HANDBOOK OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

VOLUME 2

EDITED BY
YVES GAMBIER
LUC VAN DOORSLAER

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Handbook of Translation Studies

Handbook of Translation Studies

As a meaningful manifestation of how institutionalized the discipline has become, the new *Handbook of Translation Studies* is most welcome.

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 *http://benjamins.com/catalog/hts*

Handbook of Translation Studies

Volume 2

Edited by

Yves Gambier
University of Turku

Luc van Doorslaer
Lessius University College, Antwerp; CETRA, University of Leuven

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Handbook of translation studies / edited by Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer.
p. cm. (Handbook of Translation Studies, ISSN 2210-4844 ; v. 2)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Translating and interpreting. I. Gambier, Yves, 1949- II. Doorslaer, Luc van, 1964-
P306.H36 2010
418'.02--dc22 2010028104
ISBN 978 90 272 0332 8 (Hb ; alk. paper)

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Supporting universities

UiO : Universitetet i Oslo

Lessius

Table of contents

Introduction

This volume is the second one in the project called the *Handbook of Translation Studies* (HTS). After the success of the first volume, we believe that this Handbook meets existing needs in the discipline. From the beginning, we have tried to keep the own specificities of this publication series in mind.

The idea for a new Handbook appeared in the summer of 2008, with two major contributions to the field: to be the first encyclopedia with this scope in translation studies to offer *both a print edition and an online version*, and to be regularly revised and updated. Another added value is the interconnection with the principles of selection and organization we have used in the online *Translation Studies Bibliography* (TSB). The taxonomy of the TSB has been applied pragmatically and in part to the selection of concepts for the HTS. The HTS can be searched in various ways: by article, by author, by subject. The subject index in this volume is cumulative for the first two volumes.

The HTS aims at disseminating knowledge about translation and interpreting studies. It is an academic tool, but one that is also directed at a broader audience. It addresses the needs of students (who often prefer to surf the net, to skim and make do with short texts rather than studying long monographs), researchers and lecturers in translation studies and practitioners, as well as scholars and experts from other related disciplines (linguistics, sociology, history, psychology, etc.).

HTS includes relatively brief overview articles (between 500 and 6,000 words each, based on relevance). They are clearly longer than the average dictionary or terminology article, but they do not necessarily contain every possible technical detail. The limited reference list concluding each article is supplemented with a list of further reading. In the online version, the items in the reference lists are hyperlinked to the TSB, where the user can also find an abstract of the publication. Cross-references to other entries within each volume and between the volumes are also clearly indicated: * refers to vol. 1, ** refers to vol. 2.

The HTS project relies on a strong International Advisory Board with nine experts in Translation and Interpreting Studies. In addition, the project is supported and backed by a network of collaborating universities (Bloemfontein/South-Africa, Graz/Austria, Oviedo/Spain, Oslo/Norway, HUB Brussels, FUNDP Namur and Lessius University College in Antwerp/Belgium). The editors explicitly would like to thank all the partners who have worked or are working under a certain time pressure.

Feedback from all the users is more than welcome. If you have any suggestions for improvement about accessibility or usability, please don't hesitate to contact the editorial team at hts@lessius.eu. And finally, the *Handbook* is published in English but

we are willing to add translations of individual articles in Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Russian, Portuguese and Spanish to the online edition. These might be challenging projects for students.

Translation Studies Bibliography: www.benjamins.nl/online/tsb
Handbook of Translation Studies: www.benjamins.nl/online/hts

The HTS editors
Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer
November 2011

Advertising translation

Cristina Valdés
University of Oviedo

Advertising translation is one of the areas within Translation Studies that has evolved most rapidly and intensively in the last few decades, in spite of its late entrance in the academia. Any comprehensive study of this topic requires an interdisciplinary approach to deal with the complexity of advertising material production as well as with the complexity of its translation. Aspects like the discourse of advertising and the implications for translation, the richness and variety of advertising texts, the different participants in the production, distribution and translation stages and the impact of the media are key issues to consider.

The first studies on advertising translation can be traced back to the 1970s when Canadian linguists such as Tatilon (1978) explored the nature of advertising translation. Claiming that this translation process involves more than mere interlingual transfer from a written text in a SL to another in a TL, Tatilon declared his position in favour of the translatability of this kind of texts, according to their communicative nature: "les traducteurs démontrent inlassablement la possibilité de traduire" (Tatilon 1978: 75). Assuming that the primary function of advertising is persuasion, Tatilon concluded that advertising language should be clear, memorable and attractive enough to arouse the receptor's interest in the product. Thus translators should process the source text, particularly wordplay**, to transfer it into the target language so that the target text fulfils the same function as the source text in a different context.

The pragmatic function of advertising material compels a description of the different participants in the communicative process of production and translation of these texts. This assumption has led to a flexible and interdisciplinary approach to advertising translation in the publications in the field in the last two decades, with studies focusing on concepts such as *communication*, *culture* or *consumer* and exploring the role of the different text types and media which are used for promotional campaigns. The cultural turn in Translation Studies (see Turns of Translation Studies*) has evolved in this area more than in others, since the political and economic role of advertising in the global village cannot be detached from translation actions.

In advertising translation both the source and target texts are part of the same marketing campaign and production process, and they are written by different authors in different languages and for differentiated target audiences, although with the same communicative function (Valdés 2004). Therefore, both source and target text share the same *function*, that is, to persuade the receptor to purchase or consume a product,

regardless of whether they share the same concept and form. Both content and form of advertisements are defined by the marketing campaign of the particular product that is promoted on an international scale. Cross-cultural barriers, but also common assumptions and values, may pose some difficulties to translators when trying to preserve and communicate the same message in different markets, and often a global campaign in a single language is launched worldwide, in an attempt at reducing costs and reinforcing the 'global' identity of the product or brand. On the contrary the use of only one language, generally English or French, triggers cultural and ideological tensions, or is simply appreciated as an aesthetic asset of the campaign, e.g. in clothing brands for young people, and as a sign of sophistication, e.g. in perfume brand promotions.

Translating promotional material is therefore an inherent part of more general processes of marketing and product promotion, and some studies arise from the area of marketing (De Mooij, in Adab & Valdés 2004), while others emerge from the description of new political and social realities in contexts like Eastern Europe or China. The translation of an advertisement entails the import of foreign cultural values to the target culture; therefore the translator becomes an importer of the ideological component that advertisements contain. For example Jettmarova, Piotrowska and Zauberga (1997) illustrated how western values and ideas were made attractive through images and brand names employed in international marketing campaigns launched in the Czech Republic, Poland and Latvia in the late 1990s and highlighted literalness as an overall strategy for translating advertisements, since foreign linguistic and textual patterns are adopted.

Similarly, after China's entry into the World Trade Organization, advertising translation has become a useful tool to challenge marketing practices and cultural and language standards. For instance, Ho (in Adab & Valdés 2004) offered a vision of advertising translation as an activity that adds economic value to the value chain of the whole marketing process in Chinese economy, entailing much more than mere language and culture transfer.

Product-oriented approaches to advertising translation have flourished since the 1990s in different contexts and covering several aspects. Major contributions on advertising translation have provided a thorough reconstruction of translation strategies* from a large corpus of texts in language pairs such as French and Spanish (Bueno García 2000) or Russian and English (Smith 2009), or in different languages as in French, Arabic, English, Portuguese and Spanish (Guidère 2000) or English, Spanish, French and Italian (Valdés 2004). These monographs present a general state-of-the-art of the translation of, mostly, printed advertising in different languages and contexts. They pay attention to verbal and non-verbal elements in advertising and how the stylistic effects of the original message are preserved in the different language versions. In her foundational paper, Adab (2000) establishes a more adequate approach for investigating advertising texts and their translation.

All these studies contextualise these translation activities within a wider situation characterised by cross-cultural interactions and communication.

Another interesting source that offers an overview of translation practices in advertising is the edited volume by Adab and Valdés (2004), where these two authors gathered a collection of specialised papers related to promotional material and its translation. Based on some advertising campaigns, Simões Freitas (in Adab & Valdés 2004) explored the semiotic nature of advertisements and how meaning is construed by viewers, so that equivalence is achieved, while in the same volume Millán-Varela (in Adab & Valdés 2004) emphasized the cultural and ideological role of advertising translation, following a semiotic description of international ice-cream marketing campaigns and Sumberg (in Adab & Valdés 2004), introducing the translation of tourist brochures as promotional material, to mention but a few.

Other scholarly contributions to advertising translation have dealt with more specific issues involving the analysis of language and discourse, the semiotic approach to advertising translation (see Semiotics and translation*) or, most recently, the impact of the media on advertising translation. Two remarkable examples of linguistic and rhetorical approaches to advertising translation are Quillard's paper (2001), where she examined punning and wordplay in advertising translation, and Shakir's study of registeral and schematic constraints in translation from English into Arab (1995). Semiotics is another area of knowledge that has influenced several studies in advertising translation, making particular reference in some cases to the role of visual elements in printed advertisements and in their translation (Torresi 2010).

Moreover, the media employed for promotion also contribute to the complexity of advertising translation, as the internal combination of elements and the reception of audiovisual commercials pose difficulties to translators (see Audiovisual translation*). Some research has been carried out in the area of translation for television as well, being De Pedro (1996) a pioneer in the description of the translation of television advertising. Valdés (2007) explored a series of general audiovisual translation strategies for Spanish television spots.

The impact of electronic media on the advertising industry has also affected research and practice in this kind of translation, as scholarly activities have illustrated. Recent publications include those on promotional material translation for websites, one of the recent areas of academic interest in advertising Translation Studies. Chiaro (in Adab & Valdés 2004) describes the similarities and differences between some print and electronic advertising material for agro-food products when this is translated from Italian into English to be effectively commercialised in international markets. Besides, Valdés (2008) looked carefully at the localization* of promotional discourse on the Internet, while Lee (2009) "investigates the non-verbal and verbal signs in commercial websites translation with a corpus of multinational companies operating in Greater China", demonstrating that the medium is global but the content is not.

This recent trend reveals some of the concepts commonly discussed about advertising translation, such as the difficulty to identify one and only source text when in most cases advertisements are created as parallel texts or texts that are products of different communication acts and hence for different receptors although they are intended to obtain the same or similar reaction under specific circumstances. The urgent demand of translations for the Web*, and most specifically for promotional material, is requiring quick adaptation and quality standards for this translation type. Besides, the semiotic complexity of website hypertexts and television commercials also urge translators to intervene creatively to trigger the intended pragmatic effect on the target audience.

At present, there is a growing need of studies on different aspects of advertising translation such as the tensions between local and global audiences of advertising or the quality of training programs in this area, to mention some. Meanwhile isolated examples of research are presented in conferences and publications, focusing on language and cross-cultural transfer in a rapidly-changing market-based world.

References

Adab, Beverly. 2000. "Towards a More Systematic Approach to the Translation of Advertising Texts." In *Investigating Translation*, Beeby, Alison (ed.), 225–237. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Adab, Beverly & Cristina Valdés (eds). 2004. *Key Debates in the Translation of Advertising Material.* Special issue of *The Translator* 10 (2). Manchester: St Jerome.

Bueno García, Antonio. 2000. *Publicidad y traducción*. Soria: Monográficos de la Revista Herméneus. Vertere.

Guidère, Matthieu. 2000. *Translating Ads.* Paris: Harmattan.

Jettmarova, Z., Piotrowska, M. & Zauberga, I. 1997. "New Advertising Markets as Target Areas for Translation." In *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995,* Snell-Hornby, Mary, Zuzana Jettmarova & Klaus Kaindl (eds), 185–194. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lee, Yvonne. 2009. "The Medium is Global, the Content is not: Translating Commercial Websites." *Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA Postgraduate Network* 1 (2). http://journalhosting.org/meccsa-pgn/index.php/netknow/article/viewFile/51/88 [Accessed 14 June 2011].

Pedro, Raquel de. 1996. "Beyond the Words: the Translation of Television Adverts." *Babel* 42 (1): 27–45.

Quillard, Genevieve. 2001. "La traduction des jeux de mots dans les annonces publicitaires." *TTR* 14 (1): 117–157.

Shakir, Abdullah. 1995. "The Translation of Advertisements: Registeral and Schematic Constraints." *Meta* 40 (1): 62–72.

Smith, Karen. 2009. *The Translation of Advertising Texts: A Study of English-Language Advertisements and their Translations in Russian*. VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.

Tatilon, Claude. 1978. "Traduire La Parole Publicitaire." *La Linguistique* 14 (1): 75–87.

Torresi, Ira. 2010. *Translating Promotional and Advertising Texts*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Valdés, Cristina. 2004. *La traducción publicitaria: comunicación y cultura*. 2004. Colección La Aldea Global. València: Universitat de València. Castelló de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. Bellaterra: Universitat Autòmoma de Barcelona. Servei de Publicacions, D.L.

Valdés, Cristina. 2007. "A complex mode of screen translation: The case of advertisements in Spanish television channels." *A Tool for Social Integration? Audiovisual Translation from Different Angles*. Special issue of *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 6: 277–293.

Valdés, Cristina. 2008. "The localization of promotional discourse on the Internet." In *Between Text and Image. Updating research in screen translation*, Chiaro, Delia, Heiss, Christine & Chiara Bucaria (eds), 229–243. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Agents of translation

Hélène Buzelin
University of Montreal

1. Defining agents of translation

In Translation Studies* (TS), the notion of agent has received various definitions. For Juan Sager (quoted in Milton & Bandia 2009: 1), an agent is anyone in an intermediary position (i.e. a commissioner, a reviser, an editor, etc.) between a translator and an end user of a translation whereas for Milton & Bandia (2009) an agent of translation is any entity (a person, an institution, or even a journal) involved in a process of cultural innovation and exchange. A third avenue was suggested by Simeoni (1995) who defined the agent as "the 'subject,' but socialized. To speak of a translating agent, therefore, suggests that the reference is a 'voice,' or a pen (more likely a computer today), inextricably linked to networks of other social agents" (Simeoni 1995: 452; see Networking and volunteer translators*). As this definition reminds us, agent is a sociological concept. It designates an entity endowed with agency, which is the ability to exert power in an intentional way. Agents are usually understood to be human, although some paradigms, such as actor-network theory, maintain that non-humans are also endowed with agency.

Although the call to know more about translators, or "translating subjects," was made quite early in the history of TS (see Translation history*), it is only since the mid-nineties, as sociological approaches developed, that the concept of "translating agent" started to spread. As Tuija Kinnunen & Kaisa Koskinen (2010: 5) have aptly noted, agency became a buzzword in the discipline within a decade. Why did this happen? What is the scope of this notion? Why was it first introduced into TS? What are the key issues and perspectives in agent-grounded research? The following lines will attempt to begin answering these questions.

2. On the agent/structure opposition in the social sciences

The concept of agency is inextricably linked to that of structure. Together, they reflect a longstanding debate: are human actions governed by objective structures or by free will? While theories of social determination give the upper hand to objective structures, theories of social action place more emphasis on free will.

Beginning in the late seventies, attempts were made to think about agency and structure in relational rather than dichotomic terms. Anthony Gidden's structuration theory and Pierre Bourdieu's theory of fields are among the most distinguished. The former assumes that "the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organize. Structure is not 'external' to individuals: as memory traces, and as instantiated in social practices, it is in a certain sense more 'internal' than exterior to their activities" (Giddens 1984: 25).

In Bourdieu's framework, the relation is represented by the concept of habitus. Although this concept can be traced back to Aristotle, it becomes central in Bourdieu's theory, where it is defined as a "durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations, produc[ing] practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation. […] In practice, it is the habitus, history turned into nature, i.e. denied as such, which accomplishes practically the relating of these two systems of relations." (Bourdieu 1977: 78–79)

While Giddens and Bourdieu searched for a framework that would avoid the pitfalls of both objectivism and subjectivism, the founders of actor-network theory, who view society as a "seamless fabric," rejected the concepts of structure and agent altogether, along with the subject/object and micro/macro dichotomies they imply, in favor of the concept of actor-network (Buzelin in Wolf & Furaki 2007).

3. Why study translation from the viewpoint of the agent?

The reasons for an agent-grounded study of translation were first articulated in details by Simeoni (1995). In his view, the issues at stake were the definition, cohesion, and position of TS in the human and social sciences. Translation, as Simeoni noted, is a human event. It is both linguistic and social by nature. As such, its practice is never too far removed from its study. Yet, as TS developed, the relation between these two views on the object (and these two ways of relating to translation) had remained largely unexamined. Sadly, the subjective viewpoint tended to be discarded as "objective" models were sought. This split, Simeoni argued, could only lead to increased fragmentation within the discipline. "Object-centeredness polarizes. On the other hand, an 'I'-centered linguistics will naturally meet the terms of equally 'subject'-centered sciences, e.g. sociology* or, for that matter, Translation Studies" (Simeoni 1995: 452). Hence, studying translation from the viewpoint of the agent was felt as the most accommodating stance to enhance dialogue between philological and psychological views in TS, while helping to reintegrate linguistics within the discipline.

Another argument, related to the first but less specific to TS, was to move away from deterministic or mechanistic modes of explanation. Both Simeoni (1998, 2001) and Pym (1998) criticized Toury's model of translation norms* on that ground (see Descriptive Translation Studies*). The former worked at showing how the concept of *habitus,* for example, could allow TS scholars to better articulate the relationship between collective and individual factors in the acquisition of translatorship. In the same vein, Pym argued for a "humanization" of translation history. Focusing on translators first and then on their texts, Pym claimed, could help to bridge the gap between raw data and systemic generalizations, it would allow to unveil what he calls "multi-discursive mediation", "multiple allegiances" and "professional intercultures" (Pym in Dam & Zethsen eds.)

Finally, in as much as agency implies willingness and ability to act, such a focus on translators and their practice may be felt as ultimately empowering to the profession. This point (or wish) surfaces quite clearly in Dam & Zethsen's introduction to a recent thematic issue of *Hermes* focusing on translators. As the authors claim: "Much more research is needed […] to gain more knowledge on translators and interpreters as a social and professional group and hopefully in the long run be able to strengthen the status, image and identity of the profession" (2009: 11). Hence, in the opening article of this issue, Chesterman lays out a map of this "new" subfield he suggestively calls "translatOR studies".

4. Perspectives in agent-grounded research

The development of *agent*-grounded research in TS is closely related to the growing interest in sociological approaches, although not all of the social theories used in TS are concerned with agents (Niklas Luhmann's system theory being a case in point). In other words, agent-grounded researches analyse translation as a practice from the viewpoint of those who engage in it, in particular (social, cultural or professional) settings. Two main paths can be distinguished: one relates to translation history; the other borrows the methods of qualitative sociology or anthropology to study contemporary practices. The contributions published in Milton & Bandia eds. (2009), Dam and Zethsen eds (2009), and Tuija Kinnunen & Kaisa Koskinen eds. (2010) provide excellent examples of each path.

4.1 The socio-historiographic path

To date, there have been many case studies on key figures of cultural, literary or political history who engaged in translation as a way to spread new (sometimes revolutionary) ideas, new literary models, or new cultural images (See for example Bastin, Tahir-Gürçaglar and Uchiyama in Milton & Bandia). These studies reveal that "agents

of translation" are diverse, including politicians, military personnel, publishers, educators, and others. They remind us that translation is an engagement in social life and debates, a way to express one's own agency. As Pym puts it (in Dam & Zethsen eds. 33), it is more often than not "just one leg of a multifarious career". As an example, Gouanvic's research on the introduction of American science fiction to post-war France (1999), one of the first extensive applications of Bourdieu's theory in TS, highlighted how promoting or translating a foreign literature may become a strategy to take position, or improve one's position, in a national literary field. And this argument could apply to other fields (intellectual, political, academic, etc.).

To learn more about the translator's agency as such, one must also consider people for whom translation was a routine and core activity. This may be a challenging task in terms of data collection, as information may be less easy to find. This is the path taken, for example, by Reine Meylearts (2008) and Outi Paloposki (in Milton & Bandia and in Kinnunen & Kaisa Koskinen). Their work demonstrates how archival and paratextual material – like drafts, correspondence, and footnotes – used in conjunction with analyzed translations can be highly informative about a past translator's decision-making process. Such case studies reveal how the translator's agency can express itself as well as the multiple tensions underlying the formation of translatorship.

Not all translators followed the norms of their time, but only those who did were likely to gain recognition from colleagues who would preserve their historical legacy. At least, this is what our histories of translation tend to suggest. But, as Simeoni reminds us (in Wolf & Furaki 2007), this view is a construction, not a given. This is why the study of allegedly atypical translations and translators is so important. Indeed, as the scholar suggested in his research on Domenico Valentini, those atypical cases remind us of the social, political or ideological origins of translation norms. This understanding introduces more relativity and complexity into the writing of translation history while inviting us to fine-tune or even revise our definitions of competence in translation.

4.2 The sociological and ethnographic path

Empirical research on contemporary translating agents can take on many forms, including global surveys on the perceived status of translators** and status of interpreters**, interviews of translators (e.g. Abdallah in Kinnunen & Koskinen eds.), or ethnographies of "translation centers", i.e. any organization where the main activity consists in producing or promoting translation such as the translation bureau of a national or supranational institution, the translation department of a company, a publishing house, a translation agency or even an international book fair (see Ethnographic approaches*; Institutional translation**).

Fieldwork is particularly suited to observe and analyze the agent/structure relation, and translation is no exception. This approach tends to highlight how much "translation centres" are loci whereby various interests are in competition; it usually emphasizes the collective nature of the translation process as well as the hybrid character of the *translating agent*. It finally shows how those centres may produce, to varying degrees, their own translation norms.

For example, Koskinen (2008) analysed the day-to-day routine of the Finnish translation unit of the European Commission as well as the process of text production/translation in this institution. Her contribution reveals the conflict between economic and symbolic status of EU translators, as well as the various forms of socialization and identification (institutional, national, professional) that are created in this particular translating (and translated) institution. Drafts analysis highlights how the collective process by which EU texts are produced/translated leads to creation and assertion of an 'institutional' voice, very much depersonalized and reflecting, above all, the interest and viewpoint of this institution.

5. Debate over the translator's habitus

If empirical research is always grounded in theoretical assumptions, it aims to test those assumptions in the search for explanatory models. In that respect, one key question at the heart of agent-oriented research has to do with the definition and characterization of the translator's habitus.

One challenging thesis that provoked significant commentary was proposed by Daniel Simeoni (1998) who argued that subservience might be a key feature of a long-range translatorial habitus. This thesis was developed from a socio-historical rereading of Cicero and Saint Jerome combined with textual analysis of three major sociological essay translations. This sociohistorical exploration led the scholar to conclude that there is no continuity between Cicero's and Saint Jerome's respective approaches to translation, but rather a radical break. While "the textual and linguistic norms to which Cicero subjects himself are the same in writing and translating" (Simeoni 2001: 178), Saint Jerome developed a relationship of "devotion" to the text that involved a tightening up of linguistic norms. It is this Christian model of practice – as opposed to the Roman or the Judaic models – that "lead, around the 6th century, to the very first examples of scholarly translation, a distant echo of which can still be heard today in translations of sociological books" (Simeoni 2001: 242). Simeoni clarifies this point:

> This hyeronimic break does not explain, in itself, the behavior of today's translators […] More precisely, it is the internalization of a discourse that has kept on referring to Saint Jerome from the 5th century – in other words, several centuries of reshaping

> and reiteration of St Jerome's words, for interests that were, each time, different and external to translation – that can explain how this particular cultural attitude finally succeeded in imposing itself. (Simeoni 2001: 243) [translation mine]

The subservience argument has been criticized as if it was yet another way of reiterating "the idea of 'the tyranny of norms' in translation" (Sela-Sheffy 2005: 3). Both Sela-Sheffy and Inghilleri (2003), for example, insist that different models of translation coexist, some involving more subservience than others, from which translators can choose. Also, while Simeoni argued that the translator's habitus was more general (social) than specific (professional), both reseachers present signs of the opposite, pointing towards the increasing recognition of the profession.

This divergence of views can be partly understood if we bear in mind that the above scholars work on slightly different objects. Simeoni embraced a wide diachronic viewpoint to find an agent-grounded explanation to the question of why a translation generally sounds like a translation, or to use Toury's words, why is it that "in translations, linguistic forms and structures often occur which are rarely, or perhaps even never encountered in utterances originally composed in the target language" (Toury 1995: 207–208). On the opposite end of the spectrum, Sela-Sheffy and Inghilleri take a very close look at contemporary practices in particular fields (one of which does not belong to the realm of written texts). This synchronic and contemporary viewpoint is more likely to highlight diversity and to present signs of the translator's enhanced status. Indeed, the recognition of translation or interpreting as professions and as a legitimate object of research is quite recent; and it is fair to assume that this process of recognition may have in the long run an influence on the translator's status and on translating practices. Yet it is too early to assess the nature and extent of this potential influence.

In any case, there will never be any universal answer to the key question of the translator's habitus and translatorial agency, be it only because those concepts make sense in relation to particular social and historical conditions. But surely the body of research produced so far, and the richness of debates show that agent-grounded research has truly become an integral part of the TS landscape, and a highly dynamic one.

(The author thanks Shawn McCrory for his revision of the text.)

References

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Transl. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dam Helle V. & Zethsen, Karen Korning (eds). 2009. *Translation Studies: Focus on the Translator.* Special issue of *Hermes (Journal of Language and Communication Studies*) 42.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 1999. *Sociologie de la traduction. La science-fiction américaine dans l'espace culturel français dans années 1950*. Arras: Artois Presses Université.
Inghilleri, Moira. 2003. "Habitus, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially situated activity." *Target* 15 (2): 243–68.
Kinnunen, Tuija & Koskinen, Kaisa (eds). 2010. *Translators' agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
Meylaerts, Reine. 2008. "Translators and (their) norms: Towards a sociological construction of the individual." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, Daniel Simeoni (eds), 91–202. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Milton, John & Bandia, Paul (eds). 2009. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2005. "How to be a (recognized) translator: Rethinking habitus, norms, and the field of translation." *Target* (17) 1: 1–26.
Simeoni, Daniel. 1995. "Translating and studying translation: The view from the agent." *Meta* 40 (3): 445–460.
Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The pivotal status of the translator's habitus." *Target* 10 (1): 1–36.
Simeoni, Daniel. 2001. *Traduire les sciences sociales. L'émergence d'un habitus sous surveillance: Du texte support au texte-source*. Doctoral dissertation. Paris: École des hautes études en sciences sociales.
Wolf, Michaela & Furaki, Alexandra (eds). 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Further reading

Buzelin, Hélène. 2005. "Independent Publisher in the Networks of Translation." *TTR* 19 (1):135–173.
Inghilleri, Moira (ed.). 2005. *Bourdieu and the Sociology of Translation and Interpreting*. Special issue of *The Translator* 11 (2).
Koskinen, Kaisa. 2008. *Translating Institutions: An ethnographic study of EU translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Methods in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bibliographies of translation studies

Luc van Doorslaer
Lessius University College, Antwerp and CETRA, University of Leuven

From the beginning it should be made clear that this entry is mainly about bibliographies of translation *studies*, meaning bibliographies gathering scholarly and academic publications dealing with translation and interpreting. In addition to the scholarly bibliographies, the translation world of course also produces several bibliographies of translated books. The most famous one is UNESCO's *Index Translationum* (consulted in 2011, but already created in 1932).

1. Tools as a sign of institutionalization

For a developing discipline like Translation Studies* it is inevitable that the growing amount of materials will gradually lead to a growing need for knowledge-structuring academic 'tools' (not to be confused with technical translation tools*). The making of (research) bibliographies is always based on the need to systematize existing but often fragmented knowledge in a given area. Mainly in the last decade Translation Studies has witnessed the development of many new academic tools. New, sometimes overlapping, sometimes complementary historical surveys, handbooks, encyclopaedias, textbooks, dictionaries, journals, terminologies and bibliographies have been issued, illustrating both the emergence of a maturing discipline and the combined demand for (constructed or perceived) structure. Together with such aspects as the building of curricula at universities, the organization of PhD programmes and summer schools, the spread of knowledge through a growing network of publishers and (online) journals, such tools are not only the manifestations of the dynamics of a branch, but also materialize and realize the institutionalization of a discipline. Because of their comprehensiveness aspirations, the general bibliographies of Translation Studies (particularly the modern online versions) are the most encompassing of all academic tools.

2. A bit of history

Already from the beginning of its history, the discipline of Translation Studies needed a systematizing tool, even during a phase where its knowledge was not at all as widespread as it is today. Eugene Nida's *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964) is generally

considered as containing the first 'bibliography', although it was mainly an extended list of references at the end of a monograph (comparable to the extensive reference sections at the end of the main dictionaries, handbooks or readers available in the discipline nowadays). Nida explicitly introduced the bibliography as a tool "not only to provide the reader with data on the scores of books and articles cited in the text", but also as "a wide selection of source materials dealing with many distinct but ultimately related phases of translating" (Nida 1964: 265). The sources mentioned by Nida were related to linguistic structure, psychology, anthropology, information theory, machine translation, theology, stylistics and literary criticism, illustrating that from the outset there seemed to be an awareness of multidisciplinarity present in Translation Studies. Nida's pioneering work was explicitly recognized as a point of reference in *The Science of Translation: An Analytical Bibliography (1962–1969)* by Bausch, Klegraf and Wilss, published in 1970. The editors started their first paragraph of the preface with the recognition that since Nida "no up-to-date comprehensive bibliography of translation has been published" (1970: I). Subsequently the prestigious *International Bibliography of Translation* (Van Hoof 1972) was published in the early seventies. More than 4600 titles dealing exclusively with written translation were listed there. These works are to be considered the first initiatives taken to compile a *general* bibliography on Translation Studies.

In addition to such general bibliographies, there have been several *partial* bibliographic initiatives in the realm of translation. In most of these cases, the bibliographies are limited on explicit geographical, chronological or thematic grounds (or based on a combination of these limitations):

- geographically or culturally, like Tradbase, the *Portuguese Bibliography of Translation Studies,* a Lisbon University project confining itself to Portugal;
- chronologically, like Van Bragt's *Bibliographie des traductions françaises (1810–1840)*;
- thematically, like the recent *Comprehensive bibliography on subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing* (Arnáiz Urquiza & Pereira 2010) or Gile's CIRIN Bulletin (for conference interpreting).

3. Modern online bibliographies

Online research bibliographies, either comprehensive or partial in their orientation, are a more recent phenomenon. These regularly updated bibliographies not only give voice to the development of cultural and social phenomena within translation, but mainly to the discipline of Translation Studies as such. The underlying software makes it possible to carry out very detailed and advanced category searches, not only for titles

or authors, but in some of the bibliographies also for series, languages of publication, persons as subject, etc. From a research point of view, they are valuable sources because of the abstracts of the publications included. Examples are Bitra (Franco Aixelá 2010), St. Jerome's *Translation Studies Abstracts online* (TSA) and Benjamins' *Translation Studies Bibliography* (TSB - Gambier & van Doorslaer 2010). A bibliography like TSB is especially interesting from a conceptual and metalingual point of view, as from the beginning it was based on a conceptual map and a keywords system. Van Doorslaer (2009) deals with the selection and organizational principles of the keywords and the underlying conceptual maps in TSB.

Last but not least, these online bibliographies can serve as large databases containing information that can be used for bibliometrical or scientometrical analyses or for the use of quantitative data about categories dealing with countries, languages of publication as well as with affiliations. Franco Aixelà (2003) and van Doorslaer (2005) are examples in which online bibliographies are used as a starting point for quantitative analyses of Translation Studies facts.

References

Arnáiz Urquiza, Verónica & Pereira, Ana. 2010. "A comprehensive bibliography on subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing from a multidisciplinary approach." In *Listening to subtitles. Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing*, Pilar Orero and Anna Matamala, 219–227. Vienna: Peter Lang.

Bausch, K.-Richard, Klegraf, Josef & Wilss, Wolfram. 1970. *The Science of Translation: An Analytical Bibliography (1962–1969)*. Tübingen: Narr.

Bragt, Katrien van. 1995. *Bibliographie des traductions françaises (1810–1840): répertoires par disciplines*. Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.

Doorslaer, Luc van. 2005. "The Indicative Power of a Key Word System - a quantitative analysis of the key words in the *Translation Studies Bibliography*." *Meta* 50: 4 (attached on CD-rom).

Doorslaer, Luc van. 2009. "Risking Conceptual Maps. Mapping as a keywords related tool underlying the online *Translation Studies Bibliography*." In *The Metalanguage of Translation*, Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (eds), 27–43. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Franco Aixelá, Javier (ed.). 2010. *BITRA. Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation*. https://aplicacionesua.cpd.ua.es/tra_int/usu/buscar.asp?idioma=en [Accessed 14 June 2011]

Franco Aixelá, Javier. 2003. "BITRA: an international on-line bibliography of Interpreting and Translation Studies." *Babel* 49 (2): 149–163.

Gambier, Yves & Doorslaer, Luc van (eds). 2010. *Translation Studies Bibliography.* (7th release, approx. 20,000 items). http://www.benjamins.nl/online/tsb/ [Accessed 14 June 2011]

Gile, Daniel (ed.). 2010. *CIRIN - An international information network on conference interpreting research*. http://cirinandgile.com/ [Accessed 15 June 2011]

Hoof, Henry van. 1972. *Internationale Bibliographie der Übersetzung - International Bibliography of Translation*. Pullach bei München: Dokumentation.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating. With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Translation Studies Abstracts online. 2010. Manchester: St. Jerome. http://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/ [Accessed 14 June 2011]

Tradbase - Bibliografia Portuguesa de Estudos de Tradução. 2010. http://www.fl.ul.pt/centros_invst/comparat/tradbase/index.asp [Accessed 14 June 2011]

UNESCO. 2011. *Index Translationum – World Bibliography of Translation*. http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7810&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 15 June 2011]

Collaborative translation

Sharon O'Brien
Dublin City University

Collaboration is evident in all types of translation scenarios and across the whole process of translation, from authors, to publishers, to translation agencies and to translators. Collaboration can occur between translators and any one of these other agents or between two or more translators. Functionalist approaches* to translation theory (Nord 1997) emphasize this collaborative nature of the entire translation process. A general definition of collaborative translation, then, is when two or more agents cooperate in some way to produce a translation. Collaborative translation can also have a more narrow meaning, referring to the situation where two or more translators work together to produce one translated product. The term has also come to be closely linked with the concepts of community* translation, social translation, volunteer translation, fan translation, fansubbing and crowdsourcing. This close association of concepts is evident in the term "CT^3" (pronounced "CT cubed") which was coined by DePalma and Kelly (2008) to refer to "Community", "Collaborative technology" and "Crowdsourcing" in the domain of localization*. Collaborative translation can occur in many domains including the translation of technical, literary (e.g. Agorni 2005; Rosslyn 2001) and popular genres (e.g. O'Hagan 2009).

Collaboration is normally understood to take the form of human-to-human cooperation. However, it can also involve human-to-machine collaboration. Human-to-machine collaboration occurs when, for example, revisions** are made by translators to translations generated by an automatic Machine Translation* system and are then returned to the Machine Translation system in order to improve the machine-generated translation in a subsequent cycle. The term given to this is "Machine Learning".

1. History

Collaborative translation is not a new concept. For example, the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek is reputed to have been undertaken by seventy-two translators working in collaboration with one another. A more recent example is the active collaboration of James Joyce with several translators in the endeavour of translating his own work (Costanzo 1972). More recently, technological developments have acted as a driver for mass collaborative translation: First came the creation of virtual communities via the Internet. Then we witnessed the digitization of products and content and

ubiquitous broadband connections, all of which have enabled mass collaboration. The Open Source movement, globalization* and the increase in user-generated content have led to an increasing demand for translation while the development of computer-aided* translation tools* within the translation industry has opened the doors to virtual collaboration between translators.

2. Motivators

There are three main motivators for collaborative translation: (1) Commercial, (2) Social and (3) Personal. In the domain of commercial translation*, word volumes have been growing and deadlines have become tighter. Translation clients want to have more content translated, into more languages, in a shorter timeframe and so it is no longer acceptable for one translator to work on a large volume of text for a long period of time. Instead, many translators work in parallel on smaller chunks of text and they are expected to collaborate with one another on questions of terminology and via online Translation Memories.

There is ample evidence that people are willing to volunteer their time to translate text for a social cause with many examples of such efforts, most of which involve collaborative translation. For example, after the Haitian earthquake in 2010, relief organizations set up an SMS (short-messaging service) whereby Haitians could text real-time reports to a specific number. The text messages were in Kréyol and the aid agencies could not translate them quickly enough. A collaborative crowdsourcing system was set up by an organization called CrowdFlower to allow Haitians all over the world translate the text messages and categorize the issues (Ferrier 2011). Collaborative translation is also in evidence in cultural and popular genres such as games, audiovisual products and fiction, the motivators for which are identified as a wish to fill a gap in publication (when, for example, a product is unavailable in a particular language) or to overcome a time delay which might occur between publication of the source and a specific target language version (O'Hagan 2009). People may also wish to collaborate in a translation project in order to gain experience, learn new skills, network, or simply to "give back" to the community (O'Brien & Schäler 2010).

3. Crowdsourcing for collaborative translation

"Crowdsourcing" is the term coined by Howe (2006) to refer to the act of recruiting an undefined, large group of people to take on a specific task which would normally be assigned to in-house employees. Crowdsourcing has been used by both commercial and not-for-profit organisations to service translation demand. An example of its use

in the commercial sector is that of Facebook. Facebook launched their collaborative translation project in December 2007. By February 2008 most of the social networking site had been translated into Spanish. To date content from the site has been translated into 70 languages. Wikipedia is an example of a not-for-profit collaborative translation effort, with 3.5 million articles in English and 262 language editions to date, the latter of which have been created through a crowdsourced collaborative translation effort. Those who collaborate on crowdsourced translation projects are often motivated via leaderboards (the person who contributes the most and/or best translations is rated most highly). Since collaborators in crowdsourced translation scenarios are often not professional translators, it is sometimes feared that the translation quality* will be poor. However, organisations that utilize a crowdsourcing strategy often employ professional translators as proof-readers and revisers. The use of peer voting, where the "crowd" votes for different versions of translations, also acts as a quality control mechanism. Moreover, it has been noted that the non-translator's expert knowledge in a domain can compensate for a lack of formal translator training (O'Hagan 2009).

4. Technology

As mentioned above, technology has acted as the main enabler for collaborative translation in the modern age. In commercial translation, web-based term databases and translation memory systems enable translators to collaborate on high volume translation projects. New tools are now being developed, called Collaborative Translation Platforms, which combine terminology management, translation memories, machine translation, workflow and project management functionality. For collaborative multimedia projects, specific tools have been developed to allow fans to collaboratively translate content (O'Hagan 2009; Díaz Cintas & Muñoz Sánchez 2006). Chat rooms are where peer voting and debate over preferred translations take place in crowdsourced projects and tailor-made tools have also been developed, an example being Facebook's Translation Application.

5. Impact

Collaborating on translation projects clearly has benefits. Being able to consult with the source text author, or to exchange ideas and debate with a fellow translator will most likely lead to higher quality translation and might contribute towards skill enhancement of novice or junior translators. In commercial scenarios, the use of collaborative translation memories and term bases not only decreases translation time, but (theoretically) improves consistency. Crowdsourced collaborative translation

projects have given access to information and products to language communities who might otherwise have been denied access or who might have had to wait some time before gaining access.

On the other hand, mass collaborative crowdsourced translation presents challenges for the translation profession. DePalma and Kelly (2008) predicted that a community approach to translation will replace the traditional process known as T-E-P (translation, edit, proofread) and that this will require an "overhaul" of the "traditional sequential translation process". What's more, with the increasing popularity of crowdsourcing, the boundary between professional and amateur is no longer clear. One prediction is that companies will pay for professional translation when they need a very high level of quality, but that the "crowd" will be engaged to translate other content. The changing landscape also challenges the traditional mode of translator training. While it is difficult to predict future developments, it is probably safe to assume that the ability to translate in a collaborative way is a skill that professional translators will need in the future.

References

Agorni, Mirella. 2005. "A marginal(ized) perspective on translation history: Women and translation in the Eighteenth century." *Meta* 50 (3): 817–830.

Costanzo, W.V. 1972. "The French version of *Finnegan's Wake*: Translation, adaptation, recreation." *James Joyce Quarterly* 9 (2): 225–236.

DePalma, Donald & Nataly Kelly. 2008. *Translation of, for, and by the people: How user-translated content projects work in real life*. Report produced by Common Sense Advisory.

Díaz Cintas, Jorge & Muñoz Sánchez, Pablo. 2006. "Fansubs: Audiovisual translation in an amateur environment." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 6: 37–52.

Ferrier, Ryan. 2011. *Crowdsourcing the Haiti Relief: one year later*. http://blog.crowdflower.com/2011/01/crowdsourcing-the-haiti-relief-one-year-later/ [Accessed: 20 January 2011]

Howe, Jeff. 2006. "The rise of crowdsourcing." *Wired* 14.06, June.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translation as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

O'Brien, Sharon & Schäler, Reinhard. 2010. "Next generation translation and localization: Users are taking charge." In *Proceedings of Translating and the Computer 32*. London: Aslib.

O'Hagan, Minako. 2009. "Evolution of user-generated translation: Fansubs, translation hacking, and crowdsourcing." *The Journal of Translation and Localisation* 1: 94–121.

Rosslyn, Wendy. 2001. "Gender in translation: Lowell and Cixous rewriting Akhmatova." In *Gender and Sexuality in Russian Civilisation*, Peter I. Barta (ed.), 71–86. London: Routledge.

Comparative approaches to translation

Cees Koster
Utrecht University

The comparative perspective on translation belongs to the very core of its study. On a broader scale this may be illustrated by the close relationship between the discipline of Translation Studies* and adjacent disciplines like comparative literature and various branches of contrastive studies (linguistics, pragmatics, stylistics). (Cf. for instance the problems of demarcation between Translation Studies and Comparative Literature and Contrastive Linguistics discussed in Bassnett 1993 and Malmkjaer 1999 respectively; see also Literary Studies and Translation Studies*.)

In a more narrow sense comparative approaches to translation are associated with the comparison of texts (or discourses). This contribution will be mainly concerned with this aspect.

As a practice the comparison of translations and originals is as old as the practice of translation itself, but only since the emergence of a more descriptively oriented paradigm within the study of translation, it has become object of systematic scrutiny.

Holmes assigns the comparison of translations its place in the product-oriented branch of Descriptive Translation Studies* (1988: 72), but it is widely agreed nowadays that it also has its place in function- and process-oriented studies as well. The assumption underlying such comparison is that the relationship between any two (or more) texts may be considered a complex network of similarities and differences, which lends itself to description.

Any comparative effort necessarily involves a **corpus** of texts and has to take into account three interrelated dimensions: it a) sets out with a certain **aim**, an idea, a theoretical notion, of what aspect(s) of the corpus is (are) to be studied, b) provides for a **conceptual apparatus**, a set of terms suitable to describe the relationship between the texts in the corpus, and c) uses a specific **method**, which provides for different stages, a *tertium comparationis*, and a unit of comparison.

As to **corpus** different kinds of comparisons may be envisaged, which may be related to different aims (see Corpora*). Although a comparison between translation and original seems to be the default type, the situation is more complex. Two types of corpora may be distinguished: one in which the original is not involved and one in which it is. In some types of descriptive research initial stages of a comparison are directed towards the position of the target text within its own environment. According to Toury, a comparison may be made between a translation and one or more comparable original texts from the target culture, in order to establish whether or not the

translation complies to target norms (1995: 72). Another possible corpus consists of different versions of a single target text. In the case of retranslations* it would also be possible to compile a corpus of parallel translations of a single source text to be compared among each other; parallel corpora might include translations from one target language or more languages. Adding the source text to these kinds of comparison allows for three more types of corpora.

Corpora may be compiled with respect to several parameters, depending on the aim of the comparative effort; they may consist of, for instance, translations from a specific historical period, translations of one or more works of a specific source text author, translations from the oeuvre of a single translator, translations within the domain of one text type or genre, etc.

With respect to their **aim** comparative efforts differ widely. A first distinction can be made between descriptive and evaluative aims (see Evaluation/Assessment**). The comparison of translations within an evaluative framework may be found in translation criticism and reviewing in magazines and newspapers, within a pedagogical context (quality assessment in the class room), or within ideological approaches to translation (case studies from the point of view of for instance post-colonialism, or feminism; see Post-colonial literatures and translation*; Gender in translation*).

Within the descriptive tradition of translation comparison several aims can be distinguished according to the different theoretical frameworks that guide the research questions underlying individual instances of comparative description. These frameworks are based on assumptions about the nature of the translation process*, or about the function of translation in the receiving culture.

Within the theoretical framework of Gideon Toury (1980, 1995) the basic assumption is that translations constitute a form of social behavior governed by *norms*. The aim of a comparative effort within this framework, then, is to reconstruct the norms underlying the translational choices made in the corpus. Several comparative efforts within a hermeneutic tradition take as their theoretical point of departure the assumption that translation is a form of *interpretation* (Frank 1990, from a historical-hermeneutical viewpoint; Koster 2000, from a structural-hermeneutic viewpoint; see also Hermeneutics and translation*). The aim of these frameworks is to (re)construct from the relationship between target and source texts the translator's interpretation of the original text. Some theorists wish to express the relationship between target and source texts in terms of the *strategies* chosen by the translator (Holmes 1988; Venuti 1995; Van Leuven-Zwart 1998–90; Chesterman 1997; see also Translation strategies and tactics*), the assumption being that all the choices made by a translator are conscious ones deriving from a strategic plan. With respect to literary translation Holmes also posits the aim of reconstructing the translator's *poetics*, a coherent set of ideas about the function of individual translations.

In order to be able to express the relationship between the compared texts one needs a **conceptual apparatus** suited to the theoretical framework. In his research program Toury has incorporated an elaborate division of several kinds of norms, some of which may be used to describe the translational behavior that is constructed from the actual text comparison, the most important one being the *initial norm*. Both on the level of the description of actual textual choices within individual texts and on the level of a corpus as a whole Toury proposes to describe the translational relationships in terms of the dichotomy between *adequacy* (translator's adherence dominantly to the requirements of the source text) and *acceptability* (translator's adherence dominantly to the requirements for text production in the target culture).

Holmes also posits two terms to describe basic strategies with: *retentive* and *recreative* translation. Retentive translation comprises the strategies of historicization and exoticization with respect to the linguistic context, literary intertext and socio-cultural situation pertaining to the text pair(s). Recreative translation comprises the strategies of naturalization and modernization.

The frameworks in which the translational interpretation is the focus of comparison do not provide for fixed terms to describe the results of a comparison with, because the result is always unique for the text pair under scrutiny. Still, the view on the source text or author may be connected to the translator's poetics, that may either be innovative or conservative.

The compilation of a corpus, aim and conceptual apparatus may or may not be part of an explicit methodology, which is able to account for a coherent comparative effort. One may speak of a **method** when the proposal for the way a comparison has to be performed explicitly reflects on the different stages of comparison, on the status of the *tertium comparationis* and provides for a unit of comparison.

One of the most important features of any comparison is the *tertium comparationis*, the third term of the comparison. It is generally agreed that comparison takes place indirectly, by way of an intermediating construct making it possible to compare texts in the first place. Comparative description involves the establishment of the relation between corresponding text elements as well as the attribution of features to those elements. A comparison based on the prior attribution of features would be a 'second degree' comparison, since it departs from a descriptive operation. A first degree comparison departs from a pertinent level of correspondence that is established a priori. Closely related to the concept of *tertium comparationis* is the actual unit of comparison that is employed during a comparative effort. This unit is often located at the microstructural level and may vary as to the linguistic level it pertains to (from morpheme to semantic unit).

In this vein Holmes distinguishes between two 'basic working methods' (1988: 89): the 'distinctive feature method' and the 'repertory method'. In the first a hierarchical list of features of one of the texts is compiled that the analyst may find significant

and striking, which is then checked against a similar list of the other text. Holmes does not address the problem of which text to start from, source or target text. In the latter method a 'required repertory of features always to be analyzed' is compiled beforehand. The levels of analysis incorporated into a repertoire usually are determined by the specific aim of a framework.

As to the different stages of comparison the distinction between a top-down method and a bottom-up method is relevant. This distinction is based upon the premise that the analysis of a text is always directed both at the text as a whole and its constitutive parts. A bottom-up method departs from the notion that one first has to compare texts on the level of the component parts (microstructure), then make an analysis of the source text and target texts as a whole (macrostructure) and then answer the question to what extent the differences on the microstructural level influence the relationship between source and target text on the macrostructural level. A top-down method starts with the establishment of a common core of source and target text after which the way the two texts' component parts relate to this core is compared.

Although the comparative perspective on translation is still widely applied, from pedagogical contexts to corpus linguistics and from contextualized case studies to historical literary research, the explicit reflection on the methodology of translation comparison typically was a phenomenon of the more descriptively oriented period in the history of Translation Studies of the last quarter of the 20th century. After the cultural, ethical and sociological turns the comparison of translations has remained a central practice within the discipline, but theoretical reflection nowadays is more concerned with aim and theoretical framework rather than comparative methodology. An exception to this point is the domain of corpus-based Translation Studies, in which comparable and comparative corpora are analyzed electronically with the objective of finding patterns of translation behavior (cf. Laviosa 2002).

References

Bassnett, Susan. 1993. *Comparative Literature. A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Chesterman, Andrew. 1997. *Memes of translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frank, Armin Paul. 1990. "Forty Years of Studying the American-German Translational Transfer: A Retrospect and Some Perspectives." *Amerika-studien/American Studies* 35: 7–20.

Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Koster, Cees. 2000. *From World to World. An Armamentarium for the Study of Poetic Discourse in Translation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Laviosa, Sara. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. van. 1989/1990. "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I & II." *Target* 1 (2): 151–181 and 2 (1): 69–95.

Malmkjaer, Kirsten. 1999. *Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies: Interface and Differences* [Platform Papers in Translation Studies 1]. Utrecht: Platform Vertalen & Vertaalwetenschap.

Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation.* Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Cultural approaches

Cristina Marinetti
University of Warwick

The cultural approach or 'cultural turn' (see The turns of Translation Studies*), as it is commonly known, is a theoretical and methodological shift in Translation Studies that gained recognition in the early nineties and is primarily associated with the work of Susan Bassnett, André Lefevere and, later, Lawrence Venuti. While drawing on Descriptive Translation Studies*, especially the work of the so called 'Manipulation School' (Hermans 1985), and sharing in the target-orientedness of polysystems theory* and Gideon Toury's work on norms of translation*, the cultural approach also reflects a more general shift in epistemological stance in the humanities and beyond, from 'positivism' to 'relativity', from a belief in finding universal standards for phenomena to a belief that phenomena are influenced (if not determined) by the observer. Although primarily developed from the study of literature, the cultural approach has been seen to cut across the literature v. non-literature divide as it 'implicitly embraces all kinds of translation' (Snell-Hornby 1990: 84).

One of the cornerstones of the cultural approach in Translation Studies* is criticism of the linguistic approach (see Linguistics and translation**) and of the notion of equivalence as the starting point for a theorization of translation. For Bassnett & Lefevere, translation is primarily contextual. It is a fact of history and a product of the target culture, and as such it cannot be explained through the mapping of linguistic correspondence between languages, or judged with respect to universal standards of quality and accuracy (1990: 3). By shifting the focus from language to culture, it was possible to draw on important theoretical developments, such as the Foucauldian notions of 'power' and 'discourse', and use them to redefine the contexts and conditions of translation (1990: 6). In Bassnett & Lefevere's *Translation, History and Culture*, various contributions demonstrate the cultural power of translation, whereby translators can deliberately manipulate the texts to advance their own ideology (1990: 88) or mimic dominant discourses to guarantee acceptance in the target culture (1990: 57). Translation is shown to be a powerful mode of cultural construction, a means by which new nations can establish their identity amongst neighbouring countries (1990: 65), but also a way of constructing fictitious 'images' of foreign authors, texts and entire cultures. And this is where 'the cultural approach' becomes a methodological as well as theoretical shift, moving Translation Studies onto new ground:

> Now the questions have changed, the object of study has been redefined, what is studied is the text, embedded within its network of both source and target

> cultural signs and in this way Translation Studies has been able to utilize the linguistic approach and move out beyond it. (Bassnett & Lefevere 1990: 12)

Another redefinition articulated for the first time by the cultural approach is that of translation as a form of re-writing. Alongside anthologies, histories, criticism and adaptation*, translation is one of the ways in which works of literature are 're-written', and these re-writings are the primary way in which cultures construct 'images' and 'representations' of authors, texts and entire periods of history. In one of his many detailed case studies, Lefevere shows how the choices made by the French, English and German translators of *The Diary of Anne Frank* were a result of ideological manipulation. Especially poignant is the analysis of the German translation, which tones down or eliminates Anne's account of the violent treatment of the Jews and her harsh words against the Germans, thus rewriting Anne Frank's diary to fit in with the public discourse of the mid-fifties when Germany was struggling to escape its Nazi past (Lefevere 1992: 71–75). For Lefevere, in particular, the notion of rewriting is very important and he argues very forcefully that the study of literature should be the study of rewritings because these and not the original, classical, canonical texts are the primary mode of consumption and appreciation of literature in modern times (1992: 7). The focus on rewriting serves not only to broaden the horizon of Translation Studies beyond linguistics and text analysis but also aims at contributing to the study of literature and culture by showing the value of studying translations as elements that 'play an analysable part in the manipulation of words and concepts which, among other things, constitute power in a culture' (Lefevere 1985: 241)

The concept of 'manipulation' goes hand in hand with the notion of rewriting in helping to redefine translation after the cultural turn. Translation is rewriting and 'rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power' (Bassnett & Lefevere 1990: vii). The contexts and modes of these manipulations are many and varied and in *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of the Literary Fame* Lefevere offers a model or rather 'a system'[1] to analyse translations and other forms of rewriting by studying the 'control factors' that are behind the manipulation of literature and which he articulates through the concept of 'patronage'.

Patronage is 'any power (person, institution) that can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature' (1992: 15). Power and therefore 'patronage' here is understood in the Foucauldian sense not as a primarily repressive force but as the main producer of knowledge and discourse. As a control factor, patronage works, for

1. In actual fact, Lefevere here draws on the concept of systems introduced by the Russian formalists but plays down structuralist terminology, and, distancing himself from Even-Zohar's polysytems, does not claim to offer a system or a theory but a 'heuristic construct' that will help him introduce the main concepts of systems thinking and show how they can be applied to the study of rewritings in a productive manner' (1992:12).

Lefevere, on three distinct levels: ideology, economics, and status. Although very difficult to distinguish neatly, especially because historically they have often been exercised by the same agents** – be it institutional or individual (e.g. local kings in pre-colonial India or the Catholic Church in Renaissance Italy) – these components of patronage determine translation choices both directly, by influencing or imposing translation decisions, and indirectly by determining the parameters within which the professionals (translators, writers, rewriters, educators) work. The professionals, in turn, constitute another 'control factor' by determining directly, from inside the literary system, which works of literature to translate and how. Later in the book, before delving into a meticulous case study of the translation of Aristophane's *Lysystrata*, Lefevere demonstrates the heuristic/explanatory nature of his model by backgrounding patronage and introducing 'the dominant poetics' as a control factor:

> Two factors basically determine the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. These two factors are, in order of importance, the translator's ideology (whether he/she willingly embraces it, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage) and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time of the translation. (1992: 41)

With patronage, the cultural approach moves sideways from descriptive Translation Studies and starts tracing the roots of translation phenomena not through posited ideas of systems and cultural norms but in the role played by institutions and individuals shaping those systems and cultures, thus paving the way for reflections in recent translation thinking on important questions of 'ethics' and 'agency' (see Ethics and translation*; Sociology of translation*).

The question of ethics emerges forcefully in the mid-nineties, especially in the work of Lawrence Venuti, further problematizing the application of positivistic/scientific methodologies to the study of translation. Central to a redefinition of translation for Venuti, is the Derridean concept of *différance*, which unveils the relative and relational nature of meaning. By embracing Derrida's ultimate call for semiotic relativity, Venuti is able to look at both foreign texts and translations as derivative products, which cannot be assessed on the basis of relationships between source and target texts. Since meaning is not fixed and unchangeable but plural and contingent, the translated text and the translator's intentions are not one and the same but generate multiple and often conflicting discourses. This conflict, what Venuti calls 'the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation' (1995: 19), should be the central concern of Translation Studies both in terms of methodology and ethics. Methodologically because it locates translation within the asymmetrical relationships of power (economic, political, cultural) that characterize cultural production; and ethically as it allows us to denounce the 'invisibility' of cultural and linguistic difference and champion the cause of translators who play a vital role in the global

circulation of culture and are yet marginalized by the very systems they contribute to create. By further relativizing translation, and the methods for studying translation, Venuti also calls very forcefully for an 'ethics' of translation, an 'ethics of difference… that recognizes and seeks to remedy the asymmetries in translating, a theory of good and bad methods for practising and studying translation' (1998: iii). Through Venuti's work, the cultural approach brings to Translation Studies not only a focus on culture, history and the translator but also the basis for a more self-reflexive practice for both translators and translation scholars.

Subsequent culturally-inflected studies have looked at translation as cultural interaction and have developed the question of translation ethics in the context of political censorship, endorsement of or resistance to a colonial power and gender politics, generating a substantial body of literature that has developed these ideas into legitimate sub-areas (see Censorship*; Post-colonial literatures and translation*; Gender in translation*; Political translation*).

Another innovative development of the cultural approach is the attempt to map translation in relation to transnational literary tendencies and to the concept of 'world literature' which has since become central to debates in literary studies (SEE Casanova, 2007 in Further Reading section). Bassnett and Lefevere study this in the context of lesser known languages and postulate that these literatures 'will only gain access to something that could be called "world literature", if they submit to the textual system, the discursive formation (…) underlying the current concept of world literature' (1998: 76). To give theoretical strength to the concept of world literature, Bassnett & Lefevere draw on Pierre Bourdieu's *Theory of Practice* and see translation as primarily concerned not with the circulation of information but of cultural capital. In this sense, translation is seen as a phenomenon that is determined not only by the dominant poetics and 'control factors' of the target culture but by transnational forces that depend on the dominant discourses underlying the concept of 'world literature'. Before his untimely death in 1996, Lefevere was developing the idea of 'conceptual grids', 'a set of conceptual categories transcending various nations' (Bassnett & Lefevere 1998: 77) which he was beginning to see as playing a major part in determining both translation decisions and the success and acceptance of minor literatures on the world stage.

The 'cultural turn' has been the subject of criticism in recent times from two opposite, and possibly self-neutralizing perspectives, as either too conservative or too radical. From within Translation Studies, some see the cultural turn's move from text to culture as not innovative or distinctive as it 'had long been a part of the intellectual background of the descriptive paradigm' (Pym 2010: 149) while, from outside Translation Studies, comes a criticism of the broadening of Translation Theory (TT) beyond the linguistic operated by the cultural turn which has allegedly lead to a focus on 'questions that TT scholars seem interested in but are perhaps not well-equipped to handle' (Singh 2007: 80). When engaging in depth with the literature of the cultural

approach, it is impossible not to see the importance and value of such contributions not only in developing Translation Studies as a discipline but also in raising awareness of the importance of translation in other fields. The greatest achievement of the cultural approach is revealing the possibilities offered by the study of translation as a mode of representation of culture and as an active player in the dialectic of competing cultural discourses within and across languages and national cultures. The recent turn to 'cultural translation' in sociology and to 'world literature' in comparative literature are further proof that the 'cultural turn' of the nineties was indeed innovative and almost prophetic in its tireless championing of translation as a vital concept that should become central to all disciplines involved in the study of cultural interaction.

References

Bassnett, Susan & Lefevere, André (eds). 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.

Bassnett, Susan & Lefevere, André. 1998. *Constructing Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hermans, Theo (ed.). 1985. *The Manipulation of Literature*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Lefevere, André. 1985. "Why Waste our Time on Rewrites." In *The Manipulation of Literature*, Theo Hermans. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of the Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Singh, Rajendra. 2007. "Unsafe at any speed? Some unfinished reflections on the 'cultural turn' in Translation Studies." In *In Translation - Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*, Paul St-Pierre & Kar C. Prafulla (eds), 73–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1990. "Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer? A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany." In *Translation, History and Culture*, Susan Bassnett & André Lefevere (eds), 79–86. London: Pinter.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*: *A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge.

Further reading

Bachman-Medick, Doris. 2009. "Introduction: The Translational Turn." *Translation Studies* 2 (1): 2–16.

Casanova, Pascale. 2007. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M.B.Bevoise. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tymoczko, Maria & Gentzler, Edwin (eds). 2002. *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. "Translations, Simulacra and Resistance." *Translation Studies* 1 (1): 18–33.

Deconstruction

Dilek Dizdar
Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

"Deconstruction" is primarily used to refer to the philosophy of Jacques Derrida, although Derrida himself did not ascribe a privileged status to the term. It was incorporated into many disciplines and different approaches so that it became a more general term which moved beyond Derrida's own work and has had a lasting influence on other poststructural, postmodern, postcolonial and gender-related approaches. Derrida's radical challenge of traditional Western (metaphysical) philosophy, in particular of its hierarchical binary oppositions, has implications for translation theory and practice, which were first discussed in Translation Studies* in the 1990s. Derrida himself attributes a central role to translation in his work and explicitly discusses its role in numerous publications.

1. Deconstruction

1.1 Decomposing the structure

The term "deconstruction" was first used by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* (1967) as a "translation and adaptation" of Heidegger's term "Destruktion" or "Abbau" (Derrida 1985a: 1). It did not refer to a negative operation, rather, it was a question of "decomposing and desedimenting of structures" (Derrida 1985a: 2). This epistemic break with structuralism was realised through the fundamental question on the "structurality of the structure" (Derrida 1978: 278) that concerns the very conditions of considering the structure as structure, its being embedded in tradition, its inherited centres and modes of functioning. Such involvement includes "[a]ll types of structures, linguistic, "logocentric", "phonocentric" […] socio-institutional, political, cultural, and above all and from the start philosophical" (Derrida 1985a: 2). The deconstruction of the structure disrupts its totality and stability by demonstrating the impossibility of totality and stability, and understanding "how an "ensemble" was constituted and to reconstruct it to this end" (Derrida 1985a: 2–3).

1.2 The play of signs

In order to realise a critique of the structure there can be no 'outside position', as one is always part of the structure that one attacks and, according to Derrida, the

transformation of structures can only be effective when it comes from inside the structure. We have always been part of a play of signs, where each sign refers to another sign and not to a transcendental signified as essentialist philosophy assumes. One can only talk about 'trace' which cannot be drawn back to an original meaning. For this movement of trace, which consists of unfixable or uncontrollable deferrals, a constant "spacing" and "temporisation", Derrida introduces the neographism *différance* (Derrida 1982). For the understanding of 'text' this implies that a text is not a closed unit with a retrievable meaning, but an open fabric of traces. Derrida also uses the sheaf-metaphor to refer to a "complex structure of a weaving, an interlacing which permits the different threads and different lines of meaning – or of force – to go off again in different directions, just as it is always ready to tie itself up with others." (1982: 3)

It follows that the concept of an 'original' text, as opposed to a derived, secondary translation, also becomes problematic; the traditional hierarchical relationship between 'original' and 'translation' is dissolved.

1.3 Deconstructive writing

For Derrida, to question the condition of thinking requires going beyond the cosy confines of academic philosophising, to a broadened philosophical practice that also touches upon questions of responsibility and ethics*. In his own texts, the practice of border crossing is reflected in a hybrid way of writing, which eludes a simple allocation of the genres of philosophy or literature, and the conditions of constative, unequivocal lines of argument, possessing a strong performative character. The concept of languages as closed units with fixed boundaries is also challenged by focussing on words and expressions which do not clearly belong to one language or another.

2. Deconstruction and Translation (Studies)

2.1 Translation in deconstruction

Translation* is a fundamental philosophical problem in deconstruction which Derrida links to the development of Western philosophy itself. Traditional Western thought believes in translatability, the possibility of transferring semantic content into another signifying form: "Therefore the thesis of philosophy is translatability in this common sense, that is, as the transfer of a meaning or a truth from one language to another without any essential harm being done" (Derrida trans. Kamuf 1985b: 120). As this translatability thesis is vital for the survival of philosophy, the failure of translation also means the failure of philosophy itself. The impossibility of transferring the 'meaning' (also within the same language), which would provide

a clear distinction between the signifier and the signified, is a crucial message in deconstruction and other anti-essentialist approaches, which points to the intrinsic relationship that exists between epistemology and concepts of translation.

In his reading of the Saussurian concept of sign, Derrida deconstructs the idea of a signifier independent of language and thus the opposition between a signifier and a signified. At the same time, he shows that the opposition functions and is, to a certain extent, even indispensable, especially for the notion of translation. The (metaphysical) concept of translation is interdependent with the assumption that signifier and signified can be separated from one another. Derrida states that translation would not be possible without this opposition and that the idea of a transcendental signified is, in turn, rooted in the assumption of "an absolutely pure, transparent, and unequivocal translatability." (1981: 20) But a translation which practices this difference only *appears* possible because the difference between signifier and signified is never pure. The reference to an origin is impossible, each time we pretend to refer to a signified it is actually already a signifier because we cannot step out of language. As such, a pure difference cannot be maintained and translation has never been "some "transport" of pure signifieds from one language to another, or within the same language, that the signifying instrument would leave virgin and untouched" (ibid). Translation is, therefore, rather to be understood as a "regulated transformation of one language by another, one text by another" (ibid).

While on the one hand, Derrida deconstructs the metaphysical concept of translation, which bases itself on the possibility of one-to-one correspondence; on the other, he uses translation as a movement which establishes difference and counteracts a totalisation of the discourse. In his interpretation of the Babel myth, the birth of a multiplicity of tongues represents the resistance to colonial violence and linguistic imperialism: "[W]hen God imposes and opposes his name, he ruptures the rational transparency but interrupts also the colonial violence or the linguistic imperialism. He destines them [the Semites] to translation, he subjects them to the law of translation both necessary and impossible" (Derrida 1985c trans. Graham: 174).

According to Derrida, the impossibility of translation is based on the principle of economy which seems to be constitutive for the traditional concept of translation. This principle states that a translation must have a quantitative relation with the source text: "one word *by* one word" (Derrida trans. Venuti 2001: 181). If long explanations in footnotes, paraphrases, etc. dominate in a translation, the boundaries of what we usually expect from a translation are exceeded. The traditional concept of translation is therefore based on a quantitative claim which quickly reaches its limits, for example, when homophonic or homonymic effects are involved. Translation then, "in the strict, traditional, and dominant sense of the term [,] encounters an insurmountable limit and the beginning of its end, the figure of its ruin" (ibid).

2.2 The relevance of deconstruction for Translation Studies

A deconstructive approach allows Translation Studies to challenge its own traditions and to rethink its centres and hierarchies. Translation theory and the concept of translation are embedded into the philosophy of presence. For centuries, translation theory was dominated by the ideal of equivalence, based on an essentialist stance which postulates a neutral transfer of meaning between languages and cultures (cf. Arrojo 1995: 53). Universalistic models and theories, which have been attempting to systematise rules for this transfer, have dominated the history of translation theory in modern times. Arrojo (1998) demonstrates how a deconstructive approach to such translation theories can reveal the problems inherent to essentialist approaches to translation. As opposed to such approaches, deconstruction stresses heterogeneity and difference rather than homogeneity and sameness. Essentialist approaches resulted in the oppression of translators, who should ideally be invisible, as they were merely carrying out a mechanical transfer activity. Moreover, they absolved translators of any responsibility, as the ideal translation was based on the principle of non-interference, i.e. a good translator would not interfere with a text, he/she would remain external to the translation process, as described in traditional models of transcoding. A deconstruction of such models and universalistic theories, in contrast, leads to a focus on the translator and an acknowledgement of the responsibility that a translator accepts by refusing to take the easy way out offered by the principle of non-interference (see also Committed approaches and activism*). Furthermore, deconstruction shifts the focus inevitably onto historical, ideological and institutional factors, and demands that we take a stand.

Deconstruction touches upon essential questions in Translation Studies and challenges its basic concepts (such as text, context, communication etc.), among these, the very concept of translation ('proper'). In one of his later essays, Derrida asks what would be expected of a relevant translation: 'Relevant' meaning "pertinent, apropos, welcome, appropriate, opportune, justified, well-suited", etc.; a "relevant translation would […] be, quite simply, a 'good' translation" - a "proper" translation (trans. Venuti: 2001: 177; see also Relevance and translation*). Derrida's analysis demonstrates the difficulty of such attempts to easily determine the 'relevance' of a translation. He destabilises the definition of translation 'proper' by questioning linguistic boundaries, those between different discourses and those between "proper" and metaphorical senses of translation, as well as the boundaries between "language" and "metalanguage":

> [I]f I need to address you in a single language, French (thereby recognizing that every so-called discourse on translation, every metalanguage or metatheorem on the topic of translation is fated to inscribe itself within the limits and possibilities of a single idiom); I am nevertheless always already inclined to leap over this language, my own, and I shall do it again, thus leaving undecided the question of a simple choice between language and metalanguage, between one language and another. (ibid: 176)

Derrida had already addressed the problem of defining translation proper in "Des Tours de Babel", which includes a reading of Walter Benjamin's renowned "Task of the Translator". In this essay, Derrida challenges the idea of a unified language and, thus, of translating *between* languages, by also referring to Jakobson's tripartide definition of translation (1959). For Derrida, the privileged status given by Jakobson to interlingual translation, which Jakobson calls "translation proper", indicates that he assumes that "one can know in the final analysis how to determine rigorously the unity and identity of a language, the decidable form of its limits." (173) Deconstructing the concept of language as a self-identical, homogenous and closed structure (see also Derrida trans. Mensah 1998) and foregrounding the multiplicity of languages (also within a language) and the impurity of limits, Derrida's analyses have significant implications for the field of Translation Studies which has grounded its master narratives on communication models and translation concepts such as Jakobson's. The use of the word "proper" further implies a distinction between translation in the proper and in the figurative senses (Derrida trans. Venuti 2001: 174), which might be relevant for discussions about the object field of Translation Studies which, after concentrating on translation "proper" for such a long time, has started broadening the field more recently.

Derrida's work on philosophy also has far-reaching consequences for the practice and training of translators. It avoids generalisations and does not provide guidelines, therefore it cannot offer any "handy" controls for translators. Instead, a deconstructive approach to translator training takes into account the interventionist voice of the translator and examines translation as a phenomenon "free from the impossible dream of transcendence and absolute values or of a blind, authoritarian universalism which is to be strictly followed by everyone" (Arrojo 1997: 21). The ensuing view of ethics firstly requires an awareness of the problem of undecidability, and the complexity of mostly uncontrollable conditions acting upon the translation process and the translator, as well as the readers of translated texts. According to Derrida, a decision worthy of its name is not to be taken by simply following pre-established rules and guidelines or codes of conduct; there is no possibility of deciding *a priori* which individual cases would be "just" and which ones would constitute acts of perversity (cf. Dizdar 2009: 98).

Challenging old-age assumptions, deconstruction focuses on heterogeneity and alterity without attempting to homogenise in the service of a particular theory or method. Although not the only means, it continues to be one of the most effective ways of radically questioning essentialist premises and raising awareness of power relations.

References

Arrojo, Rosemary. 1995. "Tradition and the Resistance to Translation." In *Kultur, Interpretation, Translation*, H. Salevsky (ed.), 53–60. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Arrojo, Rosemary. 1997. "Asymmetrical Relations of Power and the Ethics of Translation." *Textcontext* 11 = NF 1 (1): 5–24.
Arrojo, Rosemary. 1998. "The Revision of the Traditional Gap between Theory & Practice & the Empowerment of Translation in Postmodern Times." *The Translator* 4 (1): 25–48.
Derrida, Jacques. 1967 [1978]. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. G. C. Spivak. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University.
Derrida, Jacques. 1978. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. A. Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Derrida, Jacques. 1981. "Semiology and Grammatology: an Interview with Julia Kristeva." In *Positions*. Trans. A. Bass, 17–36. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "Différance." In *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. A. Bass, 3–27. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Derrida, Jacques. 1985a. "Letter to a Japanese Friend." In *Derrida and Différance*, D. Wood & R. Bernasconi (eds.), 1–5. Warwick: Parousia Press.
Derrida, Jacques. 1985b. *The Ear of the Other.* Trans. P. Kamuf. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Derrida, Jacques. 1985c. "Des Tours de Babel." Trans. J. Graham. In *Difference in Translation*, J. Graham (ed.) 165–207. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Monolingualism of the Other or The Prosthesis of Origin.* Trans. P. Mensah. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
Derrida, Jacques. 2001. "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" Trans. L. Venuti. *Critical Inquiry* 27: 174–200.
Dizdar, Dilek. 2009. "Translational Transitions: 'Translation proper' and Translation Studies in the Humanities." *Translation Studies* 2 (1). Special issue of *The Translational Turn*: 89–102.
Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *On translation*, R. A. Brower (ed.), 232–9. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Further reading

Arrojo, Rosemary. 2005. "The Ethics of Translation in Contemporary Approaches to Translators Training." In *Training for the New Millennium – Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting*, Martha Tennent (ed.), 225–45. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Davis, Kathleen. 2001. *Deconstruction and Translation*. Manchester/Northampton: St. Jerome.
Dizdar, Dilek. 2006. *Translation. Um- und Irrwege*. Berlin: Frank und Timme.
Koskinen, Kaisa. 2000. *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation* [Electronic series: Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 65]. Tampere University Press. http://acta.uta.fi/english/teos.php?id=4347 [Accessed 10 April 2011]

Directionality

Nike K. Pokorn
University of Ljubljana

1. What is directionality?

When we talk about directionality in translating and interpreting we are focussing on the direction of transfer, i.e. whether translators or interpreters are working away from or into their first, native or dominant language. However, in contemporary TS the term usually indicates the practice when translators or interpreters work into their foreign language. This practice has been described by a plethora of expressions in TS, including 'le thème' (Ladmiral 1979), 'service translation' (Newmark 1988), 'inverse translation' (Beeby 1996), 'reverse translation', 'translation into the second language' (Campbell 1998), 'translation into the non-primary language' (Grosman et al. 2000), 'translation into a non-mother tongue' (Pokorn 2005), and 'translation A-B' (Kelly et al. 2003: 33–42), and has lately received a great deal of scholarly attention.

2. Traditional theoretical assumptions

In the central languages of Western Europe, translation into language B has long been considered inferior to translation into language A. The assumption that translators can master only their mother tongue and must therefore translate solely in that direction most probably stems from the Romantic identification of the transcendental nature of the nation with its language. Claims that a nation's language was the spirit of that nation (Humboldt 1836: 37) and that therefore the hidden essence of the foreign language is not accessible to foreign speakers led some scholars to believe that translation should thus always proceed from foreign languages into one's mother tongue and never vice-versa.

Although the belief in the transcendental connectedness of the nation and its language abated in the 20th century, its logical corollary that one should always translate into one's mother tongue survived. Some seminal TS texts from early 1980s thus warned against translating from language A to B, believing that this practice creates texts that are "unnatural and non-native", full of "unacceptable or improbable collocations" (Newmark 1981: 180). It was argued that translation should therefore always be carried out by native speakers of the TL, since only they are capable of intuitively grasping word associations which reflect the way in which language structures and

organises reality (Duff 1981). Also in Interpreting Studies*, the Paris school similarly argued that interpreting into B "distracts the mind from constructing sense" (Seleskovitch 1999: 62).

Other translation theoreticians idealised the subject involved in the process of translation (see Translation process*) and assumed that translators should be perfect bilingual speakers, translating from one mother tongue to another (e.g. Catford 1965: 27). And others, again, did not discuss openly the possibility of choosing one's TL in translation, but covertly expressed their conviction that only translation into language A exists in the professional world. This opaque discourse can be found, for example, in the work of Lawrence Venuti (1995), whose terminology, where translators always choose a "foreign" text and translate it in conformity with or in opposition to the "domestic" cultural situation (see Domestication and foreignization**), implies that they never work away from their native language but always into their mother tongue.

3. The spread of translation A-B

Translation A-B, however, has been a common phenomenon throughout history: for example, the famous *Septuaginta* seems to have been translated by Greeks and non-Greeks together, and the first translations of the Buddhist sacred texts from Sanskrit to Chinese were not done by Chinese native speakers. Also today, translation A-B is very common, sometimes even predominant, in peripheral linguistic communities, i.e. in communities using a language that only a few speakers use as their second language (see Linn 2006 for "core" and "peripheral"). And also in the core linguistic communities it is often used in communication with ethnic minorities or recent migrants (Campbell 1998).

When translating into language B, however, translators very seldom work alone – the common practice is co-operation between a translator who is a native SL speaker and a TL stylist. This co-operation of equal partners has been so frequent that it has found a theoretical grounding in the theory of Bible translation (Nida 1964) (see Religious translation*).

4. Contemporary research and new findings

Contemporary research into directionality focuses on various aspects of translation A-B: first, empirical research has shown that "native-speakerness" does not guarantee greater quality in interpreting (Bajo et al. 2000) or in translation (Pokorn 2005); traditional theoretical assumptions have been questioned; the necessity of translating

and interpreting into language B has been established on numerous markets; various teaching and training approaches have been explored (Campbell 1998); and tools and aids for translators and interpreters have been developed (see Translation tools*). The need to train future translators to work into their language B has been recognised (Prunč 2000) and different methods of teaching translation A-B have been investigated in TS literature (Beeby 1996, Kelly et al. 2003). All these different aspects of scholarly interest show the diminishing marginality of the practice.

References

Bajo, M. T., F. Padilla & P. Padilla. 2000. "Comprehension processes in simultaneous interpreting." In *Translation in Context*, Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador and Yves Gambier (eds), 127–142. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Beeby, Allison. 1996. *Teaching Translation from Spanish to English*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: OUP.

Duff, Allan. 1981. *The Third Language*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press.

Grosman, Meta, Mira Kadrič, Irena Kovačič, Mary Snell-Hornby (eds). 2000. *Translation into Non-mother Tongues in Professional Practice and Training*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1836. *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Berlin: Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Ladmiral, Jean-René. 1979. *Théorèmes pour la traduction*. Paris: Didier.

Linn, Stella. 2006. "Trends in translation of a minority language: The case of Dutch." In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting,* Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger & Zuzana Jettmarová (eds), 27–40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*, London: Prentice Hall.

Seleskovitch, Danica. 1999. "The Teaching of Conference Interpreting in the Course of the Last 50 Years." *Interpreting* 4 (1): 55–66.

Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London/New York: Routledge.

Further reading

Campbell, Stuart. 1998. *Translation into the Second Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Kelly, Dorothy, Anne Martin, Marie-Louise Nobs, Dolores Sánchez & Catherine Way (eds). 2003. *La Direccionalidad en Traducción e Interpretación*. Granada: Atrio.

Nida, E. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Pokorn, Nike K. 2005. *Challenging the tradtional axioms: translating into a non-mother tongue.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Prunč, Erich. 2000. "Translation in die Nicht-Muttersprache und Translationskultur." In *Translation into Non-mother Tongues in Professional Practice and Training*, Meta Grosman, Mira Kadrič, Irena Kovačič, Mary Snell-Hornby (eds), 5–20. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Domestication and foreignization

Outi Paloposki
University of Turku

During the recent years, the concepts of domestication and foreignization have developed into a convenient shorthand to describe two opposite ways (strategies) of translating (see Translation strategies and tactics*), in many cases losing their earlier (Venutian) link to an ethics* of translation and becoming (often allegedly value-free) analytical categories in descriptive studies. *Domestication* is often used to refer to the adaptation of the cultural context or of culture-specific terms (see Children's Literature and Translation*; Bible translation*; Realia**), and *foreignization* to the preserving of the original cultural context, in terms of settings, names, etcetera. The terms have also found a place in studies meant to either reject or affirm the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis (see Retranslation*).

The concepts were first introduced into modern Translation Studies by Lawrence Venuti (1991, 1995, 1998) to serve in formulating an ethical agenda. According to Venuti, the dominant Anglo-American practice and discourse of translating and Translation Studies favored fluent and transparent strategies, resulting in acculturation, "in which a cultural other is domesticated, made intelligible" (Venuti 1991: 127). For Venuti, both the practice and the discourse are ethnocentric at the level of cultural relations and detrimental to the translator, plunging her/him into invisibility. For Venuti, an analysis of past translations and translation discourse shows us alternative solutions and can thus offer a way out of the ethnocentrism and imperialism "that necessarily figure in every act of translation".

The idea of a domesticating/foreignizing translator was based on an analysis of Friedrich Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture "Über die Verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens", where "[E]ither the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him, or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (Schleiermacher 1977: 74). (Here Venuti was using André Lefevere's 1977 translation, albeit criticizing it for fluency – see Venuti 1991: 130 and footnote 6 on page 129; in the second edition of the *Translation Studies Reader*, which Venuti edited, he included a new translation by Susan Bernofsky). Venuti was keen to point out, however, that Schleiermacher's preferences rose not out of an ethical but a social concern, the formation of a national culture, with the help of the cultured elite. The contextuality of the foreignizing method, as well as the impossibility of a translation ever being *only* foreignizing, is evident in Venuti's reading. Domestication, for Venuti, may stand

for a kind of standardization of all translated language, or it may be inherent in all translation: "Translations, in other words, inevitably perform a work of domestication" (Venuti 1998: 5). Foreignization, the "poison" or counter-attack against domestication, may consist of many different kinds of practices, from the choice of source texts to any deviating practices (archaizing language, for example). Foreignization is thus a broader concept in Venuti's thinking than in Schleiermacher's, for whom foreignizing consisted of following "the turns taken by the original" (Venuti 1991: 148, quoting Schleiermacher).

Venuti's program of foreignization has been heavily criticized, partly because of the vagueness of terminology but also because it has been considered elitist or internally contradictory. Maria Tymoczko (2000: 36–37) claims that Venuti's categories are not coherent – even if we were willing to further ethical aims, how are we to know what actions are required for what purpose? Anthony Pym (1996: 167), in a similar vein, has criticized Venuti for proposing a (foreignizing) program which is unable to fulfill its objectives. Barbara Folkart (2007: 304) accuses Venuti of not paying attention to esthetics (here, though, Folkart's notion of esthetics just seems to differ from Venuti's, which is closer to the Brechtian idea of unsettling the reader). Then again, Venuti does underline the context sensitivity and variation of foreignization and domestication (see also Delabastita 2010: 131), and he offers an ethics of difference which is not based on a reformulation of fidelity (Koskinen 2000: 58–59). Despite the non-systematic use of concepts and the belligerent rhetoric, Venuti has taken up fundamental issues related to the ethics of translation, initiated one of the liveliest discussions in Translation Studies for decades, and has given impetus to a wealth of research testing his claims.

A key-word survey of Translation Studies Bibliography and Translation Studies Abstracts shows that the concepts of domestication and foreignization have since been put to use in dozens of empirical studies, from Brazil to China. In addition to tackling questions of literary prose – the source of most of Venuti's examples – these concepts have also been applied in the study of tourist texts, folktales, voice-over, news articles, drama and popular non-fiction. The units of analysis have varied as well, but perhaps culture-specific items (realia, cultural references) are among the most widely studied; in addition, registers, idioms, dialogue and culture-specific pragmatics have been addressed. Domestication and foreignization also play a key role in the so called Retranslation Hypothesis, according to which first translations tend to be more domesticated than second and subsequent translations. While the concepts have not always been used in a similar or consistent fashion in these studies – or even defined adequately –, many of the cases do seem to confirm what Venuti would no doubt agree with: that translations are rarely pure and homogeneous (see for example Ballard 2000; Brownlie 2006). Domestication and foreignization are abstractions, and as such, need to be treated with care in applying them to empirical studies.

References

Ballard, Michel. 2000. "In Search of the Foreign: The Three English Translations of L'étranger." In *On Translating French Literature and Film II*, Myriam Salama-Carr (ed.), 19–38. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Brownlie, Siobhan. 2006. "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory." *Across Languages and Cultures* 7 (2): 145–170.

Delabastita, Dirk. 2010. "Histories and Utopias. On Venuti's The Translator's Invisibility." *The Translator* 16 (1): 125–134.

Folkart, Barbara. 2007. *Second Finding. A Poetics of Translation*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2000. *Beyond Ambivalence*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 774. Tampere: Tampere University.

Pym, Anthony. 1996. "Venuti's Visibility." [Review]. Target 8 (1): 165–177.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. [1838] 1977. "On the different methods of translating." In *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*, André Lefevere (ed. and transl.), 67–89. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2000. "Translation and political engagement. Activism, social change and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts." *The Translator* 6 (1): 23–47.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1991. "Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher." *TTR* 4 (2): 125–150.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Invisibility of the Translator. A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London/New York: Routledge.

Evaluation/Assessment

Sonia Colina
University of Arizona

A translated text is defined here as a text that fulfills and/or attempts to fulfill a specific function in a target culture (in accordance with a set of explicit or implicit instructions, known as the *translation brief*) and that bears a translation relationship to another text in another language; the specifics of a translation relationship (vs. version, adaptation*) can vary from one culture to another. This discussion takes the position that a translated text comes about as the result of the interaction of social participants (minimally, the writer, the target language audience, and the translator) and a purpose.

Although oftentimes assessment and evaluation are used interchangeably, assessment normally refers to a process by which information is collected relative to some known objective or goal (e.g. the assessment of a student's acquisition of translation competence* through tests, homework, etc). Evaluation, on the other hand, has a subjective component; when we evaluate, we judge, classifying according to some defined criteria. Much work in translation has been in the area of evaluation, especially as it refers to translation as a product. This article will refer to both evaluation and assessment, as both terms are commonly used in the Translation Studies literature.

1. A controversial issue

The evaluation of translation quality* remains a controversial issue in Translation Studies*. Despite extensive debate on various fronts, little agreement exists as to how translations should be evaluated. This lack of agreement can be understood as the result of a multiplicity of factors: among them are the elusive and relative nature of quality, often dependent on social and culturally-based values and priorities, and, more generally, a multiplicity of views about translation. An evaluator's approach to quality will generally reflect his/her own views on translation*, which explicitly or implicitly presuppose a theory of translation. As Julianne House puts it: "Evaluating the quality of a translation presupposes a theory of translation. Thus different views of translation lead to different concepts of translational quality, and hence different ways of assessing quality (House 1997, 1)." To this day translation scholars continue to debate the concept of translation, along with crucial notions such as equivalence, the purpose of translation, and the role of the translator. Finding some common ground amongst approaches to evaluation can also be difficult because some proposals and evaluation

tools do not rely on any explicit theory, but rather on unarticulated views of translation passed on through training and professional socialization; many approaches also reflect varied objects of evaluation as well as unstated priorities responding to different evaluative purposes.

2. Major approaches to translation evaluation

Some methods of evaluation examine the business process that produced the translation product. While one cannot deny that a flawed production process can have a serious impact on the quality of a translation, the present contribution focuses on the evaluation of translation-specific quality, rather than on the business procedures that led to it. Other methods of translation quality assessment are experiential. They are often based on a wealth of practical experience, yet they also lack a theoretical and/or research foundation, consisting of ad hoc marking scales developed for the use of a particular professional organization or industry. While these evaluation tools are generally easy to apply, they are also difficult to generalize or replicate/validate. They tend to be sentence-based, not addressing textual issues.

Another important area of evaluation/assessment that will not be covered here due to reasons of scope is that of Machine Translation (MT)* and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT)* Tools. In addition to evaluating the texts produced with the help of MT and CAT and comparing them to those manually translated, researchers have studied automated vs. manual quality judgments, user acceptance and the need for post-editing.

The focus of this entry is on non-experiential, theoretical or empirical, methods of evaluation. These have been classified by some as equivalence-based or non-equivalence-based (Lauscher 2000).

2.1 Equivalence-based approaches

Much criticism against equivalence-based models is related to their dependence on the notion of equivalence, a controversial term in Translation Studies that is probably just as difficult to define as quality and/or translation itself. In addition, equivalence-based models cannot account for translation situations that do not have exact equivalence as their goal. Although many will agree that a target text with a completely different purpose from that of the original will not qualify as a 'translation' in most cultural traditions, 'translations' can in fact have a somewhat different function than that of the original, due mostly to audience needs, which at times require a slightly non-equivalent function for the target text. One can thus argue that reliance on an a priori notion of

equivalence is problematic and limiting, in descriptive as well as explanatory value. Some of the best-known equivalence based-models are reader-response approaches, and textual approaches, such as Reiss (1971) and House's functional pragmatic model (1997, 2001).

Reader-response approaches evaluate the quality of a translation by determining whether readers respond to it in the same way readers respond to the source (Carroll 1966; Nida & Taber 1969). For instance, the quality of the translation of a poem would be measured by comparing the responses of the readers of the original poem to those of the translation and establishing their equivalence. It is not difficult to see the problems involved in trying to measure reader-response; one in fact wonders whether it is actually possible to determine whether two responses are equivalent, given that even monolingual texts can trigger non-equivalent reactions from slightly different groups of readers. Additionally, how a reader responds to a text is not equally important for all texts, in particular for texts that are not reader-oriented (e.g., legal texts). Despite being problematic, reader-response methods must be credited with recognizing the role of the audience in translation, more specifically, of translation effects on the reader as a measure of translation quality. This is particularly noteworthy in an era when the dominant notion of 'text' was that of a static object on a page.

Another influential equivalence-based model, Reiss (1971), argues that the text type and function of the source text is the most important factor in translation and that quality should be assessed with respect to it.

House is also a proponent of equivalence as a measure of quality (1997, 2001). Her *functional-pragmatic model* relies on an analysis of the linguistic-situational features of the source and target texts, a comparison of the two texts, and the resulting assessment of their match: the textual profile and the function of the translation must match those of the original, the goal being functional equivalence between the original and the translation. House warns of the difference between linguistic analysis and social judgment. She clarifies that the functional-pragmatic approach "…cannot ultimately enable the evaluator to pass judgments on what is 'good' or 'bad'. Judgments regarding the quality of a translation depend on a large variety of factors that enter into any social evaluative statement (2001: 254)". Her position is that an objective model of translation can only offer the linguistic analysis that provides the grounds for arguing an evaluative judgment. Many translation scholars who see translation as a social activity do not share House's view about the need for a distinction between analysis and social judgment in translation evaluation.

The *argumentation-centered approach* of Williams (2001) is a textual approach to quality in which evaluation is based on argumentation and rhetorical structure. His model is also equivalence-based, as "a translation must reproduce the argument

structure of ST to meet minimum criteria of adequacy" (Williams 2001; p. 336). Argument structure is used in a broad sense that covers not only argumentative texts, but also narratives, dialogue and descriptions.

2.2 Non-equivalence approaches

Corpus-based models, such as Bowker (2001), use a large selection of natural texts in machine-readable form as a benchmark against which to compare and evaluate specialized translations (see Corpora*). Bowker (2001) is a novel proposal for the evaluation of students' translations that does not rely on textual equivalence.

For functionalism (aka, Skopos Theory, Reiss & Vermeer 1984; Nord 1997; see Functionalist approaches*), the text type and function of the translation are the criteria guiding translation decisions; consequently, they should also be the criteria guiding evaluation. In this model, the specifications for the target text, the *translation brief*, are of paramount importance in determining quality. However, functional approaches to evaluation generally remain vague as to how evaluation is to proceed after the function of the translation has been established. Much criticism leveled not only at functionalist, but also at other non-experiential evaluation models has to do with the difficulty involved in applying them in professional and teaching contexts (Lauscher 2000; Colina 2008). Corpus-based models and equivalence-based reader-response methods are also very time-consuming. Some critics point out that in order to bridge the gap between theoretical and practical quality assessment, "translation criticism could move closer to practical needs by developing a comprehensive translation tool" (Lauscher 2000, p. 164). As seen here, many approaches to evaluation center only on partial aspects of quality.

Colina (2008) is a functional approach (i.e. translation products are evaluated relative to the function of the text and the characteristics of the audience specified by the customer for the translated text) referred to as *functional-componential*, since it evaluates various components of quality separately. Colina (2008) claims that, without explicit criteria on which to base their evaluations, evaluators often rely on their own priorities, which may or may not coincide with the requester's. Within a functionalist framework, she argues that evaluation criteria should be based on the translation brief. In an attempt to introduce flexibility with regard to different conditions influencing quality and to make explicit the requesters' priorities, Colina's *functional-componential* proposal incorporates a user-defined notion of quality in which the requester decides which aspects of quality are more important for his/her communicative purposes. This is done either by adjusting customer-defined weights for each component or simply by assigning higher priorities to some components. Custom weighting of components also allows for customization depending on the effect of a particular component on the whole text, which may vary depending on textual type and function. The functional-componential approach does not rely on a point deduction system; rather, it tries to

match the text under evaluation with one of several descriptors provided for each category/component of evaluation. Given that evaluation is based on customer-defined settings and priorities, this is a functional model that incorporates equivalence as one possible translation requirement.

In order to show the applicability of the model in practical settings, to develop testable hypotheses and to validate the model, Colina and her collaborators designed a tool based on the *functional-componential* model, which was tested for inter-rater reliability (cf. Colina 2008). Results show good inter-rater reliability for Spanish and Chinese health education materials.

Lauscher (2000) also argues for a comprehensive and customer-defined approach to quality consisting of different components and priorities that may vary according to the situation. She states that "the translation process is guided by case-specific values. These values… are set and agreed by the interested parties during the translation process. In order to judge the quality of a translation, the values should be made accessible to the evaluator and operationalized as evaluation parameters. Because the application of evaluation parameters depends on situational and individual factors, translation quality is ultimately a matter of agreement and consensus (2000, p. 149)." Recent quality assessment proposals, such as Lauscher (2000) and Colina (2008, 2009) allow for variable notions of quality, depending on case-specific values, customer-defined and negotiated quality criteria and may thus be more flexible and adaptable to various purposes and translation views. As such, they incorporate equivalence and non-equivalence-based views of translation.

References

Bowker, Lynne. 2001. "Towards a methodology for a corpus-based approach to translation evaluation." *Meta* 46 (2): 345–64.

Carroll, John B. 1966. "An experiment in evaluating the quality of translations." *Mechanical Translation* 9 (3–4): 55–66.

Colina, Sonia. 2008. "Translation quality evaluation: Empirical evidence for a functionalist approach." *The Translator* 14 (1): 97–134.

House, Julianne. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.

House, Julianne. 2001. "Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation." *Meta* 46 (2): 243–57.

Lauscher, Susanne. 2000. "Translation quality-assessment: where can theory and practice meet?" *The Translator* 6 (2): 149–68.

Nida, Eugene & Charles Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Reiss, Katharina. 1971. *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetungskritik*. München: Hüber.

Reiss, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translations-Theorie*. Tübingen: Niemayer.

Williams, Malcolm. 2001. "The application of argumentation theory to translation quality assessment." *Meta* 46 (2): 326–44.

Further reading

Colina, Sonia. 2009. "Further evidence for a functionalist approach to translation quality evaluation." *Target* 21 (2): 215–244.

Schäffner, Christina (ed.). 1998. *Translation and Quality.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Maier, Carol (ed.). 2000. *Evaluation and translation.* Special issue of *The Translator* 6 (2).

Lee-Jahnke, Hannelore (ed.). 2001. *Évaluation: paramètres, méthodes, aspects pédagogiques / Evaluation: Parameters, Methods, Pedagogical Aspects*. Special issue of *Meta* 46 (2).

Williams, Malcolm. 2004. *Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-Centered Approach.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Hybridity and translation

Sherry Simon
Concordia University

When two different things are brought together – when plants or animals are 'crossed', when two identities are fused, when literary genres are mixed, when a building combines the features of different architectural styles – something new results. This new thing is a hybrid. Today the idea of hybridity has largely positive connotations as it is articulated in esthetics or in cultural theory using postcolonial models (Bhabha, Young) and cyborg theory (Haraway). Mixed identities and creative interference are positively valued for their power to innovate and surprise, to express new emotions and ideas, to reflect changing sociocultural realities. In French, a similar revaluation of the term "métissage" has been undertaken. However, the idea of hybridity carries with it a long history of negativity. Consider the words *mongrel* or *half-breed*, which share the same semantic field. During the 18th and 19th centuries hybridity was regularly associated with the abnormal, the monstrous or the grotesque, and the term was implicated in some of the more somber episodes of scientific history having to do racist ideas of 'polygenesis' – which postulated the existence of more than one human species. For those who defended pure forms of expression, hybridity was a form of contamination – in the same way as religious syncretism was and continues to be rejected by defenders of authoritative dogma.

The hybridity that concerns Translation Studies* belongs to a tradition of debate having to do with plurilingualism and linguistic creolization, notions of transculturalism and transtextualization, as well as aspects of diasporic cultural expression that include bilingualism and double consciousness. While these ideas of cultural mixing have become especially prominent since the advent of postcolonial theory (see Post-colonial literatures and translation*) in the last decades of the 20th century, it is mistaken to assume that hybridity is a new feature of cultural life. Only ignorance of history could lead to the assumption that migration and diasporic consciousness are new features of human history. In fact, significant migratory movements across all of the continents have existed from earliest history, movements inspired by imperial conquest and settlement, or trade routes along passages like the Silk Road, resulting in phenomena of contact, translation, cultural mixing and hybridity (Tymoczko).

There are strong affinities between the process of translation and the creation of a cultural or linguistic hybrid. A translation carries aspects of one text into the materiality of another, so any translated text could be considered a hybrid that results from the interpenetration of two language systems. This is a highly abstract notion,

however, because a translated text does not necessarily carry the marks of the process through which it came into being. It often (but not always) looks like a product of the target language.

Hybridity should therefore be reserved to describe only certain kinds of translations – those that draw attention to themselves as the products of two separate meaning systems. Hybrid texts are those that display "translation effects": dissonances, interferences, disparate vocabulary, a lack of cohesion, unconventional syntax, a certain "weakness" or "deterritorialization". This mixing can be expressed either at the level of linguistic codes or more broadly at the level of cultural or historical references. While the hybrid text affirms the dividedness of identity, often becoming an expression of loss and disorientation, it can also become a powerful and emancipatory place for the writer to occupy.

Translation offers a model of hybrid textuality when it bears the marks of the *relation* that brought it into existence. This highlighting of relationality supports Walter Benjamin's idea that translation does not erase language difference but exposes the spaces where meaning-systems collide. The translated text can be understood as a contact zone, a third space, which is an overlapping of cultures that can generate "borderline affects and identifications" (Bhabha 1993: 167). For Homi Bhabha, following Walter Benjamin, the third space or space-between must be understood not as a separate alternative space but as an arena of active and ongoing differences, whose meanings are always in flux. The hybrid text can be understood, then, as a translation that is – according to the norms of conventional language transfer – deliberately unfinished.

Certain practices highlight the power of translation to produce a disjunctive, relational entity. These range from the self-translations of postcolonial writers (Salman Rushdie, Amitav Ghosh) to the esthetics of translators such as Henri Meschonnic or the Quebec poet Jacques Brault (*Transfigurations*, 1999), or indeed of any translator who deliberately carries a literalist approach to its most extreme point, with the aim of infecting the structures of the target language with the syntax and vocabulary of the original. The experimental writer Christine Brooke-Rose creates a linguistically hybrid novel in *Between* (1978) by replicating the structures of the plurilingual universe of the conference interpreter. Alexis Nouss proposes a specific configuration of hybridity with the notion of the "outre-langue", ('the language beyond') – a notion evoking the historical resonances of language which haunt the author's tongue, especially when the author writes from a situation of exile or loss. Certain writers in the modernist tradition have attempted to convey the layered experiences of history and diasporic wandering in their writing through incomplete translation and hybrid texts. This was true of Ezra Pound as it is true of the Montreal poet A.M. Klein who integrated the many languages and traditions of the Jewish past into his own distinctive pluralist poetics.

Hybridity takes on special importance in contexts where there is a heightened and historically anchored consciousness of cultural and linguistic mixing. Indeed, both translation and hybridity have become key terms in accounting for the ways in which divided, recovered or reconstructed identities are configured within the wider cultural forums in which they wish to participate. In this sense, both translation and hybridity are alternatives to ideas of assimilation (loss of identity) and multiculturalism (the multiplication of discreet and separate identities). Both translation and hybridity emphasize the disjunctive and provisional nature of affiliation, taking the form of interlingual or mixed expression. These forms of incomplete translation occur, for instance, in writing communities like those of postcolonial Africa or India, where there is a constant and ongoing interrelationship between the colonial language (English or French) and the languages of daily life, or in diasporic or immigrant communities, or in communities where a minoritized vernacular competes with standard languages. Amitav Ghosh's the Sea of Poppies, is powerfully illustrative of the ways in which the English language novel can integrate a plurality of modes of expression, conveying, in this case, a real sense of the multilingual and hybrid identities of colonial Calcutta. Edwin Gentzler's exploration of translation in the Americas (*Translation and Identity in the Americas)* highlights the prominence of hybridity and métissage in the historical consciousness of such nations as Brazil and reveals the plurilingual and mixed origins of United States culture. Hybridity has been discussed as a strong feature of writing that emerges at the borders between nations and languages, such as Chicano and Chicana literature, with its mixtures of English and Spanish. When such mixed languages become the basis of a literary culture, the resulting texts are self-consciously hybrid. Other North American examples of such languages are *chiac* from the Canadian region of Acadie and *joual* in Quebec – both French heavily influenced by English. Theatre is particularly rich in these kinds of plurilingual experiments.

If a hybrid text is in some sense already a translation, a product of the encounter between two languages, how is this plurilingual, hybrid text itself to be translated? How can translation recreate the tensions that are part of the original? There are no easy answers to these questions, as several important analyses have shown. In each case, attention has to be given to the social force of the languages and the cultural and literary implications of their intermixing. Catherine Leclerc has reflected on this question in her study of translations from the Acadian *chiac*, showing how translation displaces and intensifies the tensions of the original. The translator must create crossovers in the new languages, consciously taking on the role of a rewriter. Canadian translators Philip Stratford, Betty Bednarski, Kathy Mezei and Ray Ellenwood have all reflected on the difficulties – ethical and esthetic – of translating *joual* (see Simon 1995), often admitting to the impossibilities of transferring the transgressive power of this particular language mix from French into English. How to transfer the minor status of Spanish within Chicana literature to the Catalan situation where Spanish is

a dominant language? This is the challenge that Pilar Godayol faced in her translations of Chicana writings, attempting to restore the force of the original through italics, for instance. In these cases, the conventional meaning of equivalence must be re-examined to allow for the reproduction not of semantic meaning but of the historical and political forces represented in language.

The term hybridity has been the object of three main kinds of critique in the area of cultural theory. First, because it is a product of bounded cultural forms (languages, cultures, identities), the hybrid presupposes and indeed requires the existence of pure, uncontaminated artifacts. There is therefore a kind of complicity or collusion between the hybrid (as the negation of pure forms) and the normative forms that allow it to come into existence. The popularity of the hybrid possibly even exaggerates the normative and conventional aspects of objects deemed to lie outside the hybrid. In fact, all cultures are interwoven, and there are aspects of hybridization in the cultural life of practically any identity or object that is put into circulation. Second, hybridity too easily effaces the conditions and power relations that bring it into being. All hybrids are not equal: some are the product of forced yoking, while others are the product of voluntary affiliations. The mixing of cultures has often been the result of war and conquest, such as the violent colonization and evangelization of Latin America. Hybridization occurs in such zones of contact, marked by unequal relations of power. It is essential, then, that a defense of the hybrid does not ignore the political forces that continue to marginalize and exclude certain populations. Nor should such a defense avoid distinguishing between the hybridity of privileged middle-class cosmopolitanism and the unwanted marginality often imposed on less privileged groups. Celebrated as the mark of new, fluid identities, hybridity has more often been used as a mark of value than as an instrument of analysis. To what extent can terms like *hybridity*, *metissage*, *cosmopolitanism* or *creolization* account for specific transcultural encounters, the historical significance and differential cultural weightings of mixed forms? The important volume *Metissages* by François Laplantine and Alexis Nouss is a symptom of this difficulty. If all the objects in the encyclopedia are "métis" (the volume contains hundreds of entries, across historical periods, artistic genres and cultures), what is the specificity of the cultural configurations that produced them? What the concept of *metissage* gains in philosophical depth it loses in analytical precision. And finally, how long does a hybrid remain hybrid? When does a creole become a normativized language (like Haitian creole or Yiddish)? Hybridity is necessarily a 'timely' and temporary creation, one that creates a rupture in the fabric of time. Once it enters into the expected repertory of cultural artifacts and systems, it loses its right to the title.

The notion of hybridity remains useful for Translation Studies, however, when it points to practices of translation that highlight the disjunctures between the cultures they are bridging, practices that create texts of interference and contamination. These practices of translation necessarily call upon an enlarged idea of translation*

(Tymoczko), one that includes practices of self-translation, of bilingual writing, of unfinished translation. These and other expressions of language encounter reflect the dissonances of the contact zones from which they emerge.

References

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.

Gentzler, E. 2008. *Translation and Identity in the Americas: New Directions in Translation Theory.* London/New York: Routledge.

Godayol, P. (ed.). 2001. *Veus Xicanes*. Vic: Eumo Editorial.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*, 149–181. New York: Routledge.

Laplantine, F. & Nouss, A. 2001. *Métissages, de Arcimboldo à Zombi*. Paris: Pauvert.

Leclerc, Catherine. 2005. "Between French and English, Between Ethnography and Assimilation: Strategies for Translating Moncton's Acadian Vernacular." *TTR* 18 (2): 161–192.

Simon, Sherry. (ed.). 1995. *Culture in Transit*. Montreal: Véhicule Press.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2003. "Enlarging Western Translation Theory: Integrating Non-Western Thought about Translation." http://eslking.com/library2/collections/language/translation/tymoczko_translation_theory.pdf [Accessed 14 June 2011]

Wolf, M. 2007. "The location of the 'translation field. Negotiating borderlines between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, Michaela Wolf & Alexandra Fukari (eds), 109–119. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Young, Robert J.C. 1995. *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. New York/London: Routledge.

Further reading

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* 91: 33–l40.

Schäffner, Christina & Adab, Beverly. 2001. "The Idea of the Hybrid Text in Translation: Contact as Conflict." *Across Languages and Cultures* 2 (2): 277–302.

Simon, Sherry. 1999. *Hybridité Culturelle*. Montréal : Editions Ile de la Tortue.

Wolf, Michaela. 2000. "The 'Third Space' in Postcolonial Representation." In *Changing the Terms. Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre (eds), 127–145. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Institutional translation

Kaisa Koskinen
University of Eastern Finland

1. Institution as a sociological concept

The concept of institution is one of the core concepts in sociological theories (see Sociology of translation*). Institutions have been studied, and the concept defined and redefined, not only in sociology but also in, for example, economics, political science and organization studies. Institution has proved to be a fruitful and versatile concept, but it follows that it is also notoriously difficult to employ because of the possibilities of misunderstanding and confusion between the various usages.

The picture is perhaps less confusing if we look at institutions as existing on three different levels: abstract institutions (such as religion) give rise to more formal institutions (such as the church) that are, for practical reasons, further divided into concrete institutions (such as local parishes) with their assigned material spaces, members and recurrent activities. In principle, we can study institutions on a range of levels: from the abstract level to concrete realisations, and from the world-system to the level of individuals and everyday micro processes. On all these levels, institutions share a number of features: any institution can be defined as a form of uniform action governed by role expectations, norms, values and belief systems.

To sum, institutions consist of more or less permanent roles and patterned actions, and their authority and legitimacy have been endowed by the surrounding society whose needs the institution is designed to serve. This also partially explains the confused meanings: modern societies have built a number of concrete institutions in order to carry out their various governance, control and education activities.

2. Translating institutions

Applying the variety of usages and levels of institution to Translation Studies*, on the most all-encompassing level one could argue that the activity of translation is a social institution in itself, and *all* translation is thus institutional. In this perspective, all translations and all discourse about them in a society constitute a system, or institution, of translation:

> The system of translation, as a social system, consists of all the communications processed and followed up as translational communications – and only those. The

> structure of the system consists of expectations about communications. The system's boundaries are constantly being defined, affirmed and renegotiated by the system itself. (Hermans 2003: n.p.)

In every society and all historical periods, translation activity is directed and constrained by norms*, and to play the social role of translatorship within a particular cultural environment, one has to acquire the set of norms required in it (Toury 1995: 53, 57–58). Viewing translating as a social institution offers interesting lines of research on questions such as how translators are socialized into their profession, and how professional conduct is negotiated and monitored socially. However, other, more concrete, levels of institution are also useful and relevant for studying translation.

The first, and most programmatic, plea for taking the *concrete* translating institutions seriously in Translation Studies was expressed by Brian Mossop already back in the 1980s. He argued that translation always takes place in some kind of an institutional framework and that translational decisions are to a great extent pre-determined by the goals of the institution within which the translator works (Mossop 1990: 343; see Translation policy**). This view again implies that translation is always institutional, but the understanding of institutions is different from the global approach mentioned above. The institutions Mossop had in mind are very different from the institutions, or systems, that provide the norms and values for the professional translation activity as a whole – and far more concrete. According to him (1988: 65), translating institutions include "corporations, churches, governments, newspapers", and he calls for an "institutional" understanding of the translation process that takes these "missing factors" into account in explaining translational phenomena. This institutional approach assumes that translators make conscious choices to adapt their translations "in the sense of making the translation serve the purpose of the translating institution" (Mossop 1990: 345; see Adaptation*). The translators act as agents** of the institution, not as individuals (ibid.: 351).

André Lefevere was another scholar in the early 1990s explicitly in favour of a concrete approach to translating institutions. His framework was based on systems theory, but he decidedly worked against its "forbidding level of abstraction" (Lefevere 1992: 11). Instead, his concept of patronage refers to concrete persons and institutions (such as religious bodies, political parties, publishers, the media) who have the power to further or hinder the development of literature (ibid.: 15). These patrons can execute ideological and economic constraints and grant or withhold prestige and status, and they operate by means of institutions set up to regulate the literary life: academia, the educational system, critical journals, and censorship*.

Since these early contributions to studying translating institutions, institutions have become a regular object of study in sociologically oriented studies that have become a prominent subsection of the field in the 21st century. For example, Lawrence Venuti (1998) explores the marginalized role of translation in a number

of institutions such as literary scholarship, the publishing industry and copyright law. A number of concrete translating institutions from different eras, cultures and ideological backgrounds have been subjected to analysis in recent literature, among them state institutions such as the Turkish Translation Bureau (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008), private companies such as a small translation agency (Risku 2004) and non-governmental organizations such as the Middle East Media Research Institute MEMRI (Baker 2007).

3. Translating institutions and institutional translation

Defining either translation as an institution in itself or all translation as institutional would render a separate concept of 'institutional translation' tautological and meaningless. What then *is* institutional translation, and does it need to be separately defined? Mossop explicitly takes issue with the concept of institutional translation, emphasising that his view is different:

> The translating institutions of this article are obviously concrete institutions, but not in the sense in which one often hears about "institutional translation": the translating of texts of a technical or administrative nature by large modern organizations conceived as purely economic-political entities. Translating institutions may in fact be quite small. They may produce literary translations; and in the past, they took forms unfamiliar in the modern period: a post-Renaissance patron of writers who translated is an example of a concrete institution. (Mossop 1988: 69)

In spite of Mossop's emphasis on the wide spectrum of translating institutions, his own research has always focused on an institution that fits well with the traditional, administrative understanding: Canada's Federal Translation Bureau. Another well-known example is the European Union institutions, the biggest translating institutions in the world. In her book on the translators working for the European Commission, Kaisa Koskinen (2008) discusses the different conceptions, but she returns to a view that is not dissimilar to the one Mossop refers to above. She argues that within all these various concrete institutions where translating takes place, a translation genre exists that is qualitatively different from others, and that the concept of institutional translation captures the essence of that genre. Her definition is as follows:

> [W]e are dealing with *institutional translation* in those cases when an official body (government agency, multinational organization or a private company, etc.; also an individual person acting in an official status) uses translation as a means of "speaking" to a particular audience. Thus, in institutional translation, the voice that is to be heard is that of the translating institution. As a result, in a constructivist sense, the institution itself gets translated. (Koskinen 2008: 22)

Institutional translation is thus a form of autotranslation. Institutions produce documents, and in multilingual contexts these documents also need to be translated. Significantly, in institutional translation, the institution is typically the author of both the source text and its translation(s). Thus, institutional translation is self-translation. From the above definition it also follows that not all translating institutions produce institutional translations. Some institutions mainly rely on institutional translation, whereas some others, while perhaps actively engaged in translation, seldom do. The division between institutional and non-institutional kinds of translation is not clear-cut; translations can rather be placed on a continuum or a cline of increasing institutionality. While all translations are affected by some kinds of institutional constraints, 'institutional translation' refers to those occupying the extreme end of the continuum.

Prime examples of institutional translation include: official documents of government agencies and local authorities of bilingual or multilingual countries; translating in the European Union, the United Nations and other international or supranational organizations, and international courts of law. In other words, institutional translation typically takes place in the various concrete institutions that modern societies have built in order to carry out their governance and control needs and activities. Conversely, a translated novel published by a publishing house (i.e., an institution) does not normally belong to the genre of institutional translation. This is because the publishing house is not the author, the novelist is not identified as a representative of the publisher, and as readers, we do not typically try to construct the publishing house's voice but that of the original author addressing us via translation (cf. Mossop 1990: 352). On the other hand, there can be times and contexts when publishing houses and literary translations are employed by the society to forward a particular national aim, and in those cases they can indeed be seen as institutional translations (see Tahir Gürçağlar 2008). Koskinen also lists multinational organizations and private companies as potential producers of institutional translations. Particular genres of company documents, and particular highly controlled modes of text production in global companies (often undertaken under the label of localisation), indeed resemble text work in public institutions in many ways. Still, it might be preferable to restrict the concept to those concrete institutions that directly serve the societies' control and governance functions.

4. Genre characteristics of institutional translation

In institutional translation it is often important, symbolically or for practical reasons, to maintain that the different versions of a particular document are equally authentic and equivalent. The communicative function (or *skopos*; see Functionalist approaches*) of

the source text and its translation(s) in these cases is a constant: although the different language versions are targeted to different sub-groups of the audience, the "authorial intention" in them remains the same (Šarčević 1997: 21). This idea of sending the same message in different languages results in an (over-)emphasis on equivalence in institutional translation as the different versions need to be perceived as "the same text". The constant communicative function of all translated versions also creates the need for maintaining the "illusion" or "legal fiction" that multilingual legislation is simultaneously drafted in several languages. To produce the image that the institution speaks to you directly in many tongues, the translator's role needs to be effaced. Institutional translation therefore often (although not always) hides its translational origins. Translating, as well as document drafting, is a collective and anonymous process where the institution bears the authority.

The collective and anonymous nature of institutional translation also relates to another recurrent feature of it: standardisation (Trosborg 1997: 151). As the institutional author remains the same regardless of the personality of those playing the role of its translators, it is typically considered necessary to control the consistency of the vocabulary, syntax and style of all documents. Traditionally, this has been realised with the help of style guides, revision practices, mentoring and training (that is, normative control and socialisation to the profession), but in contemporary institutions consistency is also assured by databases, term banks and CAT tools (see Computer-aided translation*). Translators' memory tools are thus one form of institutional memory.

Institutional translations are often characterised as being unnecessarily complex, dense and lacking in readability (e.g., Trosborg 1997; see also Koskinen 2008). This is no surprise, since these are also known as recurring problems of original legal and administrative texts. Officialese often remains officialese in translation. In supranational contexts such as the EU, most translations are produced within the institutional context, not within the target culture, and they may therefore appear unfamiliar or strange for the target audience (hence the complaints of "eurojargon"). Because of this, they have also been labelled as "hybrid texts", this hybridity** causing them to feel "out of place", "strange" or "unusual" in the target culture (Trosborg 1997: 146). One explanation for this "strangeness" relates back to the predominance of equivalence: the measure of success in these language versions is their similarity with one another, not only with the source text, and even less with parallel texts in the target culture.

It is, however, necessary to note the variation that is evident in existing literature on institutional translation. For example, whereas focus on the EU often brings to light unidiomatic expressions or strangeness, Mossop's (1990) analysis of the Canadian Translation Bureau emphasises idiomaticity. Similarly, whereas Koskinen observes translators (similar to writers) pushing forward the Commission in their translation strategies* (2008: 144), Calzada Pérez reports contradictory evidence in her data from the European Parliament (2001: 221). It is actually remarkable that both sets of data

indicate a normalisation tendency (see Koskinen 2008: 136). It is indeed important to understand that translating institutions have different (and changing) ideological and political agendas, and their preferred translation strategies are designed accordingly (Mossop 1988: 67; see also Koskinen 2009). There is also a further disagreement as to whether these strategies are employed by the translators consciously (as Mossop argues) or unconsciously (as Calzada Pérez claims), or both.

We do not know enough of different institutional settings, and our historical understanding of the trajectories of translation practices within a single institution is still thin. The processes of institutionalisation and de-institutionalisation of translating are not well-understood yet. Some of these institutions are large, international conglomerates while others are small, local units; some employ a veritable army of translators, others employ just a few (the small bilingual municipalities in Finland, