher may abstain from publishing a translation not because there is a law against it, but in fear of what may happen once the work becomes public, and translators may take upon themselves the role of gatekeepers and even act as advocates of censorship. However, "while censorship is a manifestation of manipulation, not all manipulation is censorship" (Merkle et al. 2010: 14), and it may be argued, for instance, that textual additions do not amount to censorship, while cuts may or may not be censorious, depending on where the border between censorship and attenuation is drawn. One crucial problem is that by representing popular fiction both as aesthetically inferior and non-educational, censorious interventions may be camouflaged as operations of textual improvement, so that censorship practices are often justified by a perceived or asserted need to make the translated texts "acceptable" not only as regards political issues, but also in relation to socio-cultural factors and aesthetic criteria.

4. Other research themes in connection with popular fiction in translation

Some authors have discussed the role played by popular fiction in translation in shaping national cultures and literatures, and the way various forms of ideological manipulation have affected the circulation of foreign popular literature and impinged on its appropriation by the receiving cultures (see Reception and translation[4]). For instance, Rundle (2018) argues that translation undermined the Fascist cultural project, which saw popular culture as an opportunity to manipulate the masses by appealing to them but also retaining the core values of Fascism; Weissbrod (1991) and

Ben-Ari (2009) investigate how translated popular literature was both affected by and contributed to political and social changes in Israel; Milton (2001) discusses the practices and social implications which characterize the production and consumption of popular fiction in the Brazilian mass market; Zlatnar Moe and Žigon (2016) investigate stereotyped National images[3] in a corpus of Slovene translations of romance, crime and fantasy novels.

A common trait in popular fiction is the interplay between translation and what Bolter and Gruslin (1999) have called remediation, defined in relation to what the contemporary entertainment industry calls repurposing, i.e., the reuse of content from one medium in another medium. A related concept is that of "transmedial storytelling", which refers to the creation of a coherent narrative experience across different media platforms and is commonly used as a marketing strategy (Okulska 2016). While remediation is typically discussed in relation to digital media, the borrowing of content between one medium and another is "extremely common in popular culture today, [but it] is also very old" (Bolter and Grusin 1999: 44). Even before the contemporary boom of offshoots, spinoffs, rewritings, co-writings, adaptations and recontextualizations, the cross fertilization and interchange between written literature, comics, animated cartoons, films, radio shows and TV series has been a constant feature of popular fiction. Popular genres have always been translated, adapted, plagiarized, imitated and reshaped in transmedial production and reproduction (van Doorslaer 2020: 143). Bestselling popular novels have been adapted for the screen or the stage since the eighteenth century, and novelization, i.e., the adaptation of a film for the written medium, is a cultural practice that has always characterized popular fiction to a larger extent than literary fiction. The heroes and anti-heroes that became the protagonists of many popular narratives in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries went continuously back and forth between the printed page and the screen, and were consumed both in original[4] and translated forms and media (Dimitroulia 2018). Interlingual and transmedial rewritings exemplify the "malleability" of popular fiction, and the "symbiotic relationship" (Murphy 2018: 8) of different forms of popular fiction and culture is strengthened when genre narratives in one medium contribute to the dissemination and audience appreciation of the same narratives in other media. More recently, TV series have been translated using different strategies and modes (dubbing or subtitling) to accommodate different media outlets (TV, DVD and streaming outlets) and different viewerships (nationwide audience, children, fans), sometimes resulting in radically different products with respect to those in the source language. Considering the way in which popular texts are variously transformed and reshaped when transferred in other media, looking at the translation of popular fiction from the perspective of translational remediation may allow productive exchanges with the neighboring disciplines of media studies and adaptation[1] studies.

Another theme which intersects with the study of popular fiction is the relationship between gender[1] and translation with respect, for instance, to the way in which socially constructed notions of “man” and “woman” affect the agency of translators, and to the use of gendering translation strategies, whereby female identity is represented along more conservative and stereotypical lines than in original texts. Studies that have analyzed issues of gender in translated popular fiction range from investigations of how translators position themselves in relation to texts that may subvert established conventions of genre[4] and gender (for example, the sex of the story’s protagonist), to manipulative editorial practices involving the “normalization” of characters who do not conform to accepted notions of social conduct (Bianchi 2018). Other research topics include the role of translations and pseudotranslations[2] in popularizing a genre in a given target culture (see also Popularization and translation[4]), and the study of the image of translation and translators in popular fiction (Kaindl 2018).

Translation practices and processes have always been intertwined with the production of popular fiction, and much scope remains for research in this area. This would benefit not only TS, but also a wide range of approaches to the study of literature and the entertainment industry.

References

Bassnett, Susan. 1998. “The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies.” In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, ed. by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 123–40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ben-Ari, Nitsa. 2009. “Popular Literature in Hebrew as a Marker of Anti-Sabra Culture.” *Translation Studies* 2 (2): 178–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700902937722.

Bianchi, Diana. 2018. “Dangerous Visions? The Circulation and Translation of Women’s Crime Fiction and Science Fiction.” *Perspectives* 26 (6): 901–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1437194.

Bianchi, Diana, and Federico Zanettin. 2018. “‘Under Surveillance’. An Introduction to Popular Fiction in Translation.” *Perspectives* 26 (6): 793–808. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1510017.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Carter, Ellen. 2018. “Translating Popular Fiction.” In *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, ed. by Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi Carbonell i Cortés, 431–44. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315670898-24

Dimitroulia, Titika. 2018. “From Antiheroes to New Realism: French and Italian Crime Fiction in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Century.” *Perspectives* 26 (6): 809–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1493132.

Gelder, Ken. 2004. *Popular Fiction. The Logics and Practices of a Literary Field*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203023365

Kaindl, Klaus. 2018. “Fictional Representations.” In *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge*, ed. by Lieven D’hulst and Yves Gambier, 51–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.142.05kai

Merkle, Denise, Carol O’sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer, and Michaela Wolf. 2010. “Exploring a Neglected Century: Translation and Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe.” In *The Power of the Pen: Translation and Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. by Denise Merkle, Carol O’sullivan, Luc van Doorslaer, and Michaela Wolf, 7–26. Vienna: Lit.

Milton, John. 2001. “Translating Classic Fiction for Mass Markets.” *The Translator* 7 (1): 43–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2001.10799084.

Murphy, Bernice M. 2018. *Key Concepts in Contemporary Popular Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Okulska, Inez. 2016. “From Intersemiotic Translation to Tie-in Products, or Transmedial Storytelling as a Translation Strategy.” *Forum of Poetics* 6: 58–69. http://fp.amu.edu.pl/from-intersemiotic-translation-to-tie-in-products-or-transmedial-storytelling-as-a-translation-strategy/.

Rundle, Christopher. 2018. “Stemming the Flood: The Censorship of Translated Popular Fiction in Fascist Italy.” *Perspectives* 26 (6): 838–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1444646.

van Doorslaer, Luc. 2020. “Translation Studies: What’s in a Name?” *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 7 (2): 139–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2020.1824761.

Weissbrod, Rachel. 1991. “Translation of Prose Fiction from English to Hebrew: A Function of Norms (1960s and 1970s).” In *Translation: Theory and Practice, Tension and Interdependence*, ed. by Mildred L. Larson, 206–223. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.v.22wei

Zanettin, Federico. 2017. “Translation, Censorship and the Development of European Comics Cultures.” *Perspectives* 26 (6): 868–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1351456.

Zlatnar Moe, Marija, and Tanja Žigon. 2016. “Comparing National Images in Translations of Popular Fiction.” In *Interconnecting Translation Studies and Imagology*, ed. by Luc van Doorslaer, Peter Flynn, and Joep Leerssen, 145–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.119.09zla

Further essential reading

Barker, Chris. 2003. *Cultural Studies. Theory and Practice*. Second edition. London: Sage.

Hartman, Michelle. 2019. “Prose fiction.” In *Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation*, ed. by Kelly Washbourne and Ben Van Wyke, 206–219. London: Routledge.

Hopkinson, Amanda and Karen Seago. 2019. “Crime fiction.” In *Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation*, ed. by Kelly Washbourne and Ben Van Wyke 220–239. London: Routledge.

Translating social sciences

Yves Gambier
University of Turku | Kaunas University of Technology

The term "social sciences" encompasses here certain disciplines, such as sociology, psychology etc. The main objective is not to cover all the disciplines taught and researched at the university level but to understand the extent to which certain social sciences have benefited from translation to become more international.

The social sciences have over time experienced periods of change; today, we can say they are fragmented into subfields and specialities. Psychology, for instance, can be divided into social psychology, developmental psychology, cognitive psychology, neuropsychology, etc. Sociology includes a broad variety of frames of inquiry and research methods, based on structural functionalism, conflict theory, anti-positivism, etc. Different schools have existed, such as the Frankfurt school, the Birmingham school and so forth.

These features are sufficient to emphasize why ideas, publications and authors, both within a given social science and between social sciences, circulate between countries and languages only with difficulty.

1. A domain scarcely studied

In addition to conferences held in New York (1991, 2005, 2016), London (2004), Rouen (2005), Paris (2013, 2015), Graz (2015) and Cerisy-la-Salle (2017), we can refer to two international research programmes. The first (2004–2008) aimed at creating a "European space for the social sciences" (ESSE, www.espacesse.org), while in the second EU project (2013–2017) "International cooperation in the social sciences and the Humanities: socio-historical perspectives and future possibilities" (http://interco-shs.eu/en/), seven teams carried out a comparative analysis of the institutionalisation of several disciplines in the social sciences, emphasising the role of translations in the circulation of paradigms and theories (Santoro & Sapiro 2017; Heilbron et al. 2018; Fleck et al. 2019; Sapiro et al. 2020). Finally, we can mention the Social Science Translation Project (SSTP) sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies (2004–2005) which created *Guidelines for the Translation of Social Science Texts* (2006). Alongside sociologists, a series of translation studies (TS)scholars also work in the domain. See Sociology of Translation[1]

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.tra21

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

2. The editorial conditions of the translations

What are the factors which promote translations? Who are the agents involved in the import of foreign texts and in the decision-making process? (Sapiro 2012; Nies 2002).

There are many stakeholders in the editorial market, with varied skills and interests: publishers, series editors, literary agents, the lawyers responsible of copyrights, agents of cultural networks abroad, representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, media critics, distributors, booksellers … and translators. All of them, at one time or another, fulfil the function of gatekeeper regarding the selection, promotion and distribution of a work.

The decision to translate depends on the balance of power between cultures and languages in the current globalised world. And we can add the differentiations between disciplines (e.g., the United States privileging the works of philosophy and of history rather than those of psychoanalysis), the distinctions between ways of thinking, of conceptualizing. Another factor is the position and the resources of the publishing houses in the editorial field, regarding the financial constraints and legal matters. The time factor is here important – to acclimatize to something new, to promote a title, to control the rotation of books in a bookstore, to measure the lifespan of a work (which defines the value of the catalogue of a publisher, the reissues in paperback, (re)translations) etc.

Other socio-cultural factors can also modify editorial offers, such as the place of language teaching, the academic context that legitimizes certain disciplines more than others, international competition between commercial publishers and university presses (Sapiro 2012; 2014).

In addition to interviews and statistics, Sapiro (2012: 297–367) analyses three case studies: (1) Regarding the sociologist Norbert Elias, first accepted in France by historians, Sapiro looks at the role played by translations and their paratexts, and the impact of the awards received in the process of his canonization. (2) The second case of late recognition refers to the slow importation of analytical philosophy and pragmatism (e.g., C. S. Peirce, J. Dewey, H. Putnam, W. Quine, J. Austin) from the United States into France. (3) The third case confirms the importance of intellectual, institutional and editorial configurations in the target field regarding the reception of the political and moral philosophy elaborated by John Rawls.

3. The discourse of the social sciences and functions of the translations

In at least several cultures, disciplines such as history and sociology have long been affiliated to the Faculty of Humanities. Between literary studies and the social sciences, there should also be what are often termed the “Sciences humaines” – a culturally-oriented triptych that instantly illustrates the division between disciplines as seen in the USA and France, for instance.

Different scholars take up this tension between the logic of the scientific field and the logic of the literary field that adds value to style and originality of thinking. The tradition of empiricism, reporting experiences, develops another discursive strategy. We have here two different inheritances in the social sciences: one is derived from philosophy, the other from the sciences. From 1981 onwards, Ladmiral has often tackled this distribution between literary texts, "discours théorique culturel" (including philosophy) and technical texts (texts in the natural sciences: informative and pragmatic texts). The cultural theoretical discourse would lie between literary and technical texts and belong to both. This halfway position is reinforced by a certain conceptualisation marked by the univocality principle (one term = one concept) which is supposed to characterize the natural sciences in achieving a high level of generality and universality. On the other hand, such texts communicate "through concepts that are shared (or contested) within a specific community of scholars or groups sharing common goals" (*Guidelines* 2006: 4). Because of their historical assumptions and ideological biases, these concepts cannot find their straightforward "dictionary translations" (ibid: 4; Price 2008). Translations open up concepts and give authorial responsibility to the translators.

Surprisingly, the polemics about social science texts and concepts does not refer to terminology at all (Terminology and translation[1]) – from Eugen Wüster's works in the 1950s to socio-terminology and cognitive terminology, developed in the 1990s. Yet imported concepts (from another language, from another discipline, from another period of time) are transplanted into a different epistemological context. Burke and Richter (2012) is just an example dealing with terms and concepts beyond formalism (studying origins and forms of the terms) and idealism.

Such an approach through concepts also ignores the textual dimension of social science publications. Social science texts follow certain conventions, according to the genre (monograph, academic dissertation, paper in a peer-reviewed journal, essay) and the types of argumentation (reflexivity, empirical case study, commentary, point of view). Contrastive rhetoric underlines the different traditions in the overall composition of a text, in the ways of structuring information, the use of citations and other forms of intertextuality. Social science texts are always referring to other texts, other authors who also refer to other texts (Collet 2016): they do not differ from literary and scientific texts in that respect. Social media and blogs, sites of preprints (uploaded texts to be discussed before their publication) might change writing scientific texts.

With so many ambiguities in the characteristics of social science texts, what could be the functions of the translations? Indeed, such functions are not necessarily proper to the translation of the social sciences. Translation has always played a key role in the move of theories, and methods, in particular in the C17th. in Western Europe when promoting vernaculars and secularization of knowledge. See Banoun et al. (2019) about translations into French, over the period 1914–2000, in history (Chapter 24), anthropology and sociology (Chapter 27) and psychology (Chapter 28). But this international circulation, with a re-interpretation of the ideas and paradigms, has not been the result of a balanced relationship. To translate is not only to select and produce new texts; it is also distributing and having effects in the target culture. Translations shape, transform, and stimulate disciplines in the receiving communities, implying a new division of symbolic capital at the international level. At the national level, they introduce changes against local dominant trends and shake up national hierarchies and networks. Translated texts are read in different contexts of reception; their intertextual background is untied. The retranslations of the same original texts call for different strategies according to the period of time and context. See, for instance, Schögler (2012) about Max Weber translated into English. What happens to de-contextualisation and re-interpretation when source texts (peer-reviewed articles, chapters in a book) in German, French, Japanese, Chinese are rewritten and self-translated into English? (see Self-translation[1]) We can also mention (self-)translating into English questionnaires for cross-national surveys in the social sciences (Behr & Sha 2018). Does the English hegemony create an epistemological monoculture and inequalities with the illusion of transparency and a common conceptual space? (Bennett 2007; Boaventura 2014; see Lingua franca[5]). Translating and reading translations develops reflexivity and a de-domestication of cognitive categories.

4. Reception and effects of translations

Translations can be the cause of some changes in the readers' mind and/or attitude, and in intercultural relations, in the target culture. In other words, they can affect individual readers, at a given moment or over time, and groups of people. Some references provide examples of such circulation and intellectual changes through translations – e.g., Santoro & Sapiro (2017) concerning the importance of certain scholars as driving forces in the change in and through social networks and foreign contexts, such as Said, Foucault, Arendt, Barthes; Heilbron et al. (2018) about the patterns of trans-nationalisation and Westernisation in the social sciences between the North and the South, the West and Asia; Fleck et al. (2019) about institutionalisation and professionalization in the social sciences in different countries; Schögler (2019) about the reception of Elias and Arendt; Sapiro et al. (2020) about the reception of structuralism in English Studies, the importation of the Frankfurt School into France, and the legitimation of Gramsci, Polanyi, Foucault, Said and Spivak in several countries.

The reciprocity of influences is never on an equal basis: translations can sometimes be sites of conflict or invisible violence, for instance the English reception of French social theorists flourishing in the period 1950–2000 (e.g., Althusser, Barthes, Baudrillard, Derrida, Lyotard) and the rapid diffusion of what is called French Theory, especially in the US. The *histoire croisée* in the social sciences between France and the USA is a relevant example of how influence is complex: not only books are translated but any movement of ideas, theories or methods is a "translation", an adaptation to a new context (Naugrette-Founier and Poncharal 2019).

Two particular case studies could be mentioned here. Darwin's *Origin of Species* is important because of his scientific and as well as the philosophical, political and theological impact on society, on our way of thinking about nature, including humans. The original and the (re)translations were received in many different sociocultural contexts, by different types of readerships, some translations being made from another translation (relay or indirect translation[3]). The re-contextualisation very often required an ideological adaptation to certain cognitive schemes and categories, and beliefs. The analysis of the different translations raises questions of authorship, accuracy, and faithfulness to the readers, and the role and responsibility of the translators (Pano & Regattin 2015; Regattin 2017).

The other case concerns Bourdieu's influence in sociology and across disciplines (anthropology, culture, education, literary studies, media studies and TS) in several foreign countries. Sapiro and Bustamante (2009) have mapped the geographic and linguistic distribution of his books in translations between 1958 and 2008. Once widely recognised, Bourdieu's works were increasingly and more rapidly translated, and then expanded from academia to the intellectual field. See also Santoro et al. 2018. Such an international reception does not take into account the different interpretations and uses of Bourdieu's works and the problems of translations, and ignores secondary readings, indirect translations, and research postures – in short, not only the influence but also the effects of Bourdieu (and on his own trajectory!).

To sum up, the selection criteria and process involved in translating social science texts are linked to the expected reception and the active paradigms in the target culture. Translation in the social sciences is not only transmitting and adapting texts. There are also other types of transmission via associations, conferences, research meetings, teaching, online talks and TV programmes, involving different activities such as reading, commenting, interpreting, quoting, rewriting and popularising … by peers in the same discipline or from another discipline, by journalists and by advanced students. As to translators, the divide between professionals and academics (Sapiro 2014: Chapter 5) reminds one of the long-standing divide between translators who become specialists and specialists who try their hand at translating (Schögler 2012).

References

Banoun, Bernard, Isabelle Poulin and Yves Chevrel (eds). 2019. *Histoire des traductions en langue française : XXè siècle*. Lagrasse: Verdier.

Behr, Dorothée, Mandy Sha (eds). 2018. Translation of questionnaire in cross-national and cross-cultural research, *Translation and Interpreting* 10 (2). https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.110202.2018.a01

Bennett, Karen. 2007. Epistemicide! The tale of predatory discourse, *The Translator* 13 (2): 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799236

Burke, Martin and Richter, Melvin (eds). 2012. *Why concepts matter. Translating social and political thought*. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004194908

Collet, Tanja. 2016. "Intertextuality in specialized translation: citations as semantic in social science", *Journal of Specialized Translation* 26: 72–95.

Guidelines for the translation of social science texts, sponsored by The American Council of Learned Societies. 2006. 30 pages. Online: www.acls.org/sstp.htm. Translated into Arabic, Chinese, French, Japanese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

Ladmiral, Jean-René. 1981. "Éléments de traduction philosophique", *Langue française* 51, 19–34. https://doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1981.5095

Naugrette-Fournier, Marion and Bruno, Poncharal (eds). 2019. "La réception de la « pensée française » contemporaine dans le monde anglophone au prisme de la traduction", *Palimpsestes* 33.

Nies, Fritz (ed.). 2004. *Les enjeux scientifiques de la traduction. Echanges franco-allemands en sciences humaines et sociales*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'Homme. Published also in 2002: *Spiel ohne Grenzen? Zum deutsch-französischen Transfer in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Pano Alamán, Ana and Fabio Regattin. 2015. *Tradurre un classico della scienza: traduzioni e ritraduzioni dell'Origin of Species di Charles Darwin in Francia, Italia e Spagna*. Bologne : Bononia University Press.

Price, Joshua. 2008. "Translating social science. Good versus bad utopianism", *Target* 20 (2): 348–364. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.20.2.09pri

Regattin, Fabio. 2017. Avatars contemporains de Darwin : traductions françaises de *The Origin of Species* (XX–XXIè siècles). *Parallèles* 29 (2): 64–81.

Santoro Marco, Gallelli Andrea and Grünig Barbara. 2018. Bourdieu's International Circulation: An Exercise in Intellectual Mapping, in: *The Oxford Handbook of P. Bourdieu*, ed. by Medvetz Thomas and Sallaz Jeffrey, p. 21–67. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Sapiro, Gisèle (ed.) 2012. *Traduire la littérature et les sciences humaines. Conditions et obstacles*. Paris: Ministère de la culture et de la communication. https://doi.org/10.3917/deps.sapir.2012.01

Sapiro, Gisèle and Mauricio Bustamente. 2009. "Translation as a measure of international consecration. Mapping the world distribution of Bourdieu's books in translations", *Sociologica* 2–3: 1–44. Online.

Schögler, Rafael, 2012. "Übersetzungsstrategien und Übersetzung sfelder. Die Übersetzungen von Max Weber' Die protestantische Ethik' ins Englishe", *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 23 (3): 127–160.

Further essential reading

Boaventura, de Sousa Santos. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder/London: Paradigm Publishers.

Fleck, Christian, Matthias Duller and Victor Karády (eds). 2019. *Shaping human and science disciplines. International developments in Europe and beyond*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92780-0

Heilbron, Johan, Gustavo Sorá and Thibaud Boncourt (eds). 2018. *The social and human sciences in global power relations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73299-2

Santoro, Marco and Gisèle Sapiro (eds). 2017. Traveling theories. The international circulation of social thinkers and their works, *Sociologica (Italian journal of sociology online)* 1, January-April 2017.

Sapiro, Gisèle, Marco Santoro and Patrick Baert (eds). 2020. *Ideas on the move in the social sciences and Humanities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35024-6

Schögler, Rafael (ed.). 2019. *Circulation of Academic Thought. Rethinking Translation in the Academic Field*. Bern: P. Lang. https://doi.org/10.3726/b14868

Translator studies

Andrew Chesterman
University of Helsinki

1. Origins of the term

James Holmes' classic map of translation studies (TS) (1988) rapidly became one of the foundations of contemporary descriptive[1] TS. It largely reflected the traditional focus on translations as texts or products. However, contemporary research on translation has long been concerned with issues that go beyond purely textual or linguistic ones, and this general perspective seems to be on the increase as the field broadens.

True, the map did include research on the translation process and translator training. And in Holmes' original text (although not on some versions of the map itself) translation policy is mentioned: this covers, says Holmes, the role and status of translators, their social and economic position. Translation sociology (see Sociology of translation[1]) is also mentioned in the text, but does not appear on the map itself. In fact, the role played by the human agents[2] who have been and are responsible for producing translations mostly remains hidden. Several of the subsequent "turns[1] of translation studies" (Snell-Hornby 2006) have shown the need to expand the map. Indeed, Holmes' map has been debated not only because of what it highlighted, but also because of what it excluded or downplayed. It has become increasingly clear that the cartography representing the Big Picture of the expanding field of TS needs updating, in order to keep up with new research interests. Hence, among other things, the emergence of the label "translator studies", as a cover-term for various kinds of research which focus primarily on people rather than texts, translators rather than translations. The term has come to denote a broad subfield of the heterogeneous mother discipline.

One of the earliest proposals to name and conceptualize a subfield covering non-textual studies of translation was an article called "Translator-Centredness" by Genseng Hu (2004). Hu referred to his own earlier work on the ecology[5] of translation, which theorizes translation in terms of adaptation and selection. The fundamental question here concerns what translators do. Hu proposed "translator studies" as a term to cover all research that places translators at the centre of focus. He noted many precursors of such an approach, mentioning concepts from the pre-linguistic period such as the translator's experience and freedom of choice, and from the post-

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.tra22
© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

structural period such as the translator as the agent of a cultural practice, and the translator's subjective involvement. He recognized the roles played by other translation agents such as editors and publishers. He also mentioned some of the early work using think-aloud protocols (see Cognitive approaches[1]) to study translators' decision-making, including decisions perhaps influenced by the translator's personality or ideology: any translator will leave an individual imprint. Hu comments that the general social status of translators does not seem to have improved as a result of the research done on translators themselves. If this is one aim of his own research, it goes interestingly beyond the goals of a purely descriptive or explanatory approach.

A second early use of the term "translator studies" was an article by Chesterman (2009), entitled "The name and nature of Translator Studies". This takes a different approach, starting from Holmes' map. Whereas Hu called for more research in translator studies, Chesterman offered an outline sketch of the different kinds of already existing research that can be grouped under a translator studies umbrella.

2. Branches

Chesterman's sketch suggests that translator studies can be conceptualized in terms of the following main branches: cultural, cognitive and sociological. These overtly correspond to three of the main post-linguistic turns in TS: cultural[2] approaches, cognitive approaches and the sociology of translation. Some examples of each follow.

Under the cultural branch we can place e.g., work on the analysis and effects of translators' ideologies[3], as seen for instance in activist, committed[1] approaches; work on translation ethics[1]; and on translation history[1], particularly when research deals with the careers and influences of individual translators and interpreters. The general perspective of this branch thus sees translators as agents of cultural exchange and evolution. As significant agents, the way they are perceived and represented in different cultures is also relevant. One way to study this is to investigate the representations[3] of translators and interpreters in fiction: how realistic are these representations, how stereotypical, how convincing? What attitudes towards them are expressed by other fictional characters?

Research in the cognitive branch on translators' mental processes has expanded hugely in recent decades, to cover e.g., attitudes towards norms, personal translation principles, and the effects of different emotional characteristics on decision-making (for a recent survey of cognitive research on translation, see Jakobsen & Alves 2020). Translators' attitudes are being studied as part of their personal habitus (e.g., Yannakopoulu 2008). Translation psychology[3] is also beginning to look at the influence of the translator's personality (e.g., Hubscher-Davidson 2009). Translators' feelings of job satisfaction, or alternatively of professional lamentation, are another topic of research (e.g., Dam & Zethsen 2016). The exploration of different personal working or writing styles is also of interest in this context (Mossop 2000). The activity of keeping a translation diary may also affect one's own motivation, according to Mossop (2014).

The sociological branch of translator studies has itself been branching out in new directions. It has been investigating the sociology of translators themselves: networks and professional associations (Pym 2014), chat-groups, gender[1] issues, status, accreditation systems, economic status, etc. And it has also been analysing the effects of sociological factors of the working process, such as the use of different translation aids in computer-aided translation[1]. An interesting focus here has been the notion of cognitive friction, which may be caused by highly unpleasant working conditions and affect translation quality[1] (see Ehrensberger-Dow & O'Brien 2015).

The borders between these three main branches are fuzzy: they can all overlap with each other. Ideology is manifested partly as a cultural phenomenon, e.g., concerning the history of ideas, and partly as social action motivated (via cognition) by these ideas. The concept of the translator's affect, which might be glossed roughly as emotional energy, involves sociological as well as cognitive processes (Koskinen 2020). And cognitive friction (mentioned above) arises from an imbalance between a translator's cognitive processing and some aspect of the working conditions, i.e., of the sociological environment. In sociologically oriented research, Bourdieu's notion of the habitus, as made use of in research on translators' attitudes (first by Simeoni 1998), also straddles the border between the cognitive and the social. Indeed, the position known as embodied cognition taken by some cognitive scientists assumes that no clear distinction can be made between mind and body: the mind is inextricably linked to its physical environment, so that mental processes are highly contingent on local conditions.

3. Prospects

The interdiscipline of TS started from a linguistic focus on texts (however broadly defined), and this focus remains at the centre of the field. However, around this core all three main branches of translator studies have been developing fast. One sign of this is the increasing use of some version of an agent model of research, rather than a textual or comparative one based on analysing the relations between source and target texts. In research that has an explanatory goal, the initial *explanandum* ("that which is to be explained") is often some phenomenon at the textual level, such as an individual translation solution, or a tendency. But an *explanans* ("that which explains") may well be found in some aspect of one or more of the agents of translation, such as personality, or mood, or attitude to working conditions. In terms of

Aristotle's causes, more prominence is given to the efficient cause: here, mainly the translator himself or herself (see further Chesterman 2008).

At the institutional level, too, there is increasing interest in translator studies as a subfield. In 2018, a conference was held in Vienna on this theme, with a special focus on literary translators (see https://translit2018.univie.ac.at/home/). As can be seen from the website, the list of proposed topics included these: the translator's self and identity; discourse and voice; professional trajectory; body; habitus; feminist or queer orientation; diasporic experience; perception of his/her own role; and personality (see Kaindl et al. 2021).

The way translator studies highlights the human creators of translations does bring them more visibility[4], at least in academic circles. This may lead to a more recognized status, as Hu wished, but it may not. However, the links between academia and the profession are perhaps strengthening, with many shared associations and conferences. Translator trainers may be able to use translator studies to instil greater self-respect in future practitioners. Yet not all practitioners receive any training, as more and more work is crowd-sourced out to amateurs. The competitive world of the translation industry is a tough one, with continuing pressure to cut costs and increase productivity.

At least within academic circles, one key function of translator studies may be its resistance to the threat of the dehumanization of translation services: the threat that they will increasingly be run by computer programs with only minimal contributions from human translators, who are themselves becoming more and more like cyborgs. If translator studies can contribute towards preserving and developing the key human elements of translation, where they are essential, that would be a respectable contribution indeed. And we may gradually understand more of what it means for human beings to translate.

References

Chesterman, Andrew. 2008. "On explanation." In *Beyond Descriptive Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, ed. by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, 363–379. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.75.27che

Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. "The name and nature of Translator Studies." *Hermes* 42: 13–22.

Dam, Helle V. and Karen Korning Zethsen. 2016. "'I think it is a wonderful job.' On the solidity of the translation profession." *JoSTrans* 25: 174–187. Available at https://www.jostrans.org/issue25/art_dam.php.

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, and Sharon O'Brien. 2015. "Ergonomics of the Translation Workplace: Potential for Cognitive Friction." *Translation Spaces* 4 (1): 98–118. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.4.1.05ehr

Holmes, James S. 1988. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In J.S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, 67–80. Amsterdam: Rodopi. Reprinted e.g., in *The Translation Studies Reader* (2000), ed. by Lawrence Venuti 172–185. London: Routledge.

Hu, Genseng. 2004. "Translator-Centredness." *Perspectives* 12 (2): 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2004.9961494

Hubscher-Davidson, Séverine. 2009. "Personal diversity and diverse personalities in translation: A study of individual differences." *Perspectives* 17 (3): 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/09076760903249380

Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke, and Fabio Alves (eds). 2020. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. London: Routledge.

Kaindl, Klaus, Waltraud Kolb, and Daniela Schlager (eds). 2021. *Literary Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2020. *Translation and Affect*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.152

Mossop, Brian. 2000. "The workplace procedures of professional translators." In *Translation in Context*, ed. by Andrew Chesterman, Natavidad Galliardo San Salvador, and Yves Gambier, 39–48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.39.07mos

Mossop, Brian, 2014. "Motivation and de-motivation in a government translation service: a diary-based approach." *Perspectives* 22 (4): 581–591. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.948889

Pym, Anthony. 2014. "Translator associations – from gatekeepers to communities." *Target* 26 (3): 466–491. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.26.3.06pym

Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target* 10 (1): 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.10.1.02sim

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.66

Yannakopoulu, Vasso. 2008. "Norms and Translatorial Habitus in Angelos Vlahos' Greek Translation of Hamlet." In *Translation and its Others. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2007*, ed. by Pieter Boulogne. Available at https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/yannakopoulou.pdf

Further essential reading

Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth (eds). 2012. *Translators through history*. Revised edition (by Judith Woodsworth). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.101

Kaindl, Klaus, and Karlheinz Spitzl (eds). 2014. *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.110

Kinnunen, Tuija, and Kaisa Koskinen (eds). 2010. *Translators' agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. Available at https://trepo.tuni.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/65639/978-951-44-8082-9.pdf.

Pym, Anthony. 2012. *On Translator Ethics. Principles for mediation between cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (An English revised version of Pym 1997), *Pour une éthique du traducteur*. Arras: Artois Presses Université.) https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.104

Risku, Hanna. 2014. "Translation process research as interaction research: from mental to socio-cognitive processes." *MonTI* Special Issue (1) – *Minding Translation*: 331–353. Available at https://dti.ua.es/es/documentos/monti/monti-especial-1-portada-indice.pdf.

World literature and translation

César Domínguez
University of Santiago de Compostela

World literature and translation are irrevocably intertwined both historically and theoretically. Historically, if one turns to the most famous – though not unique – conceptual coinage for naming the field of supranational literary relations – Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's term *Weltliteratur*, it needs to be stressed that both the term and the underlying reflection were indebted to the experience of reading a Chinese work in translation (see Purdy 2014). In fact, this experience is shared by most readers across time and space, insofar as there are limits to the ability to master several languages. Theoretically, translation plays a key role, though not always an intrinsically positive one, in most definitions of world literature (see also Literary translation[2]). Rather than undertaking a survey of each definition, which would be highly reiterative, it is more instructive, in this regard, to take into consideration the four theoretical genealogies proposed by Jérôme David (2013). The "philological genealogy" engages "an imaginary of the more or less difficult *passage* of texts from one language to another, from one nation to another, from one culture to another" (David 2013: 14) and, consequently, translation is at its core. For the "critical genealogy", world literature "took place under the dual auspices of the challenge of the national scale and of the elitist adhesion to a very normative definition of literature" (David 2013: 17). Here, translation is in tension between works which do not translate *well* due to their *national uniqueness* and works which seem to have been written with translation in mind, such as commercial or popular works, which the second register of this genealogy excludes from world literature. For the "pedagogical genealogy", translation is an indispensable tool for the "conversation", whether between "living writers who would discuss their works and respective literature" (David 2013: 19) or by students who approach world literary works in survey seminars. The "methodological genealogy", finally, is more elusive in terms of the role of translation because, in this case, world literature is not "so much an object but a challenge – a challenge that demands a radical, epistemological litmus test of literary studies" (ibid.: 23). For determining the role played by translation, if any, one needs to take into consideration each single challenge, each single "thought experiment" (ibid.: 22). Erich Auerbach's experiment, for example, consists of writing a history of "the interpretation of reality through literary representation or 'imitation'", for which he had to "forego discussing the rise of

https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.5.wor2

© 2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company

modern Russian realism" as he could not "read the works in their original language" (Auerbach 2003: 492, 554). For Franco Moretti, the challenge is how to read "hundreds of languages and literatures". His solution is *distant reading*, which "allows you to focus on units that are much smaller or much larger than the text: devices, themes, tropes – or genres and systems". Here "the text itself disappears" (Moretti 2013: 45, 49) and, arguably, translation seems to be out of place. For Gayatri Spivak, in contradistinction, the crux of the problem with world literature lies in how to avoid the loss of the "multitude of 'subalterns'" (David 2013: 23). Her solution is *planetarity*, in which *planet* is understood as "a catachresis for inscribing collective responsibility as right", including the responsibility whereby, "when you work with literatures of the global South, you learn the pertinent languages with the same degree of care" as "the old Comparative Literature did" with "European languages". But the "new Comparative Literature" should also make "visible the import of the translator's choice" (Spivak 2003: 102, 106n12 & 18).

In his 2019 book *Contra Instrumentalism*, Lawrence Venuti has called instrumentalism "a model of translation", which conceives of translation "as the reproduction or transfer of an invariant that is contained in or caused by the source text, an invariant form, meaning, or effect" (Venuti 2019: 1). Though this model is certainly operative in most approaches to translation within world literature studies, an instrumentalist thinking is also pervasive in how world literature studies (dis)locates translation merely as a tool. For both the philological and the pedagogical genealogy, translation is a necessary form of mediation for literary works to reach wide audiences who cannot read in the source language. By contrast, for the critical genealogy, untranslatability is the sign of true world literariness, whereas, for the methodological genealogy, translation is, at best, a second-degree text, a mediation for what really counts – the source text. As Venuti (2019: 5) has put it, "instrumentalism is itself an interpretation that grossly oversimplifies translation practice". In the remainder of this article, two key interpretive understandings of translation will be outlined in terms of their (re)conceptualisation of world literature.

1. Translation as world literature

Though not wholly a reliable database, UNESCO's Index Translationum may provide illustrative depictions of world literature. Here, only two will be presented. The first one concerns the top ten source languages, a list which includes, in descending order of number of translated individual books, English, French, German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, Swedish, Japanese, Danish and Latin. The second one concerns the top ten translated individual authors, a list which includes, also in descending order, Agatha

Christie, Jules Verne, William Shakespeare, Enid Blyton, Barbara Cartland, Danielle Steel, Vladimir Lenin, Hans Christian Andersen, Stephen King and Jacob Grimm.

The list of top source languages provides a picture of a (micro) world literature (as the list is restricted here to ten positions), whose core is occupied by works originally written in English (a total of 1,266,110), followed at a great distance by French and German (226,123 and 208,240, respectively) and, on the distant periphery, Japanese (29,246) and Danish (21,252). This picture of world literature in translation largely coincides with the picture provided by anthologies of world literature (the famous three: Bedford, Longman and Norton), in which English, French and German are at the core. Differences are more noticeable, however, in terms of what each construction categorises as *peripheral* languages. A case in point is Latin, which, though peripheral in terms of the number of translated individual books, is central in (Eurocentric) world literature as the depository of the classical tradition and key for what Polysystem theory[1] has called *static canonicity*, whereby "a certain text is accepted as a finalised product and inserted into a set of sanctified texts literature (culture) wants to preserve" (Even-Zohar 1990a: 19). But, if the comparison is made between the list of the top ten translated individual authors and their positions in world literature anthologies, the discrepancies are much more significant, insofar as only Shakespeare is included in the latter, whereas the rest are excluded for not being canonical.

Such exclusion reveals the privilege accorded to the Eurocentric idea of "great books" and "great writers", which in the instrumentalist model of translation is comparable to the privilege accorded to the source text as the provider of the "invariant" that the translation is required to reproduce (Venuti 2019: 7). What is being overlooked here is a truism, namely, literary works are read by readers regardless of their institutional canonicity (consider the number of readers registered by writers excluded from world literature anthologies, such as Agatha Christie, Barbara Cartland and Danielle Steel) and when readers do not master the language in which the work was written, they read in translation. Therefore, "translated literature [is] not only [...] an integral system within any literary polysystem, but [...] a most active system within it" (Even-Zohar 1990b: 46).

An understanding of how integral and active translated literature is for the world literary polysystem is provided by Johan Heilbron and Gisèle Sapiro (2007), though their discussion is not restricted to literary works (see also Sociology of translation[1]). The basic units of the "world-system of translation" are language groups, some of which are transnational. Of this latter group, English is hyper-central, French and German central and Spanish and Italian semi-peripheral, while languages such as Chinese or Arabic are peripheral, despite the fact that they are among the most important in terms of number of speakers. In short, the more books worldwide that have been translated from a source language, the more central that language is. This qualifies the Index Translationum's statistics in important ways, for the Index counts translations of individual books and, hence, authors with many books rank higher. Furthermore, Heilbron and Sapiro's model addresses the system dynamics as well, for "[a] country's loss of prestige or power, and the resulting diminution of its language's status does have consequences for the level of translation activity" (Heilbron & Sapiro 2007: 97).

If circulation is accepted as a defining feature of world literary works (Damrosch 2003: 4), it follows that world literature comprises works that circulate in their original language (mostly in central, transnational languages within "world-literatures" – see Domínguez 2019) and, in incomparably higher numbers, works that circulate in translation regardless of the canonical status of their authors. Furthermore, "the more central a language is, the more it has the capacity to function as an intermediary or vehicular language" (Heilbron & Sapiro 2007: 96), which explains why central literary systems may provide repertoire items – both works and norms – when acting as a means of communication between (semi-)peripheral systems (a case in point is the mediating role of French between English and Spanish during the nineteenth century).

Three further issues deserve some attention. First, whereas national Literary studies[1] tends to conceive of national canons as resulting from exclusively domestic dynamics and world literary studies relies on national canons for the construction of the international one as merely an addition, translation studies (TS) shows that national consecration may be the result of a translation into a central language. Take, for instance, the case of Cees Nooteboom, a widely translated author whose work was initially valued more highly abroad than in the Netherlands. Second, TS has proven that, when the source system has a central language, translation takes place simultaneously through several book categories. The existence of such *translation packets* has not been taken into consideration in world literature studies. Third, whereas traditionally, it was translations that generated further translations, nowadays, it is the sale of translation rights at key book fairs that generates an interest in further translations. This qualifies in important ways the view of world literature as "writing that gains in translation" (Damrosch 2003: 281) when such gain is understood in merely aesthetic terms.

2. Translation for world literature

If world literature is "a paradigm that encompasses both the study of internationally canonised literature and the ambition to investigate and to be interested in all kinds of literature" (Thomsen 2008: 2), it follows that "world literature cannot be conceptualised apart from translation" (Venuti 2012: 180), for the international circulation of literature takes place mostly in translation. Furthermore, the traditional, author-oriented idea of canon – still prevalent in world literature studies – needs to be challenged in terms of canons of translation; that is to say, translation creates corpora of works which circulate in several languages and are not necessarily identical from language to language. This leads to questioning the idea of whether there really exists an ethereal world literature in the singular. There are many world literatures, and each of them is glocally located. The remainder of this section sketches two representative examples of how translation facilitates the pluralising of world literature.

2.1 Born-translated

Whereas translations have traditionally generated further translations, nowadays, the number and speed of translations is unprecedented, so much so that many works (mostly novels) have been written for translation from the start. Rebecca L. Walkowitz has called these works *born-translated literature*, which "approaches translation as medium and origin rather than afterthought. Translation is not secondary or incidental to these works. It is a condition of their production" (Walkowitz 2015: 3–4). Born-translated works are written *for* translation, as they aim to address a wide international audience; they are written *as* translations, for they pretend to take place in a language other than the one in which they have been written; they are written *from* translation, insofar as translation motivates both the story and the literary world they create (Walkowitz 2015: 4–5). For Walkowitz, J.M. Coetzee's *The Childhood of Jesus* is an exemplary case of born-translated writing. Whilst it is difficult to prove that the writer aimed to reach a wide international audience (an aim which in this case seems secured, due to the cultural capital of the Nobel Prize he won), unless archival records prove so, *The Childhood of Jesus* complies with both the *as* and *from* requisites. Coetzee's novel pretends to take place in an unidentified Spanish-speaking place in which the main characters discuss a version of *Don Quijote*, which, in turn, is a pseudotranslation[2] (from Arabic into Spanish).

Another category which fits Walkowitz's definition is that of works that are quasi-simultaneously published in several languages, with the result of blurring the boundaries between source and target text. A case in point is J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series, one of the most translated series of all time, which has prompted both unauthorised and fake translations in order to reduce the lag of several months for readers of other languages. In either case, born-translated literature challenges the confrontation between world literature and national literatures. "Many born-translated novels signal this departure", Walkowitz (2015: 30) argues, "by blocking original languages, invoking multiple scales of geography, and decoupling birthplace from collectivity".

2.2 Untranslatability

Emily Apter has located in untranslatability the limit, not of world literature, but, rather, of World Literature (in upper case), that is, "the disciplinary construct that [...] has secured its foothold in both the university institution and mainstream publishing" (Apter 2013: 2). Her main argument is that "many recent efforts to revive World Literature rely on a translatability assumption" (Apter 2013: 3). By *translatability assumption*, Apter (2013: 8) understands "the assumption that it [translation] is a critical praxis enabling communication across languages, cultures, time periods and disciplines", on which there is general agreement. But there seems to be a logical leap by those accepting the translatability assumption when the conclusion about such communication is that it is based on "cultural equivalence and substitutability" (Apter 2013: 2). In this context, the recourse to Barbara Cassin's concept of *untranslatable* might, in the end, be only pleonastic, for there is no contradiction between assuming that "every text is translatable because every text can be interpreted" (Venuti 2019: x) and defining the untranslatable as "what one keeps on (not) translating" (Cassin 2014: xvii).

And yet, an expanded interpretation of *untranslatable* as something – from a term to a text – that is non-translatable, that should not be translated, is enlightening when it comes to (re)thinking world literature. Against the expansionism and omnivorous orientation of world literature, even in Apter's above-quoted definition, stand those works which can be translated – and, sometimes, have even been translated – but should not. It is not a matter of theological ban, but a matter of cultural rights: the right to remain untranslatable, the right to keep one's own literary heritage free of the radically transformative power of translation. Consider the case of the ceremonial poetry of the Arrernte tribes of central Australia, whose compilation and translation by Theodor Strehlow has been claimed by a younger Aboriginal generation as the proper proprietors. These works, as many others, neither are translatable nor belong to world literature.

References

Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London: Verso.

Auerbach, Erich. 2003. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. by Willard D. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cassin, Barbara et al. 2014. "Introduction." In *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, ed. by Barbara Cassin, translation ed. by Emily Apter, Jacques Lezra, and Michael Wood, trans. by Steven Rendall : xvii–xx. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400849918-002

Damrosch, David. 2003. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691188645

David, Jérôme. 2013. “The Four Genealogies of World Literature”, trans. by Mary Claypool. In *Approaches to World Literature*, ed. by Joachim Küpper, 13–26. [Berlin]: Akademie. https://doi.org/10.1524/9783050064956.13

Domínguez, César. 2019. “Gualterio Escoto – A Writer across World-Literatures.” In *Translation and World Literature*, ed. by Susan Bassnett, 75–91. London: Routledge.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990a. “Polysystem Theory.” *Poetics Today* 11 (1): 9–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772666

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990b. “The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem.” *Poetics Today* 11 (1): 45–51. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772668

Heilbron, Johan, and Gisèle Sapiro. 2007. “Outline for a Sociology of Translation. Current Issues and Future Prospects.” In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, ed. by Michaela Wolf, and Alexandra Fukari, 93–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.74.07hei

Moretti, Franco. 2013. *Distant Reading*. London: Verso.

Purdy, Daniel. 2014. “Goethe, Rémusat and the Chinese Novel: Translation and the Circulation of World Literature.” In *German Literature as World Literature*, ed. by Thomas O. Beebee, 43–60. New York: Bloosmbury.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2003. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Thomsen, Mads Rosendahl. 2008. *Mapping World Literature: International Canonization and Transnational Literatures*. London: Continuum.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2012. “World Literature and Translation Studies.” In *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, ed. by Theo D’haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, 180–193. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2019. *Contra Instrumentalism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvgc62bf

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. 2015. *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/walk16594

Further essential reading

Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400841219

Bassnett, Susan. 2019. *Translation and World Literature*. London: Routledge.

Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by M. B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

D’haen, Theo. 2012. *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature*. London: Routledge.

Helgesson, Stefan. 2018. “Translation and the Circuits of World Literature.” In *The Cambridge Companion to World Literature*, ed. by Ben Etherington, and Jarad Zimbler, 85–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108613354.007

Cumulative index

A
Ability *see* Competence
ABRAPT (Brazilian Association of Translation Researchers) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Academic tools *see* Bibliographies of Translation Studies
Acceptability *see* Audiovisual translation; Polysystem theory and translation
Accessibility *see* Media accessibility
Accreditation *see* Quality in interpreting; Status of translators
Accuracy *see* Court/Legal interpreting; Medical translation and interpreting
Acquisition (history) *see* Bilingualism and translation
Activism *see* Narratives and contextual frames
Actor network (theory) *see* Agents of translation; Models in Translation Studies; Social systems and translation
Adaptation (Milton, Vol. 1, 3–6); *see also* Children's literature and translation; Domestication and foreignization; Drama translation; Indigenous peoples and translation; Pseudotranslation; Retranslation; Subtitling; Technical translation; Tourism translation
Adaptation Studies *see* Alternative labels for "translation"
Adaptation-selection principle *see* Ecology of translation
Adaptive system *see* Complexity in translation studies
Adequacy *see* Evaluation/Assessment; Machine translation today; Polysystem theory and translation
Advertising (audiovisual -, electronic -, printed -) *see* Advertising translation; Tourism translation
Advertising translation (Valdés, Vol. 2, 1–5); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Localization and translation; Semiotics and translation; Tourism translation; Translation strategies and tactics; Turns of Translation Studies; Web and translation; Wordplay in translation
Affective cognition *see* Situated cognition
Affective empathy *see* Empathy
Affective factor *see* Emotions and translation; Translation psychology
Affordances *see* Situated cognition
African Studies *see* Development and translation
Afterlife *see* Deconstruction; Postmodernism
Agency *see* Agents of translation; Conflict and translation; Development and translation; International business and translation; Interpreting Studies; Migration and translation; Paratexts; Theory of translatorial action; Translation criticism; Translation psychology
Agenda-setting *see* Information, communication, translation
Agent *see* Healthcare interpreting; Translator studies
Agents of translation (Buzelin, Vol. 2, 6–12); *see also* Communism and Translation Studies; Descriptive Translation Studies; Ethnographic approaches; Institutional translation; Music and translation; Networking and volunteer translators; Norms of translation; Power and translation; Sociology of translation; Status of interpreters; Status of translators; Translation history; Translation Studies
AI/Artificial Intelligence *see* Post-editing
AIETI (Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters) *see* Conference interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Relay interpreting
Allusions *see* Realia
Alphabet *see* Impact of translation
Alternative labels for "translation" (van Doorslaer, Vol. 5, 3–9); *see also* Adaptation; Cultural translation; Equivalence; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Interpreting; Intersemiotic translation; Intralingual translation; Journalism and translation; Localization and translation; Machine translation today; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Transcreation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation
Ambiguity *see* Interpretive approach; Machine translation today
Americas *see* Eurocentrism

Annotated corpus *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
Anthologies and translation (Seruya, Vol. 4, 1–6); *see also* Comparative approaches to translation; Literary translation; Paratexts
Anthropocentric identity *see* Ecology of translation
Anthropology and translation (Lavieri, Vol. 5, 11–16); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Cultural translation; Ethnographic approaches; Genetic translation studies; Indigenous peoples and translation; Metaphors for translation; Multilingualism and translation; Orality and translation; Retranslation; Translation
Anti-globalization *see* Globalization and translation
Applied ethics *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Applied Translation Studies (Rabadán, Vol. 1, 7–11); *see also* Corpora; Localization and translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation didactics; Translation tools; Web and translation
Appropriation *see* Author and translator
Aptitude *see* Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Aramaic *see* Lingua franca
Archive(s) *see* Genetic translation studies; Religious texts and oral tradition
Assessment *see* Curriculum; Evaluation/Assessment; Interpreting Studies; Quality in interpreting; Quality in translation; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Assimilation *see* Hybridity and translation; Interpretive approach; Machine translation today; Translation history
Assumed transfer *see* Assumed translation
Assumed translation (D'hulst, Vol. 4, 7–11); *see also* Children's literature and translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation; Translation history; Translation problem
ATISA (American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Attention *see* Interpreting; Interpretive approach; Simultaneous interpreting
Attitude *see* Translator studies
Audience *see* Empathy; Evaluation/Assessment; Music and translation; Stylistics and translation
Audio description (Matamala, Vol. 5, 17–22); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Corpora; Humor in translation; Intersemiotic translation; Media accessibility; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Music and translation; Realia; Reception and translation; Subtitling; Voices in translation; Voiceover and dubbing
Audio description process/strategies *see* Audio description
Audio-introduction *see* Audio description
Audio-subtitling *see* Audio description; Media accessibility
Audiovisual translation (Remael, Vol. 1, 12–17); *see also* Drama translation; Genres, text-types and translation; Media accessibility; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Music and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Subtitles and language learning; Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Authentic text *see* Legal translation
Authenticity *see* Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Author and translator (Flynn, Vol. 4, 12–19); *see also* Editorial policy and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Multilingualism and translation; Paratexts; Pseudotranslation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Self-translation; Visibility (and invisibility)
Authoritative translation *see* Legal translation
Authorized translator *see* Status of translators
Authorship *see* Anthologies and translation; Author and translator; Genetic translation studies; Publishing in Translation Studies; Self-translation; Translation rights
Auto-translation *see* Self-translation
Avant-texte *see* Genetic translation studies

B
Background knowledge *see* Intralingual translation
Berne convention *see* Editorial policy and translation; Translation rights
Bhagavad-Gītā *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Bible *see* Genetic translation studies; Indigenous peoples and translation
Bible translation *see* Functionalist approaches; Orality and translation; Religious translation; Translation Studies
Bibliographies of Translation Studies (van Doorslaer, Vol. 2, 13–16); *see also* Bibliometrics; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Translation Studies; Translation tools
Bibliometrics (Grbić, Vol. 4, 20–24); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Sociology of translation
Big data *see* Digital humanities and translation studies

Bilingual brain *see* Neurolinguistics and interpreting
Bilingual memory *see* Bilingualism and translation; Translation psychology
Bilingual writers *see* Self-translation
Bilingual children *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Bilingualism and translation (Shreve, Vol. 3, 1–6); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Competence; Natural translator and interpreter; Self-translation; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation process; Translation psychology; Translation universals
Bilinguality *see* Interpreting Studies; Sign language interpreting and translating
Biocultural diversity *see* Ecology of translation
Biosemiotics *see* Ecology of translation
Bitext *see* Computer-aided translation
Black box *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Models in Translation Studies; Neurolinguistics and interpreting; Translation process
Book production *see* Editorial policy and translation; Translation rights
Book series *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Border thinking *see* Translational turn
Borderland *see* Translation zone
Bottom-up *see* Comparative approaches to translation; Semantic models and translation
Boundaries between disciplines *see* Alternative labels for "translation"
Boundary *see* Migration and translation
Broker *see* Translational turn
Buddhist religion *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Business interpreting *see* Quality in interpreting

C
Canadian *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Cannibalism *see* Literary translation
Cannibalistic translation *see* Political translation
Canon *see* Anthologies and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Polysystem theory and translation; Religious texts and oral tradition
Canonical science *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Canonical text *see* Literary translation
Canonical writers *see* World literature and translation
Canonization *see* Translating social sciences
Caption *see* Subtitles and language learning
CATS (Canadian Association for Translation Studies) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Causality *see* Translation history
Causation *see* Complexity in translation studies; Translator studies
Cause/Effect *see* Models in Translation Studies
Censorship (Merkle, Vol. 1, 18–21); *see also* Adaptation; Communism and Translation Studies; Ethics and translation; Gender in translation; Political translation; Relay translation; Translation policy; Translation process
CE(T)RA Chair *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Certification *see* Conference interpreting; Status of translators; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Characters *see* Audio description
Chiac *see* Hybridity and translation
Child language brokering *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Children's literature and translation (Alvstad, Vol. 1, 22–27); *see also* Adaptation; Censorship
Chinese *see* Museums and translation
Chinese buddhist canon *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Chuchotage *see* Conference interpreting
Chunk *see* Subtitling
Cinema *see* Pseudotranslation
Circulation of literature *see* World literature and translation
Circulation of texts *see* Translating social sciences
Citation index *see* Bibliometrics; Publishing in Translation Studies
City/cities *see* Globalization and translation; Hybridity and translation; Translation zone; Travel and translation
Climate change *see* Ecology of translation
Code of conduct *see* Court/Legal interpreting
Cognition *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Cognitive approaches (Alves & Hurtado Albir, Vol. 1, 28–35); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Bilingualism and translation; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Competence; Consecutive interpreting; Eye tracking; Interpretive approach; Sight translation; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology; Situated cognition; Think-aloud protocol; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics; Unit of translation
Cognitive effort *see* Eye tracking

Cognitive empathy *see* Empathy
Cognitive poetics *see* Stylistics and translation
Cognitive processes *see* Bilingualism and translation; Interpreting; Simultaneous interpreting; Think-aloud protocol
Cognitive psychology *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting Studies
Cognitive stylistics *see* Stylistics and translation
Coherence *see* Text linguistics and translation
Cold war *see* Communism and Translation Studies
Collaboration *see* Transcreation
Collaborative translation (O'Brien, Vol. 2, 17–20); *see also* Commercial translation; Community interpreting; Computer-aided translation; Functionalist approaches; Globalization and translation; Localization and translation; Machine translation today; Networking and volunteer translators; Quality in translation; Revision; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation tools
Collective narratives *see* Narratives and contextual frames
Collocation *see* Linguistics and translation
Colonial expansion *see* Nation, empire, translation
Colonial language *see* Hybridity and translation
Colonialism *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Colonization *see* Eurocentrism; Nation, empire, translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Comics in translation (Kaindl, Vol. 1, 36–40); *see also* Children's literature and translation; Translation process; Turns of Translation Studies
Commercial translation (Olohan, Vol. 1, 41–44); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Globalization and translation; Journalism and translation; Legal translation; Localization and translation; Machine translation today; Quality in translation; Religious translation; Semiotics and translation; Technical translation; Terminology and translation; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics
Commission *see* Theory of translatorial action
Committed approaches and activism (Brownlie, Vol. 1, 45–48); *see also* Gender in translation; Ideology and translation; Networking and volunteer translators
Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies) (Grbić & Wolf, Vol. 3, 7–16); *see also* Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Norms of translation; Sign language interpreting and translating; Translation; Translation Studies
Communication (process) *see* Information, communication, translation; Text linguistics and translation
Communication Studies *see* Information, communication, translation
Communicative act *see* Interpreting Studies; Technical translation
Communicative function(s) *see* Theory of translatorial action
Communicative risk *see* Risk in translation
Communicative text(s) *see* Development and translation
Communism and Translation Studies (Popa, Vol. 4, 25–30); *see also* Agents of translation; Censorship; Children's literature and translation; Committed approaches and activism; Ideology and translation; Power and translation; Status of translators
Communities *see* Anthropology and translation; Ethnographic approaches; Networking and volunteer translators
Community interpreting (Hertog, Vol. 1, 49–54); *see also* Consecutive interpreting; Quality in interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters
Community translation *see* Networking and volunteer translators
Comparable corpus *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
Comparable data *see* Healthcare interpreting
Comparative approaches to translation (Koster, Vol. 2, 21–25); *see also* Corpora; Descriptive Translation Studies; Evaluation/Assessment; Gender in translation; Hermeneutics and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Retranslation; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies
Comparative Literature *see* Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Translation history; World literature and translation
Comparison of texts *see* Comparative approaches to translation
Competence (Hurtado Albir, Vol. 1, 55–59); *see also* Bilingualism and translation; Cognitive approaches; Natural translator and interpreter; Status of interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation didactics; Translation process; Translation psychology; Translation strategies and tactics
Competence (metacultural -) *see* Realia

Complexity *see* Anthropology and translation

Complexity in translation studies (Marais, Vol. 5, 23–29); *see also* Alternative labels for "translation"; Cognitive approaches; Hermeneutics and translation; Journalism and translation; Machine translation today; Philosophy and translation; Postmodernism; Religious translation; Semiotics and translation; Situated cognition; Social systems and translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation Studies

Complexity theory *see* Narratives and contextual frames; Social systems and translation

Comprehension *see* Lingua franca

Computer-aided translation (Bowker & Fisher, Vol. 1, 60–65); *see also* Corpora; Globalization and translation; Localization and translation; Machine translation today; Networking and volunteer translators; Terminology and translation; Web and translation

Concept *see* Language philosophy and translation

Conceptual map *see* Bibliographies of Translation Studies

Conceptual metaphor(s) *see* Metaphors for translation

Conceptual network *see* Translation problem

Concordance(r) *see* Corpora

Conference interpreting (Setton, Vol. 1, 66–74); *see also* Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting; Media interpreting; Quality in interpreting; Sight translation; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters

Confidentiality *see* Ethics and translation and for translators

Conflict and translation (Salama-Carr, Vol. 4, 31–35); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Discourse analysis; Ethics and translation; Ideology and translation; Journalism and translation; Translation strategies and tactics

Conflict zone *see* NGOs and translation

Connotation(s) *see* Realia

Consecutive interpreting (Dam, Vol. 1, 75–79); *see also* Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Eye tracking; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach

Consistency *see* Institutional translation; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies

Contact zone *see* Translation zone; Translational turn

Content *see* Media accessibility

Content management system *see* Translation tools

Context(s) *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Emotions and translation; Linguistics and translation; Medical translation and interpreting; Relay translation; Remote interpreting; Sociolinguistics and translation

Continentalization *see* Eurocentrism

Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies (Vandepitte & De Sutter, Vol. 4, 36–41); *see also* Comparative approaches to translation; Competence; Corpora; Empirical approaches; Equivalence; Linguistics and translation; Machine translation today; Quality in translation; Translation didactics; Translation problem; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation universals

Contrastive rhetoric *see* Rhetoric and translation; Translating social sciences

Controlled languages *see* Machine translation today; Technical translation

Convention(s) *see* Norms of translation; Paratexts

Cookery text *see* Food and translation

Copyrights *see* Computer-aided translation; Translation rights

Corpora (Laviosa, Vol. 1, 80–86); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Computer-aided translation; Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies; Corpus-based interpreting studies; Sign language interpreting and translating; Terminology and translation; Translation psychology

Corpus-based interpreting studies (Russo, Vol. 5, 31–36); *see also* Corpora; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Media interpreting; Quality in interpreting; Translation universals

Correspondence (lexical -) *see* Bilingualism and translation; Equivalence; Translation problem

Cosmopolitanism *see* Hybridity and translation

Cost *see* Post-editing

Coupled pair(s) *see* Translation problem

Court translator *see* Status of translators

Court/Legal interpreting (Russell, Vol. 3, 17–20); *see also* Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Legal translation; Quality in interpreting; Relay interpreting; Remote interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous interpreting; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters

Creative industries *see* Transcreation

Creative translation *see* Creativity; Semantic models and translation

Creativity (O'Sullivan, Vol. 4, 42–46); *see also* Adaptation; Agents of translation; Author and translator; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Poetry translation; Self-translation;

Transcreation; Translation strategies and tactics; Wordplay in translation
Credibility risk *see* Risk in translation
Creole *see* Literary translation
Creolization *see* Hybridity and translation; Translation zone
Crime fiction *see* Translating popular fiction
Crisis setting *see* NGOs and translation
Critical discourse analysis (CDA) *see* Discourse analysis
Critique génétique/genetic criticism *see* Genetic translation studies
Cross-border exchanges *see* International business and translation
Cross-cultural communication *see* Knowledge management and translation
Cross-cultural translation *see* Translational turn
Crowdsourcing *see* Collaborative translation; Computer-aided translation; Globalization and translation; Networking and volunteer translators; Social media and translation; Translation tools
Cultural approaches (Marinetti, Vol. 2, 26–30); *see also* Adaptation; Agents of translation; Censorship; Cultural translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Ethics and translation; Gender in translation; Linguistics and translation; Norms of translation; Political translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Sociology of translation; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Cultural change *see* Literary translation
Cultural context adaptation *see* Children's literature and translation
Cultural image *see* National and cultural images
Cultural imperialism *see* Nation, empire, translation
Cultural references *see* Domestication and foreignization; Intralingual translation; Realia
Cultural representation *see* Translational turn
Cultural semiotics *see* Intersemiotic translation
Cultural studies *see* Cultural translation; Orality and translation
Cultural transfer *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Cultural translation (Conway, Vol. 3, 21–25); *see also* Cultural approaches; Migration and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Cultural turn *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Cultural approaches; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Postmodernism
Cultural values *see* Advertising translation; Tourism translation
Cultural-specific items *see* Tourism translation
Culture *see* Polysystem theory and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Culture-bound items *see* Realia
Culture-specific elements *see* Domestication and foreignization; Realia; Sociolinguistics and translation
Curriculum (Kelly, Vol. 1, 87–93); *see also* Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation didactics

D

Data *see* Digital humanities and translation studies; Emotions and translation; Eurocentrism; Methodology in Translation Studies
Data typologies *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
Data visualisation *see* Digital humanities and translation studies
Deaf and hard of hearing *see* Audiovisual translation; Community interpreting; Interpreting; Relay interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating
Decision process *see* Translation policy; Translation psychology
Decision-making *see* Agents of translation; Cognitive approaches; Technical translation; Translation process; Translation psychology
Decolonization *see* Eurocentrism; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Deconstruction (Dizdar, Vol. 2, 31–36); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Ethics and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Philosophy and translation; Postmodernism; Relevance and translation; Translation; Translation Studies
Dehumanization of translation services *see* Translator studies
Description *see* Audio description
Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) (Assis Rosa, Vol. 1, 94–104); *see also* Applied Translation Studies; Audiovisual translation; Committed approaches and activism; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Corpora; Cultural approaches; Equivalence; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Polysystem theory and translation; Technical translation; Translation didactics

Development and translation (Marais, Vol. 3, 26–31); *see also* Hybridity and translation; Orality and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Development Studies *see* Development and translation
Deverbalization *see* Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Sight translation
Diachrony *see* Intralingual translation
Dialect *see* Indigenous peoples and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Voices in translation
Dialogic interaction *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Didactics *see* Curriculum; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation didactics
Difference *see* Ethics and translation; Original and translation
Digital age *see* Multimodality and audiovisual translation
Digital humanities and translation studies (Bowker, Vol. 5, 37–44); *see also* Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Bibliometrics; Computer-aided translation; Corpora; Ethnographic approaches; Indirect translation; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Machine translation today; Media interpreting; Social media and translation; Translation history; Translation Studies; Translation tools; Translation universals
Digital media *see* Visibility (and invisibility)
Digital spaces *see* Digital humanities and translation studies
Digital technologies *see* Digital humanities and translation studies; Indirect translation
Digital text *see* Digital humanities and translation studies
Digitization *see* Alternative labels for "translation"
Diplomacy *see* Impact of translation
Directionality (Pokorn, Vol. 2, 37–39); *see also* Conference interpreting; Domestication and foreignization; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Media interpreting; Quality in interpreting; Religious translation; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation process; Translation tools
Directorate-General for interpreting (DGI) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Directorate-General for translation (DGT) *see* English as a lingua franca and translation; Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Discipline *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Translating social sciences
Discourse *see* Anthropology and translation; Cultural approaches; Discourse analysis; Ideology and translation; Power and translation; Text linguistics and translation
Discourse analysis (Schäffner, Vol. 4, 47–52); *see also* Community interpreting; Court/Legal interpreting; Evaluation/Assessment; Ideology and translation; Political translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Text linguistics and translation
Displacement *see* Cultural translation
Dissemination *see* Bibliometrics; Machine translation today
Distancing *see* Translation zone
Distant reading *see* World literature and translation
Distributed cognition *see* Situated cognition
Documents (types of -) *see* Technical translation; Terminology and translation
Domestication and foreignization (Paloposki, Vol. 2, 40–42); *see also* Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Children's literature and translation; Ethics and translation; Realia; Retranslation; Translation strategies and tactics; Visibility (and invisibility)
Dominating language *see* Relay translation
Drafting *see* Revision
Drama translation (Aaltonen, Vol. 1, 94–104); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Music and translation
Dual readership *see* Children's literature and translation
Dubbing *see* Audiovisual translation; Non-professional translators and interpreters; Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Dynamical view *see* Situated cognition

E
E-terminology *see* Social media and translation
Eco-translation/eco-translatology *see* Ecology of translation
Ecology of translation (Cronin, Vol. 5, 45–51); *see also* Globalization and translation; Localization and translation; Minority languages and translation
Economics *see* Risk in translation

Economics of translation *see* Power and translation
Editing *see* Revision
Editorial market *see* Translating social sciences
Editorial policy and translation (Sapiro, Vol. 3, 32–38); *see also* Agents of translation; Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Globalization and translation; Literary translation; National and cultural images
Effect *see* Models in Translation Studies
Effort (model) *see* Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Models in Translation Studies; Sight translation; Simultaneous interpreting
ELF/English as a lingua franca *see* Lingua franca; NGOs and translation; Translating social sciences
Embedded cognition *see* Situated cognition
Embodied cognition *see* Situated cognition
Emergence *see* Complexity in translation studies
Emotional factor *see* Representation of translators and interpreters; Translation psychology
Emotions and translation (Hubscher-Davidson, Vol. 5, 53–58); *see also* Audio description; Cognitive approaches; Empathy; Reception and translation; Translation process; Translation psychology
Empathy (Apfelthaler, Vol. 5, 59–65); *see also* Agents of translation; Author and translator; Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Cognitive approaches; Collaborative translation; Competence; Creativity; Cultural approaches; Directionality; Emotions and translation; Empirical approaches; Healthcare interpreting; Hermeneutics and translation; Ideology and translation; Impact of translation; Literary translation; Methodology in Translation Studies; Original and translation; Quality in translation; Reception and translation; Reception and translation; Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies; Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies; Sociology of translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Theory of translatorial action; Translation didactics; Translation process; Translation psychology; Translation strategies and tactics
Empire(s) *see* English as a lingua franca and translation; Impact of translation; Nation, empire, translation; Translation zone
Empirical approaches (Künzli, Vol. 4, 53–58); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Cognitive approaches; Conference interpreting; Corpora; Ethnographic approaches; Methodology in Translation Studies; Relay translation; Sociology of translation; Subtitling; Think-aloud protocol; Translation process
Empirical research *see* Empirical approaches; General translation theory; Interpreting Studies; Think-aloud protocol
Empirical studies *see* Empirical approaches; Interpretive approach; Turns of Translation Studies
Empirical testing *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Empowerment *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces; Metaphors for translation
EN 15038 standard *see* Status of translators
Enactivism *see* Situated cognition
End-product *see* Translation problem
Energy consumption *see* Ecology of translation
English *see* Lingua franca; Museums and translation; Tourism translation
English as a lingua franca and translation (House, Vol. 4, 59–62); *see also* Adaptation; Commercial translation; Globalization and translation; Lingua franca; Localization and translation; NGOs and translation; Translating social sciences
English as a pivot language *see* Indirect translation
Enquiry *see* Empirical approaches
Entextualization *see* Orality and translation
Entropy *see* Complexity in translation studies
Epistemology *see* Complexity in translation studies
Equivalence (Leal, Vol. 3, 39–46); *see also* Alternative labels for "translation"; Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies; Creativity; Descriptive Translation Studies; Evaluation/Assessment; Functionalist approaches; General translation theory; Institutional translation; Interpretive approach; Linguistics and translation; Medical translation and interpreting; Models in Translation Studies; Norms of translation; Quality in translation; Realia; Semiotics and translation; Terminology and translation; Translation; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Equivalence (cultural -) *see* Equivalence; Realia
Equivalence (dynamic -) *see* Equivalence
Equivalence (formal -) *see* Equivalence
Equivalence (lexical -) *see* Equivalence; Realia
Ergonomics and translation workplaces (Ehrensberger-Dow, Vol. 5, 67–72); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Creativity; Eye tracking; Machine translation today; Quality in translation; Situated cognition; Translation process; Translator studies
Errors *see* Post-editing; Translation 'errors'
Esperanto *see* Literary translation

Essentialism *see* Deconstruction; Ideology and translation
EST (European Society for Translation Studies) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Ethics and translation (van Wyke, Vol. 1, 111–115); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Conference interpreting; Conflict and translation; Deconstruction; Domestication and foreignization; Functionalist approaches; Philosophy and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation; Relay interpreting
Ethics and translation and for translators (Kenny, Vol. 5, 73–78); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Conflict and translation; Ethics and translation; Norms of translation; Philosophy and translation; Translator studies
Ethics of care/communication/cooperation *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Ethnocentrism *see* Domestication and foreignization
Ethnographic approaches (Flynn, Vol. 1, 116–119); *see also* Corpora; Cultural translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Sociology of translation; Translation history; Translation Studies
EU institutions *see* Institutional translation
EUATC *see* Status of translators
Eurocentrism (van Doorslaer, Vol. 3, 47–51); *see also* Orality and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation; Translation Studies
European Master's in Translation (EMT) *see* Impact of translation theory
European Parliament *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
European Quality Standard for translation (EN 15038) *see* Revision
Evaluation agency *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Evaluation/Assessment (Colina, Vol. 2, 43–48); *see also* Adaptation; Competence; Computer-aided translation; Corpora; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Machine translation today; Quality in interpreting; Quality in translation; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies; Translation; Translation criticism; Translation Studies
Evangelism *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Exhibition space *see* Museums and translation
Expectation(s) *see* Paratexts
Experiment *see* Empirical approaches
Experimental psychology *see* Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach
Experimental research *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Expert-to-expert communication *see* Translation problem
Expertise *see* Translation psychology
Expertise research *see* Competence; Think-aloud protocol
Expert–layman communication *see* Popularization and translation
Explanation *see* Agents of translation; Models in Translation Studies; Translation universals
Explicit knowledge *see* Knowledge management and translation
Explicitation *see* Translation universals
Extended view *see* Situated cognition
Eye tracking (Kruger, Vol. 5, 79–85); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Bilingualism and translation; Cognitive approaches; Ergonomics and translation workplaces; Interpreting; Linguistics and translation; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Multimodality in interpreting; Post-editing; Subtitling; Translation process
Eye-mind assumption *see* Eye tracking

F
Faithfulness *see* Political translation; Postmodernism; Self-translation
Falsifiability *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Family interpreting *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Fandubbing *see* Audiovisual translation; Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Fansubbing *see* Audiovisual translation; Collaborative translation; Subtitling
Feminist translation *see* Gender in translation; Retranslation
Fictional (character/turn) *see* Representation of translators and interpreters
Fictitious translation *see* Pseudotranslation
Fidelity *see* Intercultural mediation
Field (Bourdieu) *see* Sociology of translation
Fieldwork *see* Anthropology and translation
Figure of speech *see* Music and translation; Rhetoric and translation
Film techniques *see* Audio description
Final solution *see* Translation problem
First World *see* Development and translation

FIT (International Federation of Translators) *see* Status of translators
Fixation(s) *see* Eye tracking; Multimodality in interpreting
Fluency *see* Machine translation today; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation tools
Folk religion *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Food (- activism, - ecology, - security, - supply) *see* Food and translation
Food and translation (Desjardins, Vol. 5, 87–92); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Ethics and translation and for translators; Intercultural mediation; Intersemiotic translation; Intralingual translation; Social media and translation
Foreign language(s) *see* Directionality; Travel and translation
Foreignizing/foreignization *see* Domestication and foreignization; Realia; Retranslation; Translation strategies and tactics
Formal and informal settings *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Framing *see* Information, communication, translation; Journalism and translation; Narratives and contextual frames
French *see* Lingua franca; Museums and translation
Function(s) *see* Advertising translation; World literature and translation
Function-oriented *see* Descriptive Translation Studies
Functionalist approaches (Nord, Vol. 1, 120–128); *see also* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Genres, text-types and translation; Religious translation; Subtitling; Text linguistics and translation; Theory of translatorial action; Translation didactics; Translation Studies
Furthering *see* Translation zone
Fuzzy match *see* Post-editing

G

Gain/loss *see* Risk in translation
Gaze *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Gender in translation (von Flotow, Vol. 1, 129–133); *see also* Power and translation; Religious translation
Gender minorities *see* Gender in translation
Genealogies of world literature *see* World literature and translation
General translation theory (Dizdar, Vol. 3, 52–58); *see also* Descriptive Translation Studies; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Interpreting Studies; Models in Translation Studies; Norms of translation; Translation; Translation Studies
Generalization *see* Translation universals
Genetic translation studies (Cordingley, Vol. 5, 93–98); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Corpora; Descriptive Translation Studies; Methodology in Translation Studies; Sociology of translation
Genres, text-types and translation (Gambier, Vol. 4, 63–69); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Discourse analysis; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Media accessibility; Medical translation and interpreting; Methodology in Translation Studies; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Text linguistics and translation; Translating popular fiction; Translation problem; Translation strategies and tactics
Geography *see* Eurocentrism
German *see* Lingua franca
Global language *see* Orality and translation; Scientific translation
Globalization and translation (Cronin, Vol. 1, 134–140); *see also* Community interpreting; Hybridity and translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Tourism translation; Translation zone; Travel and translation
Gloss translation *see* Drama translation
Google Translate *see* Globalization and translation; Networking and volunteer translators
Great translation *see* Retranslation
Greek *see* Lingua franca
Guidelines *see* Audio description

H

Habitus (Bourdieu) *see* Agents of translation; Ethnographic approaches; Methodology in Translation Studies; Sociology of translation; Translation history; Translator studies
Healthcare interpreting (Cirillo, Vol. 5, 99–104); *see also* Community interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Intercultural mediation; Interpreting; Medical translation and interpreting; Multimodality in interpreting; Quality in interpreting; Remote interpreting; Sight translation; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous interpreting; Status of interpreters; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters
Hegemony *see* Nation, empire, translation
Hermeneutics and translation (Stolze, Vol. 1, 141–146); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Religious

translation; Teaching translation / Training translators
Heterogeneity *see* Deconstruction
Heteroglossia *see* Anthropology and translation; Literary translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
High/low culture *see* Translating popular fiction
Hindu religion *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Historical relativism *see* Assumed translation
Historiography *see* Gender in translation; Translation history
History *see* Impact of translation; Translation history
Homophonic translation *see* Visibility (and invisibility)
Human sciences culture *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Human-computer interaction *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces; Situated cognition
Humanities *see* Digital humanities and translation studies; Translational turn
Humor in translation (Vandaele, Vol. 1, 147–152); *see also* Descriptive Translation Studies; Wordplay in translation
Hybrid text *see* Institutional translation; Music and translation
Hybridity and translation (Simon, Vol. 2, 49–53); *see also* Development and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Translation; Translation Studies; Translation zone; Travel and translation
Hybridization *see* Post-colonial literatures and translation; Web and translation
Hypermedia text *see* Genres, text-types and translation
Hypothesis *see* Models in Translation Studies

I
IATIS (International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Identity/identities (construction of -) *see* Drama translation; Gender in translation; Hybridity and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Literary translation; Migration and translation; National and cultural images; Original and translation; Philosophy and translation; Power and translation; Representation of translators and interpreters
Ideological manipulation *see* Children's literature and translation
Ideology and translation (Baumgarten, Vol. 3, 59–65); *see also* Agents of translation; Censorship; Committed approaches and activism; Communism and Translation Studies; Conflict and translation; Cultural approaches; Ethnographic approaches; Gender in translation; Norms of translation; Political translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation; Religious translation; Sociology of translation; Translation policy; Turns of Translation Studies
Image building *see* National and cultural images
Image(s) *see* Cultural approaches; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; National and cultural images; Representation of translators and interpreters; Translation criticism; Travel and translation
Imagery *see* Poetry translation
Imitation *see* Assumed translation
Impact factor *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Impact of translation (Woodsworth, Vol. 4, 70–76); *see also* Adaptation; Censorship; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation; Religious translation; Translation zone
Impact of translation theory (van Doorslaer, Vol. 4, 77–83); *see also* Functionalist approaches; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Models in Translation Studies; Postmodernism; Status of interpreters; Status of translators; Translation didactics; Web and translation
Implicit knowledge *see* Knowledge management and translation
Implied translator *see* Voices in translation
Import *see* Literary translation; Pseudotranslation
Inclusive design *see* Media accessibility
Incongruity principle *see* Music and translation
Index translationum *see* Editorial policy and translation
Indian drama *see* Transcreation
Indigenous language(s) *see* Nation, empire, translation
Indigenous peoples and translation (Henitiuk & Mahieu, Vol. 5, 105–111); *see also* Children's literature and translation; Community interpreting; Eurocentrism; Minority languages and translation; Orality and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation; Relay translation; Religious texts and oral tradition; Religious translation; Self-translation
Indirect translation (Pięta, Vol. 5, 113–119); *see also* Equivalence; Ethics and translation and for translators; Globalization and translation; Institutional translation; Journalism and

translation; Machine translation today; Minority languages and translation; Original and translation; Quality in translation; Relay interpreting; Relay translation; Retranslation
Individual agents *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Inequality *see* Social systems and translation
Inference *see* Simultaneous interpreting
Information management *see* Knowledge management and translation
Information, communication, translation (Valdeón, Vol. 3, 66–72); *see also* Adaptation; Globalization and translation; Journalism and translation
Information-processing model *see* Situated cognition
Information flow *see* Globalization and translation
Information processing *see* Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Sight translation; Sign language interpreting and translating
Informational society *see* Information, communication, translation
Informativity *see* Text linguistics and translation
Inscription(s) *see* Comics in translation
Institutional agents *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Institutional encounter *see* Healthcare interpreting
Institutional translation (Koskinen, Vol. 2, 54–60); *see also* Adaptation; Agents of translation; Censorship; Computer-aided translation; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Hybridity and translation; Norms of translation; Official translation; Sociology of translation; Translation policy; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies
Institutionalization of Translation Studies (Gile, Vol. 3, 73–80); *see also* Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Cognitive approaches; Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Curriculum; Impact of translation theory; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Sign language interpreting and translating; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation; Translation Studies
Instrumentalism *see* World literature and translation
Integrated approach *see* Literary Studies and Translation Studies
Intellectual property rights *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Interaction *see* Healthcare interpreting; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies
Interactive machine translation *see* Post-editing
Intercultural awareness *see* Tourism translation
Intercultural mediation (Katan, Vol. 4, 84–91); *see also* Agents of translation; Committed approaches and activism; Community interpreting; Cultural approaches; Globalization and translation; Ideology and translation; Interpretive approach; Localization and translation; Natural translator and interpreter; Power and translation; Realia; Status of interpreters; Text linguistics and translation; Visibility (and invisibility)
Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies (Lambert, Vol. 3, 81–88); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Community interpreting; Conflict and translation; Corpora; Development and translation; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; International business and translation; Interpreting Studies; Methodology in Translation Studies; Music and translation; Political translation; Publishing in Translation Studies; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Interface *see* Translation tools
Interference(s) *see* Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies; Interpretive approach; Translation 'errors'; Translation universals
Interim solution *see* Translation problem
Interlingua (system) *see* Machine translation today; Relay translation
Interlingual transfer *see* Transfer and Transfer Studies
Interlingual translation *see* International business and translation; Museums and translation; Orality and translation; Travel and translation
Intermediality *see* Intersemiotic translation
Intermediary *see* Nation, empire, translation
Intermediate language *see* Relay translation
International business and translation (Piekkari & Tietze, Vol. 5, 121–126); *see also* Agents of translation; English as a lingua franca and translation; Equivalence; Indirect translation; Lingua franca; Machine translation today; Semiotics and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies
International institutions *see* Multilingualism and translation
International organisation *see* NGOs and translation
International politics *see* Power and translation
Interpersonal relationship *see* Healthcare interpreting

Interplay language-paralanguage *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Interpretant *see* Intersemiotic translation
Interpretation (of meaning) *see* Anthropology and translation; Audio description; Emotions and translation; Intersemiotic translation; Intralingual translation
Interpretative semiotics *see* Intersemiotic translation
Interpreter *see* Empathy
Interpreter education *see* Status of interpreters
Interpreter-mediated interaction *see* Status of interpreters
Interpreter's self-perception *see* Status of interpreters
Interpreting (Pöchhacker, Vol. 1, 153–157); *see also* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Community interpreting; Impact of translation; Indigenous peoples and translation; Lingua franca; Relay interpreting; Sight translation; Simultaneous interpreting
Interpreting in crisis *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Interpreting Studies (Pöchhacker, Vol. 1, 158–172); *see also* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Competence; Consecutive interpreting; Ethnographic approaches; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology; Simultaneous interpreting; Translation strategies and tactics
Interpretive approach (Lederer, Vol. 1, 173–179); *see also* Teaching translation / Training translators
Interpretive community *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Intersemiotic transfer *see* Transfer and Transfer Studies
Intersemiotic translation (Sütiste, Vol. 5, 127–134); *see also* Adaptation; Localization and translation; Orality and translation; Semiotics and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Travel and translation
Interspecies communication *see* Ecology of translation
Intertextuality *see* Interpretive approach; Literary translation; Museums and translation; Text linguistics and translation; Translating social sciences
Interview *see* Empirical approaches; Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Intralingual subtitling *see* Audiovisual translation
Intralingual transfer *see* Transfer and Transfer Studies
Intralingual translation (Zethsen, Vol. 5, 135–142); *see also* Alternative labels for "translation"; Intersemiotic translation; Norms of translation; Retranslation; Translation; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation universals
Intrasemiotic translation *see* Intersemiotic translation
Introductory translation *see* Drama translation
Inuktitut language *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Invariant *see* Intersemiotic translation
Invention *see* Rhetoric and translation
Invisibility *see* Visibility (and invisibility)

J
JAITS (Japanese Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Joual *see* Hybridity and translation
Journalism and translation (van Doorslaer, Vol. 1, 180–184); *see also* Adaptation; Audiovisual translation; Information, communication, translation; Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Journals (in TS) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Journals/periodicals *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Junior/senior translator *see* Revision

K
Keyword system *see* Bibliographies of Translation Studies
Kinesics *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Knowledge *see* Anthropology and translation
Knowledge asymmetry *see* Medical translation and interpreting
Knowledge management and translation (Risku, Vol. 4, 92–97); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Multilingualism and translation; Status of translators; Teaching translation / Training translators; Technical translation; Terminology and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation strategies and tactics
Knowledge mediation *see* Medical translation and interpreting

L
Language acquisition *see* Language learning and translation; Subtitles and language learning
Language alphabets *see* Web and translation
Language change *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Language combination *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting; Relay interpreting

Language contact *see* Impact of translation; Sociolinguistics and translation
Language in use *see* Discourse analysis
Language interaction *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Language learning and translation (Malmkjær, Vol. 1, 185–190); *see also* Subtitles and language learning
Language management *see* Multilingualism and translation
Language pairs *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach
Language philosophy and translation (Malmkjær, Vol. 3, 89–94); *see also* Linguistics and translation; Philosophy and translation
Language planning *see* Official translation; Political translation; Sociolinguistics and translation
Language plurality *see* International business and translation
Language policy *see* Multilingualism and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation
Language separation *see* Bilingualism and translation
Language standardization *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Language technologies *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Language use *see* Ethnographic approaches; Gender in translation; Interpretive approach; Retranslation; Sociolinguistics and translation
Language variation *see* Sign language interpreting and translating; Sociolinguistics and translation
Language-switching *see* Bilingualism and translation
Languages A/B *see* Directionality; Quality in interpreting
Languages for special purposes (LSP) *see* Technical translation
Languages of limited diffusion *see* Relay interpreting
Lateralization (cerebral -) *see* Neurolinguistics and interpreting
Latin *see* Lingua franca
Law *see* Court/Legal interpreting; Legal translation
Law of translational behaviour *see* Translation universals
Laws of thermodynamics *see* Complexity in translation studies
Laws of translation *see* Descriptive Translation Studies; Norms of translation; Translation universals
Layman readership *see* Intralingual translation
Learner-centered approach *see* Translation didactics
Legal translation (Cao, Vol. 1, 191–195); *see also* Multilingualism and translation; Technical translation
Lengthening *see* Translation universals
Lexical pattern *see* Translation universals
Lexical selection *see* Bilingualism and translation
Liaison interpreting *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting; Relay interpreting
Liberal arts paradigm *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Libretto *see* Music and translation
Licensing *see* Translation rights
Light/full post-editing *see* Post-editing
Lingua franca (Hewson, Vol. 5, 143–149); *see also* Collaborative translation; Conference interpreting; Directionality; English as a lingua franca and translation; Globalization and translation; Machine translation today; Orality and translation; Relay interpreting; Revision; Scientific translation; Tourism translation; Translation 'errors'; Turns of Translation Studies
Linguistic diversity *see* Editorial policy and translation
Linguistic error *see* Revision; Translation 'errors'
Linguistic imperialism *see* Deconstruction
Linguistic mediation service *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Linguistic minority *see* Minority languages and translation; Self-translation
Linguistic structures *see* Machine translation today
Linguistic tools *see* Indigenous peoples and translation
Linguistic variation *see* Terminology and translation
Linguistics and translation (Malmkjær, Vol. 2, 61–68); *see also* Corpora; Equivalence; Relevance and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Translation; Translation strategies and tactics; Unit of translation
Literary criticism *see* Literary translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Translation criticism
Literary journal *see* Translation criticism
Literary Studies and Translation Studies (Delabastita, Vol. 1, 196–208); *see also* Adaptation; Cognitive approaches; Corpora; Descriptive Translation Studies; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Gender in translation; Journalism and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Religious translation; Translation Studies

Literary text *see* Digital humanities and translation studies; Genetic translation studies; Methodology in Translation Studies; Stylistics and translation

Literary translation (Delabastita, Vol. 2, 69–78); *see also* Adaptation; Agents of translation; Censorship; Children's literature and translation; Comics in translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Drama translation; Equivalence; Gender in translation; Hermeneutics and translation; Multilingualism and translation; Paratexts; Poetry translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Retranslation; Self-translation; Sociology of translation; Stylistics and translation; Turns of Translation Studies; Voices in translation

Literary translator *see* Status of translators

Live transmissions *see* Media interpreting

Localization and translation (Schäler, Vol. 1, 209–214); *see also* Computer-aided translation

Logging (software) *see* Audiovisual translation; Cognitive approaches; Methodology in Translation Studies; Translation process

Low-proficiency user *see* Lingua franca

Loyalty *see* Poetry translation

M

Machine translation today (Forcada, Vol. 1, 215–223); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies; Post-editing; Translation tools

Malay *see* Tourism translation

Manipulation *see* Cultural approaches; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Political translation; Translating popular fiction; Voiceover and dubbing

Manipulation School *see* Descriptive Translation Studies

Map (of Translation Studies) *see* Bibliographies of Translation Studies; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Empirical approaches; General translation theory; Translation criticism; Translator studies

Marketing *see* Transcreation

Matches *see* Computer-aided translation; Machine translation today

Meaning-making process *see* Multimodality and audiovisual translation

Meaning/sense *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Anthropology and translation; General translation theory; Interpretive approach; Language philosophy and translation; Linguistics and translation; Poetry translation; Simultaneous interpreting

Media *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters

Media accessibility (Remael, Vol. 3, 95–101); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Children's literature and translation; Interpreting; Localization and translation; Media interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating; Subtitling; Translation Studies; Voiceover and dubbing; Web and translation

Media interpreting (Pöchhacker, Vol. 1, 224–226); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Media accessibility; Simultaneous interpreting

Media sources *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies

Mediating text *see* Indirect translation

Mediation practices *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters

Mediation/mediator *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Conflict and translation; Healthcare interpreting; Indirect translation; National and cultural images; Non-professional translators and interpreters

Medical settings *see* Healthcare interpreting

Medical translation and interpreting (Montalt, Vol. 2, 79–83); *see also* Competence; Methodology in Translation Studies; Quality in interpreting; Scientific translation; Technical translation; Terminology and translation; Translation problem

Memes/supermemes *see* Interpreting Studies; Translation Studies

Memorial museum *see* Museums and translation

Memorisation *see* Religious texts and oral tradition

Mental process *see* Situated cognition; Translator studies

Mentoring *see* Conference interpreting

Menu *see* Food and translation

Meta-ethics *see* Ethics and translation and for translators

Metalanguage *see* Deconstruction; Translation history

Metaphor *see* Rhetoric and translation; Voices in translation

Metaphorical translation *see* International business and translation

Metaphors for translation (St. André, Vol. 2, 84–87); *see also* Post-colonial literatures and translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation process; Translation Studies

Metatext *see* Literary translation

Methodology in Translation Studies (Flynn & Gambier, Vol. 2, 88–96); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Committed approaches and activism; Competence; Corpora; Curriculum; Empirical approaches; Ethnographic approaches; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Interpreting Studies; Journalism and translation; Natural translator and interpreter; Networking and volunteer translators; Paratexts; Political translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Scientific translation; Sociology of translation; Technical translation; Think-aloud protocol; Translation didactics; Translation history; Translation process; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Métissage *see* Hybridity and translation
Migrants *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Migration and translation (Polezzi, Vol. 3, 102–107); *see also* Agents of translation; Cultural translation; Ethics and translation; Globalization and translation; Hybridity and translation; Multilingualism and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Self-translation; Sociology of translation; Travel and translation
Minority *see* Literary translation; Minority languages and translation; Non-professional translators and interpreters; Power and translation
Minority culture *see* Orality and translation
Minority languages and translation (Branchadell, Vol. 2, 97–101); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Literary translation; Machine translation today; Power and translation; Translation process; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Minority literature *see* Post-colonial literatures and translation
Mistranslation *see* Revision
Mixed-method approach *see* Empirical approaches
Mobility *see* Migration and translation
Modality *see* Interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating
Model of cognition *see* Situated cognition
Model of the mind/brain *see* Situated cognition
Models in Translation Studies (Chesterman, Vol. 3, 108–114); *see also* Agents of translation; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Comparative approaches to translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Equivalence; General translation theory; Semantic models and translation; Translation problem; Translation process; Translation Studies; Translation universals
Modernity/Modernism *see* Orality and translation
Modularity *see* Machine translation today
Monolingualism *see* Multilingualism and translation; Self-translation
Monotheistic religions *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Morality *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Mother tongue *see* Directionality
Motivation *see* Emotions and translation
Multiculturalism *see* Hybridity and translation
Multidirectional translation *see* Official translation
Multilateral translation *see* Translation policy
Multilingual legislation *see* Institutional translation
Multilingual context *see* International business and translation
Multilingualism and translation (Meylaerts, Vol. 1, 227–230); *see also* English as a lingua franca and translation; Translation tools
Multimedia *see* Audiovisual translation; Conference interpreting; Music and translation; Web and translation
Multimedia communication *see* Turns of Translation Studies
Multimodal text *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Museums and translation
Multimodal/intermodal corpus *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
Multimodality and audiovisual translation (Taylor, Vol. 4, 98–104); *see also* Advertising translation; Audiovisual translation; Media accessibility; Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Multimodality in interpreting (Pöchhacker, Vol. 5, 151–157); *see also* Agents of translation; Consecutive interpreting; Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Reception and translation; Semiotics and translation; Simultaneous interpreting
Museums and translation (Neather, Vol. 5, 159–164); *see also* Cultural approaches; Cultural translation; Ethnographic approaches; Intercultural mediation; Intersemiotic translation; Quality in translation
Music and translation (Mateo, Vol. 3, 115–121); *see also* Adaptation; Audiovisual translation; Drama translation; Functionalist approaches; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Translation strategies and tactics; Voiceover and dubbing
Musical *see* Music and translation
Myths *see* Anthropology and translation

N
Narrative strategy *see* Narratives and contextual frames; Pseudotranslation
Narratives and contextual frames (Harding, Vol. 4, 105–110); *see also* Children's literature and translation; Conflict and translation; Discourse analysis; Domestication and foreignization; Drama translation; Genres, text-types and translation; Journalism and translation; Localization and translation; Methodology in Translation Studies; Migration and translation; Paratexts; Power and translation; Reception and translation; Religious translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Subtitling; Travel and translation
Narratology *see* Audio description
Nation, empire, translation (Valdeón, Vol. 4, 111–118); *see also* Eurocentrism; Globalization and translation; National and cultural images; Orality and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Religious translation; Scientific translation; Translation
Nation-state *see* Editorial policy and translation; Nation, empire, translation; National and cultural images
National and cultural images (van Doorslaer, Vol. 3, 122–127); *see also* Adaptation; Censorship; Children's literature and translation; Journalism and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation policy; Travel and translation
National canon *see* World literature and translation
National identity *see* Editorial policy and translation; National and cultural images
National language(s) *see* Directionality; Multilingualism and translation
National literature(s) *see* Impact of translation
Native language *see* Conference interpreting
Native speaker *see* Directionality
Native translator *see* Non-professional translators and interpreters
Natural science paradigm *see* Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies
Natural translation *see* Bilingualism and translation; Interpreting; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters
Natural translator and interpreter (Antonini, Vol. 2, 102–104); *see also* Bilingualism and translation; Community interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Networking and volunteer translators; Translation Studies
Neologism(s) *see* Medical translation and interpreting
Network(ing) *see* Computer-aided translation; Ethnographic approaches; Globalization and translation; Social media and translation
Networking and volunteer translators (Folaron, Vol. 1, 231–234); *see also* Computer-aided translation
Neurolinguistic models *see* Interpreting Studies; Models in Translation Studies; Simultaneous interpreting
Neurolinguistics and interpreting (Ahrens, Vol. 2, 105–107); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Interpreting; Simultaneous interpreting
Neutrality *see* Intercultural mediation; Music and translation; Quality in interpreting
NGOs and translation (Tesseur, Vol. 5, 165–169); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Community interpreting; Lingua franca; Machine translation today; Networking and volunteer translators; Non-professional translators and interpreters; Sociology of translation
Non-literary text *see* Impact of translation; Stylistics and translation
Non-person *see* Status of interpreters
Non-professional translators and interpreters (Antonini, Vol. 5, 171–176); *see also* Bilingualism and translation; Collaborative translation; Community interpreting; Conflict and translation; Genres, text-types and translation; Healthcare interpreting; Localization and translation; Media interpreting; Natural translator and interpreter; Religious translation; Subtitling; Teaching translation / Training translators; Tourism translation; Voiceover and dubbing; Web and translation
Non-translation *see* Translation policy
Non-translator *see* Collaborative translation
Non-verbal communication *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Non-verbal elements *see* Advertising translation
Non-Western cultures *see* Development and translation; Eurocentrism; Orality and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Norm(s) *see* Agents of translation; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Comparative approaches to translation; Conference interpreting; Corpus-based interpreting studies; Equivalence; Institutional translation; Interpreting Studies; Literary translation; Methodology in Translation Studies; Polysystem theory and translation; Relay translation; Retranslation; Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies; Translation history

Normative ethics *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Norms of translation (Schäffner, Vol. 1, 235–244); *see also* Functionalist approaches; Polysystem theory and translation; Translation Studies
Note taking *see* Conference interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Interpreting Studies

O
Objectivity/subjectivity *see* Audio description
Observation *see* Empirical approaches; Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Observational data *see* Interpreting Studies
Occupational identity *see* Status of interpreters
Official language *see* Minority languages and translation; Official translation; Relay interpreting
Official translation (Merkle, Vol. 4, 119–122); *see also* Institutional translation; Legal translation; Minority languages and translation; Translation policy
Online bibliographies *see* Bibliographies of Translation Studies
Onomatopoeia *see* Comics in translation
Open Access *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Open source(s) *see* Collaborative translation; Computer-aided translation
Opera *see* Music and translation
Oral *see* Audio description
Oral translation *see* Interpreting
Oral-written interface *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Orality and translation (Bandia, Vol. 2, 108–112); *see also* Anthropology and translation; Audiovisual translation; Children's literature and translation; Community interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Development and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Nation, empire, translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Pseudotranslation; Religious translation; Simultaneous interpreting; Sociolinguistics and translation; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Organisational setting *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Organizational practices *see* International business and translation
Original and translation (Laiho, Vol. 4, 123–129); *see also* Deconstruction; Domestication and foreignization; Equivalence; Ethics and translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Postmodernism
Original(ity) *see* Creativity; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Multilingualism and translation; Original and translation; Philosophy and translation; Relay translation; Retranslation; Rhetoric and translation; Self-translation; Translation history; Translation rights
Otherness *see* Anthropology and translation
Outre-langue *see* Hybridity and translation
Overt and covert translation (House, Vol. 1, 245–246)

P
Paradigm *see* Translating social sciences
Paradigm shift *see* Equivalence; Ideology and translation; Metaphors for translation
Paralinguistic information *see* Audiovisual translation; Interpreting Studies; Sight translation; Subtitling; Technical translation
Parallel corpus *see* Corpus-based interpreting studies
Paratexts (Tahir Gürçağlar, Vol. 2, 113–116); *see also* Agents of translation; Norms of translation; Pseudotranslation; Voices in translation
Passive language *see* Lingua franca
Patronage *see* Cultural approaches; Institutional translation; Power and translation
Pedagogy *see* Curriculum; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation didactics
Peer review *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Pentathlon principle *see* Music and translation
Perceptual span *see* Eye tracking
Performance translation *see* Drama translation
Peripheral language *see* Editorial policy and translation; Relay translation
Periphery *see* Editorial policy and translation
Personal narratives *see* Narratives and contextual frames
Personal traits *see* Emotions and translation
Personality (type) *see* Translation psychology
Phenomenology *see* Situated cognition
Philosophical texts *see* Popularization and translation
Philosophy and translation (Arrojo, Vol. 1, 247–251); *see also* Deconstruction; Language philosophy and translation
Phraseology *see* Terminology and translation
Picture (and text) *see* Comics in translation
Piracy *see* Translation rights
Pivot language *see* Indirect translation; Interpreting; Relay interpreting; Relay translation; Subtitling
Plagiarism *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Plurilingualism *see* Hybridity and translation

Poetics of the translator *see* Comparative approaches to translation
Poetry translation (Jones, Vol. 2, 117–122); *see also* Adaptation; Competence; Status of interpreters; Think-aloud protocol; Wordplay in translation
Political ecology *see* Ecology of translation
Political translation (Gagnon, Vol. 1, 252–256); *see also* Community interpreting; Gender in translation; Ideology and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Self-translation; Translation strategies and tactics
Politics of translation *see* Conflict and translation
Polylingualism *see* Post-colonial literatures and translation
Polysemy *see* Interpretive approach
Polysystem theory and translation (Chang, Vol. 1, 257–263); *see also* Sociolinguistics and translation; Translation policy
Popular literature *see* Translating popular fiction
Popularization and translation (Liao, Vol. 4, 130–133); *see also* Genres, text-types and translation; Media accessibility; Reception and translation; Scientific translation; Terminology and translation
Post-editing (O'Brien, Vol. 5, 177–183); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Machine translation today; Quality in translation; Revision; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation tools
Post-colonial literatures and translation (Bandia, Vol. 1, 264–269); *see also* Eurocentrism
Postcolonial Studies *see* Cultural translation; Development and translation
Postcolonialism *see* Eurocentrism; Hybridity and translation; Impact of translation; Power and translation
Postmodernism (Wang, Vol. 3, 128–133); *see also* Cultural translation; Deconstruction; Ethics and translation; Globalization and translation; Philosophy and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Postmodernity *see* Postmodernism
Poststructuralist *see* Postmodernism
Power and translation (Strowe, Vol. 4, 134–141); *see also* Agents of translation; Anthologies and translation; Censorship; Committed approaches and activism; Conflict and translation; Cultural approaches; Descriptive Translation Studies; Ethics and translation; Eurocentrism; Gender in translation; Globalization and translation; Ideology and translation; Impact of translation; Migration and translation; National and cultural images; Norms of translation; Political translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Status of interpreters; Status of translators; Translation policy
Power relation(s) *see* Cultural approaches; Hybridity and translation; Ideology and translation; Interpreting; Minority languages and translation; Orality and translation; Philosophy and translation; Political translation; Power and translation; Stylistics and translation; Translation history; Translation policy
Power structure *see* Museums and translation
Prague Structuralism *see* Literary Studies and Translation Studies
Pre-/post-editing *see* Evaluation/Assessment; Machine translation today; Revision
Predictability *see* Complexity in translation studies
Prescriptivism *see* Equivalence
Presentational element(s) *see* Paratexts
Preventive censorship *see* Translating popular fiction
Prima vista *see* Sight translation
Prize(s) *see* Translation policy
Probability *see* Risk in translation
Problem-solving *see* Cognitive approaches; Translation problem; Translation process; Translation psychology
Procedure(s) *see* Translation strategies and tactics
Process *see* Translation process
Process-centered approach *see* Interpreting Studies; Translation didactics
Process-oriented *see* Descriptive Translation Studies; Interpreting Studies; Simultaneous interpreting
Processing effort *see* Intralingual translation
Product-oriented *see* Descriptive Translation Studies
Productivity *see* Post-editing
Profession-centered approach *see* Translation didactics
Professional associations *see* Community interpreting
Professional interpreter(s) *see* Healthcare interpreting; Non-professional translators and interpreters
Professionalism/Professionalization *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Impact of translation; Interpreting Studies; Natural translator and interpreter; Quality in interpreting; Sign language interpreting and

translating; Status of interpreters; Translation psychology
Promotional material *see* Advertising translation
Proofreading *see* Revision
Proper names *see* Realia
Prosody *see* Interpreting Studies
Prosopography *see* Digital humanities and translation studies
Prototype (theory) *see* Semantic models and translation
Pseudotranslation (O'Sullivan, Vol. 2, 123–125); *see also* Adaptation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Ethics and translation; Localization and translation; Norms of translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Subtitling
Psychoanalysis *see* Gender in translation
Psycholinguistics *see* Cognitive approaches; Semantic models and translation; Translation didactics; Translation process
Psychology *see* Translation psychology
Psychometrics *see* Emotions and translation
Public domain *see* Translation policy
Public health *see* Food and translation
Public image *see* Status of interpreters
Publish or perish *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Publishing in Translation Studies (Valdeón, Vol. 5, 185–190); *see also* Bibliometrics
Publishing/publishers *see* Editorial policy and translation; Institutional translation; Publishing in Translation Studies; Translation history
Pun(s) *see* Comics in translation; Wordplay in translation
Purification *see* Children's literature and translation

Q
Qualifications *see* Conference interpreting
Qualitative research *see* Empirical approaches
Quality (assurance) *see* Computer-aided translation; Conference interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Machine translation today; Quality in interpreting; Quality in translation; Revision; Status of translators; Teaching translation / Training translators; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies; Translation criticism; Translation tools
Quality in interpreting (Kalina, Vol. 3, 134–140); *see also* Evaluation/Assessment; Quality in translation; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Quality in translation (Gouadec, Vol. 1, 270–275); *see also* Evaluation/Assessment; Quality in interpreting
Quantitative research *see* Empirical approaches
Queer theory *see* Gender in translation
Qur'an *see* Religious translation

R
Ranking *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Rapprochement *see* Author and translator
Raw translation *see* Post-editing
Re-reading *see* Revision
Readability *see* Institutional translation; Subtitling
Reader *see* Emotions and translation; Evaluation/Assessment; Poetry translation; Rhetoric and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Stylistics and translation
Readership *see* Literary translation; Retranslation
Reading *see* Eye tracking
Reading skill *see* Subtitling
Realia (Leppihalme, Vol. 2, 126–130); *see also* Subtitling; Translation problem; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies
Realism *see* Communism and Translation Studies
Reality *see* Complexity in translation studies
Reception and translation (Brems & Ramos Pinto, Vol. 4, 142–147); *see also* Adaptation; Audiovisual translation; Bibliometrics; Cognitive approaches; Cultural translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Equivalence; Eye tracking; Genres, text-types and translation; Humor in translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Literary translation; Media accessibility; Music and translation; National and cultural images; Norms of translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Subtitling; Translating social sciences; Translation criticism; Translation psychology; Translation Studies; Voiceover and dubbing
Recreative translation *see* Comparative approaches to translation; Poetry translation
Redefinition (of TS) *see* Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies
Reduction *see* Music and translation
Reductionism *see* Complexity in translation studies
Redundancy *see* Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous interpreting
Referee *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Reflexive turn *see* General translation theory
Reformulating *see* Interpretive approach
Register *see* Discourse analysis; Sociolinguistics and translation; Stylistics and translation
Regularities *see* Norms of translation

Regulated translation *see* Religious translation
Regulation *see* Translation policy
Relay *see* Conference interpreting; Voiceover and dubbing
Relay interpreting (Shlesinger, Vol. 1, 276–278); *see also* Community interpreting; Relay translation; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous interpreting
Relay translation (Ringmar, Vol. 3, 141–144); *see also* Relay interpreting
Relevance and translation (Alves & Gonçalves, Vol. 1, 279–284); *see also* Intercultural mediation; Interpretive approach; Simultaneous interpreting; Subtitling
Reliability *see* Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Religion *see* Nation, empire, translation
Religious texts and oral tradition (Naudé, Vol. 5, 191–198); *see also* Anthologies and translation; Orality and translation; Religious translation
Religious translation (Naudé, Vol. 1, 285–293); *see also* Translation strategies and tactics
Remediation *see* Translating popular fiction
Remote interpreting (Moser-Mercer, Vol. 2, 131–134); *see also* Globalization and translation; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Multimodality in interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology
Repertoire *see* Literary translation; Polysystem theory and translation
Repetition *see* Computer-aided translation; Translation universals
Replacement *see* Translation problem
Reported speech *see* Voices in translation
Representamen *see* Intersemiotic translation
Representation of translators and interpreters (Kaindl, Vol. 3, 145–150); *see also* Pseudotranslation; Status of interpreters; Status of translators
Representation(s) *see* Cultural approaches; Ethics and translation and for translators; Museums and translation; National and cultural images; Travel and translation
Resistance *see* Committed approaches and activism; Nation, empire, translation; Political translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Power and translation
Response *see* Evaluation/Assessment
Retentive translation *see* Comparative approaches to translation
Retour *see* Conference interpreting; Relay interpreting
Retranslation (Koskinen & Paloposki, Vol. 1, 294–298); *see also* Relay translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Translating social sciences; Translation criticism
Reuse *see* Computer-aided translation; Localization and translation
Reversed subtitles *see* Subtitles and language learning
Review *see* Translation criticism
Revision (Mossop, Vol. 2, 135–139); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Genetic translation studies; Journalism and translation; Quality in translation; Retranslation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation 'errors'; Translation tools
Revoicing *see* Subtitling; Voiceover and dubbing
Rewording *see* Translation Studies
Rewriting *see* Anthologies and translation; Cultural approaches; Intercultural mediation; Intralingual translation; Relay translation; Visibility (and invisibility)
Rhetoric and translation (Stecconi, Vol. 3, 151–155); *see also* Applied Translation Studies; Stylistics and translation; Text linguistics and translation
Rhyme *see* Poetry translation
Rhythm *see* Music and translation
Risk (- assessment criteria, - avoidance, - in decision-making, - management (strategies), - mitigation, - reduction, - transfer, -taking) *see* Risk in translation
Risk in translation (Matsushita, Vol. 5, 199–205); *see also* Machine translation today; Post-editing
Role (of interpreter) *see* Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Court/Legal interpreting; Healthcare interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Simultaneous interpreting
Routine(s) *see* Translation psychology; Translation strategies and tactics
Russian *see* Lingua franca
Russian Formalism *see* Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Polysystem theory and translation

S
Saccades *see* Eye tracking
Sacred text(s) *see* Religious translation
Sameness *see* Deconstruction
Sample *see* Corpora
Sanskrit *see* Religious texts and oral tradition

Scenes and frames semantics *see* Semantic models and translation
Scholars (translation and interpreting -) *see* Ethnographic approaches; Interpreting Studies; Translation history
Scholarship(s) *see* Translation policy
Science of translating *see* General translation theory; Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies; Translation Studies
Scientific translation (Montgomery, Vol. 1, 299–305); *see also* Self-translation; Translation tools
Scientific productivity *see* Bibliometrics
Scientific texts *see* Popularization and translation
Scientificity and theory in Translation Studies (Gile, Vol. 4, 148–155); *see also* Functionalist approaches; General translation theory; Impact of translation theory; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Interpretive approach; Translation universals
Scientometrics *see* Bibliometrics
Script *see* Audio description
Second language *see* Directionality
Self-censorship *see* Translating popular fiction
Self-employed translator *see* Revision
Self-organization *see* Complexity in translation studies
Self-revision *see* Revision
Self-translation (Montini, Vol. 1, 306–308); *see also* Bilingualism and translation; Hybridity and translation; Institutional translation; Paratexts
Semantic chunk *see* Neurolinguistics and interpreting
Semantic models and translation (Kussmaul, Vol. 1, 309–313); *see also* Religious translation; Technical translation
Semiotic modality *see* Multimodality and audiovisual translation
Semiotics and translation (Stecconi, Vol. 1, 314–319); *see also* Equivalence; Linguistics and translation
Settings *see* Audio description; Audiovisual translation; Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Media interpreting; Simultaneous interpreting; Turns of Translation Studies
Shadowing *see* Interpreting Studies; Neurolinguistics and interpreting
Shared concepts *see* Translating social sciences
Shift(s) *see* Discourse analysis; Linguistics and translation; Translation strategies and tactics
Sight loss *see* Audio description
Sight translation (Čeňková, Vol. 1, 320–323); *see also* Consecutive interpreting; Simultaneous interpreting; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Translation strategies and tactics
Sign(s) *see* Deconstruction; Linguistics and translation; Semiotics and translation
Sign language interpreting and translating (Leeson & Vermeerbergen, Vol. 1, 324–328); *see also* Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Media accessibility; Simultaneous interpreting; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters
Sign system *see* Intersemiotic translation
Sign-language interpreting *see* Empathy
Signed language interpreting *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Similarity *see* Comparative approaches to translation; Intersemiotic translation; Original and translation
Simplification *see* Intralingual translation; Lingua franca; Machine translation today; Translation universals
Simship *see* Localization and translation
Simulation *see* Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation problem
Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology (Diriker, Vol. 1, 329–332); *see also* Conference interpreting; Simultaneous interpreting
Simultaneous interpreting (Russo, Vol. 1, 333–336); *see also* Consecutive interpreting; Eye tracking; Genres, text-types and translation; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Media interpreting
Simultaneous interpreting with text *see* Conference interpreting; Sight translation
Singability *see* Music and translation
Situated cognition (Muñoz Martín, Vol. 5, 207–212); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Complexity in translation studies; Emotions and translation; Empathy; Models in Translation Studies; Post-editing; Remote interpreting; Semantic models and translation; Subtitling
Situational approach *see* Translation didactics
Situationality *see* Text linguistics and translation
Skill(s) *see* Collaborative translation; Competence; Intralingual translation; Status of translators; Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Skopos (theory) *see* Functionalist approaches; General translation theory; Interpretive approach; Medical translation and interpreting; Theory of translatorial action; Translation
Slogan *see* Tourism translation

Social development *see* Development and translation
Social media and translation (Desjardins, Vol. 4, 156–159); *see also* Localization and translation; Machine translation today; Networking and volunteer translators; Self-translation; Translation tools; Web and translation
Social network (analysis) *see* Bibliometrics; Digital humanities and translation studies; Networking and volunteer translators; Web and translation
Social practice *see* Evaluation/Assessment; Sociology of translation
Social psychology *see* Translation psychology
Social systems and translation (Tyulenev, Vol. 4, 160–166); *see also* Agents of translation; Cultural approaches; Functionalist approaches; Models in Translation Studies; Polysystem theory and translation; Sociology of translation; Turns of Translation Studies
Social turn *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies)
Socioconstructive approach *see* Translation didactics
Sociolect *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Sociolinguistics and translation (Ramos Pinto, Vol. 3, 156–162); *see also* Linguistics and translation; Sociology of translation; Text linguistics and translation
Sociological turn *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Sociology *see* Translating social sciences
Sociology of interpreting *see* Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies)
Sociology of translation (Wolf, Vol. 1, 337–343); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Community interpreting; Functionalist approaches; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies
Solution *see* Translation problem
Song *see* Music and translation
Source content *see* Audio description
Source language *see* World literature and translation
Spanish *see* Lingua franca
Special languages *see* Terminology and translation
Specialized knowledge *see* Popularization and translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Terminology and translation
Specialized translation *see* Genres, text-types and translation; Teaching translation / Training translators
Speech (voice) recognition *see* Subtitling; Translation tools
Speech databases *see* Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology
Speech processing *see* Neurolinguistics and interpreting
Speech representation *see* Voices in translation
Stage performance *see* Music and translation
Standardization *see* Domestication and foreignization; Institutional translation; Media accessibility; Medical translation and interpreting; Translation universals
Statistical machine translation *see* Post-editing
Statistics *see* Complexity in translation studies
Status *see* Computer-aided translation; Conference interpreting; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Status of interpreters; Status of translators; Transcreation; Translator studies
Status of interpreters (Wadensjö, Vol. 2, 140–145); *see also* Community interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Journalism and translation; Relay interpreting; Representation of translators and interpreters; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous interpreting
Status of translators (Katan, Vol. 2, 146–152); *see also* Agents of translation; Committed approaches and activism; Competence; Institutional translation; Representation of translators and interpreters
Stereotype *see* National and cultural images; Orality and translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Semantic models and translation
Strategy *see* Agents of translation; Corpus-based interpreting studies; Natural translator and interpreter; Risk in translation; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation policy; Translation strategies and tactics
Structure *see* Deconstruction
Style *see* Creativity; Rhetoric and translation; Scientific translation
Stylistics and translation (Boase-Beier, Vol. 2, 153–156); *see also* Censorship; Methodology in Translation Studies; Poetry translation; Rhetoric and translation; Translation Studies
Subdiscipline *see* Alternative labels for "translation"
Subjectivity *see* Ecology of translation
Submission *see* Publishing in Translation Studies
Subtitles and language learning (Caimi, Vol. 4, 167–173); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Language learning and translation; Subtitling
Subtitling (Díaz Cintas, Vol. 1, 344–349); *see also* Interpreting; Media accessibility; Subtitles and language learning; Voiceover and dubbing

Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (SDH) *see* Audiovisual translation; Subtitles and language learning; Subtitling
Summer schools (for PhD students) *see* Institutionalization of Translation Studies
Supermeme(s) *see* Translation Studies
Surtitling *see* Audiovisual translation; Music and translation
Survey *see* Empirical approaches; Methodology in Translation Studies
Swahili *see* Lingua franca
Synchrony *see* Audiovisual translation; Interpreting Studies; Voiceover and dubbing
Synonymy *see* Medical translation and interpreting
System *see* Polysystem theory and translation; Power and translation; Social systems and translation
Sūtras *see* Religious texts and oral tradition

T

Tacit knowledge *see* Knowledge management and translation
Tactics *see* Translation strategies and tactics
Tagline *see* Tourism translation
Talmud *see* Religious translation
Taoist oral tradition *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
TAP *see* Think-aloud protocol
Target visitors *see* Museums and translation
Target-oriented *see* Descriptive Translation Studies
Task-based approach *see* Translation didactics
Tasks *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Media interpreting; Technical translation; Voiceover and dubbing; Web and translation
Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters (Pöchhacker, Vol. 4, 174–180); *see also* Community interpreting; Competence; Conference interpreting; Consecutive interpreting; Court/Legal interpreting; Curriculum; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Natural translator and interpreter; Remote interpreting; Sight translation; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology; Simultaneous interpreting; Teaching translation / Training translators
Teaching translation / Training translators (Gambier, Vol. 3, 163–171); *see also* Bilingualism and translation; Competence; Curriculum; Evaluation/Assessment; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Language learning and translation; Quality in translation; Teaching interpreting / Training interpreters; Translation didactics; Translation 'errors'; Translation problem; Translation strategies and tactics
Teamwork *see* Conference interpreting; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translating popular fiction
Technical translation (Schubert, Vol. 1, 350–355); *see also* Adaptation; Computer-aided translation; Functionalist approaches; Legal translation; Overt and covert translation; Scientific translation; Translation process
Technique(s) *see* Translation strategies and tactics
Technology *see* Information, communication, translation
Tele-interpreting *see* Remote interpreting
Telephone interpreting *see* Community interpreting; Remote interpreting
Television interpreting *see* Media interpreting; Sign language interpreting and translating
Term banks *see* Computer-aided translation
Terminological variation *see* Medical translation and interpreting
Terminology *see* NGOs and translation
Terminology and translation (Cabré, Vol. 1, 356–365); *see also* Corpora; Knowledge management and translation; Text linguistics and translation
Terminology management system *see* Computer-aided translation
Tertium comparationis *see* Comparative approaches to translation; Contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies; Creativity
Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies (Angelelli, Vol. 3, 172–177); *see also* Competence; Evaluation/Assessment; Quality in interpreting; Quality in translation
Text (source/target text) *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Audiovisual translation; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Computer-aided translation; Corpus-based interpreting studies; Emotions and translation; Empathy; Gender in translation; Genetic translation studies; Indirect translation; Lingua franca; Multilingualism and translation; Museums and translation; Retranslation; Scientific translation; Sight translation; Technical translation; Text linguistics and translation; Tourism translation; Translation universals; Turns of Translation Studies
Text analysis *see* Discourse analysis

Text convention(s) *see* Medical translation and interpreting
Text functions *see* Tourism translation
Text linguistics and translation (House, Vol. 3, 178–183); *see also* Linguistics and translation; Rhetoric and translation; Sociolinguistics and translation; Stylistics and translation
Text profile *see* Quality in interpreting
Text type(s) *see* Emotions and translation; Evaluation/Assessment; Translation problem
Text's genesis *see* Genetic translation studies
Textual layout *see* Museums and translation
Textuality *see* Hybridity and translation
Theory (design) *see* General translation theory
Theory building *see* Eurocentrism
Theory of communicative action *see* Social systems and translation
Theory of languages *see* Translation psychology
Theory of translatorial action (Schäffner, Vol. 2, 157–162); *see also* Agents of translation; Competence; Ethics and translation; Functionalist approaches; Translation didactics; Translation Studies
Thick translation *see* Ethnographic approaches; Translation
Think-aloud protocol (Jääskeläinen, Vol. 1, 371–373); *see also* Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation process; Translation psychology; Unit of translation
Third space *see* Hybridity and translation
Third World *see* Development and translation
Tibetan translations *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Title(s) *see* Comics in translation
Tools *see* Translation tools
Top–down *see* Comparative approaches to translation; Semantic models and translation
Total translation *see* Intersemiotic translation
Tourism (Studies) *see* Tourism translation; Travel and translation
Tourism promotional material *see* Tourism translation
Tourism translation (Sulaiman & Wilson, Vol. 5, 213–220); *see also* Advertising translation; Commercial translation; Quality in translation; Travel and translation; Web and translation
Tourist brochure(s) *see* Advertising translation; Stylistics and translation
Trace analysis *see* Empirical approaches
Training *see* Community interpreting; Conference interpreting; Deconstruction; Genres, text-types and translation; Interpreting Studies; Interpretive approach; Medical translation and interpreting; Models in Translation Studies; NGOs and translation; Post-editing; Sight translation; Sign language interpreting and translating; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology; Simultaneous interpreting; Situated cognition; Status of translators; Stylistics and translation; Terminology and translation
Traitor *see* Nation, empire, translation
Transcoding *see* Interpreting Studies; Simultaneous interpreting
Transcreation (Katan, Vol. 5, 221–225); *see also* Adaptation; Advertising translation; Children's literature and translation; Commercial translation; Functionalist approaches; Literary translation; Localization and translation; Orality and translation; Translation universals
Transcription *see* Multimodality and audiovisual translation; Multimodality in interpreting
Transcultural interaction *see* Theory of translatorial action
Transculturalism *see* Hybridity and translation
Transediting *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Information, communication, translation; Journalism and translation
Transfer and Transfer Studies (Göpferich, Vol. 1, 374–377); *see also* Assumed translation; Deconstruction; Directionality; Functionalist approaches
Transformation *see* Philosophy and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies
Translatability/untranslatability *see* Advertising translation; Anthropology and translation; Deconstruction; Linguistics and translation; Multilingualism and translation; Translation problem; Wordplay in translation; World literature and translation
Translating popular fiction (Zanettin, Vol. 5, 227–232); *see also* Adaptation; Censorship; Comics in translation; Cultural translation; Gender in translation; Genres, text-types and translation; Literary translation; National and cultural images; Original and translation; Popularization and translation; Pseudotranslation; Reception and translation; Web and translation
Translating social sciences (Gambier, Vol. 5, 233–239); *see also* Impact of translation; Indirect translation; Lingua franca; Relay translation; Self-translation; Sociology of translation; Terminology and translation

Translation (Halverson, Vol. 1, 378–384); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Drama translation; Ecology of translation; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Lingua franca; Translation Studies
Translation act *see* Models in Translation Studies; Relay translation; Translation problem
Translation agency *see* Revision
Translation brief *see* Evaluation/Assessment; Functionalist approaches; Translation 'errors'
Translation centre *see* Agents of translation
Translation competence *see* Author and translator; Natural translator and interpreter
Translation criticism (Paloposki, Vol. 3, 184–190); *see also* Evaluation/Assessment; Models in Translation Studies; Norms of translation; Paratexts; Translation 'errors'
Translation didactics (Kelly, Vol. 1, 389–396); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Curriculum; Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation process
Translation effect(s) *see* Hybridity and translation
Translation 'errors' (Hansen, Vol. 1, 385–388); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Functionalist approaches; Technical translation; Translation criticism
Translation ethics *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Translation event *see* Models in Translation Studies
Translation flow(s) *see* Communism and Translation Studies
Translation history (D'hulst, Vol. 1, 397–405); *see also* Functionalist approaches
Translation memory system *see* Computer-aided translation; Post-editing; Revision
Translation method *see* Linguistics and translation; Translation strategies and tactics; Unit of translation
Translation policy (Meylaerts, Vol. 2, 163–168); *see also* Agents of translation; Applied Translation Studies; Censorship; Community interpreting; Descriptive Translation Studies; Institutional translation; Multilingualism and translation; Norms of translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Subtitling; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies; Voiceover and dubbing
Translation practice *see* Impact of translation theory
Translation problem (Toury, Vol. 2, 169–174); *see also* Models in Translation Studies; Think-aloud protocol; Translation process; Translation strategies and tactics; Translation Studies
Translation process (Englund Dimitrova, Vol. 1, 406–411); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Descriptive Translation Studies; Eye tracking; Metaphors for translation; Models in Translation Studies; Think-aloud protocol; Translation problem; Translation psychology; Translation strategies and tactics; Unit of translation
Translation profession *see* Collaborative translation
Translation project *see* Globalization and translation
Translation proper *see* Translation Studies
Translation psychology (Jääskeläinen, Vol. 3, 191–197); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Neurolinguistics and interpreting; Translation process
Translation reflection *see* Impact of translation theory
Translation rights (Basalamah, Vol. 3, 198–202); *see also* Agents of translation; Editorial policy and translation; Paratexts; Retranslation
Translation rules *see* Polysystem theory and translation
Translation service *see* NGOs and translation
Translation strategies and tactics (Gambier, Vol. 1, 412–418); *see also* Adaptation; Communism and Translation Studies; Conference interpreting; Functionalist approaches; Music and translation; Think-aloud protocol; Translation process; Translation psychology
Translation Studies *see* Alternative labels for "translation"; Ecology of translation
Translation Studies (Munday, Vol. 1, 419–428); *see also* Applied Translation Studies; Cognitive approaches; Common grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies); Computer-aided translation; Corpora; Descriptive Translation Studies; Equivalence; Functionalist approaches; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Interpreting Studies; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Translation history; Translation process
Translation technologies *see* Audio description; Digital humanities and translation studies
Translation theory *see* General translation theory; Models in Translation Studies
Translation tools (Folaron, Vol. 1, 429–436); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Corpora; Teaching translation / Training translators; Technical translation; Web and translation
Translation universals (Chesterman, Vol. 2, 175–179); *see also* Contrastive linguistics and Translation

Studies; Corpora; Descriptive Translation Studies; Linguistics and translation; Norms of translation; Retranslation; Stylistics and translation; Subtitling; Translation psychology; Translation Studies
Translation working process *see* Translation strategies and tactics
Translation zone (Simon, Vol. 4, 181–185); *see also* Globalization and translation; Hybridity and translation; Migration and translation; Minority languages and translation
Translational turn (Bachmann-Medick, Vol. 4, 186–193); *see also* Cultural translation; Eurocentrism; Globalization and translation; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Migration and translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Self-translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation; Translation Studies; Turns of Translation Studies
Translationese *see* Translation universals
Translatology *see* Translation Studies
Translator studies (Chesterman, Vol. 5, 241–245); *see also* Agents of translation; Cognitive approaches; Committed approaches and activism; Computer-aided translation; Cultural approaches; Descriptive Translation Studies; Ecology of translation; Ethics and translation; Gender in translation; Ideology and translation; Quality in translation; Representation of translators and interpreters; Sociology of translation; Translation history; Translation psychology; Turns of Translation Studies; Visibility (and invisibility)
Translator *see* Emotions and translation; Indirect translation; Translation Studies
Translator's manuscript *see* Genetic translation studies
Translatorship *see* Agents of translation; Author and translator; Institutional translation; Methodology in Translation Studies
Translatorial competence *see* Theory of translatorial action
Transliteration *see* Orality and translation; Sign language interpreting and translating
Transmedial production *see* Translating popular fiction
Transmission *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Transmutation *see* Translation Studies
Transnational language *see* World literature and translation
Transportation *see* Philosophy and translation
Travel and translation (Cronin, Vol. 4, 194–199); *see also* Agents of translation; Globalization and translation; Power and translation; Transfer and Transfer Studies; Translation zone
Travel literature *see* Orality and translation; Travel and translation
Triangulated methodology *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Triangulation *see* Empathy; Empirical approaches
True translation *see* Self-translation
Turns of Translation Studies, the (Snell-Hornby, Vol. 1, 366–370); *see also* Community interpreting; Computer-aided translation; Descriptive Translation Studies; Functionalist approaches; Gender in translation; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Interpreting Studies; Machine translation today; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Sociology of translation; Think-aloud protocol; Translation Studies
Types of indirect translation *see* Intralingual translation
Types of organisation *see* NGOs and translation
Typology of translation (Jakobson) *see* Intersemiotic translation

U
Uncertainty risk *see* Risk in translation
Understanding *see* Empathy; Hermeneutics and translation
UNESCO *see* Status of translators
Unique item hypothesis *see* Translation universals
Unit of translation (Ballard, Vol. 1, 437–440); *see also* Teaching translation / Training translators; Translation strategies and tactics
Universal(s) *see* Translation universals
Untranslatability → *see* Translatability/untranslatability
Upanishads *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Usability *see* Applied Translation Studies
Usefulness *see* Applied Translation Studies
User expectation(s) *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Quality in interpreting
User interface *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces
User survey *see* Quality in interpreting
Utterance(s) *see* Language philosophy and translation

V
Validity *see* Testing and assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies
Variables *see* Interpreting Studies; Simultaneous interpreting

Vedas *see* Religious texts and oral tradition
Verbal language *see* Intersemiotic translation
Verbal reporting *see* Translation process
Vernaculars *see* Editorial policy and translation; Nation, empire, translation; Scientific translation
Video description *see* Audio description
Videoconference *see* Remote interpreting; Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology
Viewer *see* Sociolinguistics and translation
Virtual community *see* Collaborative translation
Virtual learning environment (VLE) *see* Simultaneous conference interpreting and technology
Virtual technologies *see* Ecology of translation
Virtue ethics *see* Ethics and translation and for translators
Visibility (and invisibility) (Emmerich, Vol. 4, 200–206); *see also* Committed approaches and activism; Deconstruction; Domestication and foreignization; Ethics and translation; Impact of translation theory; Institutionalization of Translation Studies; Post-colonial literatures and translation; Quality in interpreting; Translation criticism
Visual attention *see* Eye tracking; Multimodality in interpreting
Visual components *see* Multimodality in interpreting; Museums and translation
Visually impaired *see* Media accessibility
Vocal components *see* Multimodality in interpreting
Voice quality *see* Ethics and translation; Media interpreting
Voices in translation (Alvstad, Vol. 4, 207–210); *see also* Agents of translation; Orality and translation; Paratexts; Stylistics and translation; Translation psychology; Visibility (and invisibility)
Voiceover and dubbing (Díaz Cintas & Orero, Vol. 1, 441–445); *see also* Audiovisual translation; Media accessibility; Overt and covert translation; Subtitling
Volunteer translators/interpreters *see* Collaborative translation; Committed approaches and activism; Globalization and translation; Natural translator and interpreter; Networking and volunteer translators

W
Web and translation (Folaron, Vol. 1, 446–450); *see also* Computer-aided translation; Corpora; Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies; Machine translation today; Networking and volunteer translators; Social media and translation; Translation tools
Web science *see* Web and translation
Webometrics *see* Bibliometrics
Western *see* Development and translation; Eurocentrism; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Whispered interpreting *see* Conference interpreting; Media interpreting
Wikipedia *see* Collaborative translation
Women translators *see* Gender in translation
Word list(er) *see* Corpora
Wordplay in translation (Vandaele, Vol. 2, 180–183); *see also* Cognitive approaches; Humor in translation
Work process(es) *see* Technical translation; Translation tools
Workflow *see* Computer-aided translation; Machine translation today; Translation tools; Web and translation
Working language(s) *see* Conference interpreting; Interpreting; Interpreting Studies; Relay interpreting; Teaching translation / Training translators
Working memory *see* Interpreting Studies; Sight translation; Simultaneous interpreting; Think-aloud protocol
Workplace setting *see* Ergonomics and translation workplaces
Workstation *see* Computer-aided translation; Ergonomics and translation workplaces; Networking and volunteer translators; Translation tools
World language *see* Travel and translation
World literature and translation (Domínguez, Vol. 5, 247–253); *see also* Cultural approaches; Impact of translation; Literary Studies and Translation Studies; Literary translation; Polysystem theory and translation; Power and translation; Pseudotranslation; Sociology of translation
Writer *see* Gender in translation; Post-colonial literatures and translation
Writing *see* Post-colonial literatures and translation
Writing skills *see* Stylistics and translation
Writing strategies *see* Genetic translation studies

Up to now, the *Handbook of Translation Studies* (HTS) consisted of four volumes, all published between 2010 and 2013. Since research in TS continues to grow and expand, this fifth volume was added in 2021. The HTS aims at disseminating knowledge about translation, interpreting, localization, adaptation, etc. and providing easy access to a large range of topics, traditions, and methods to a relatively broad audience: not only students who prefer such user-friendliness, but also researchers and lecturers in Translation Studies, Translation & Interpreting professionals, as well as scholars and experts from other adjacent disciplines.

All articles in HTS are written by specialists in the different subfields and are peer-reviewed.

ISBN 978 90 272 0887 3

9 789027 208873

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY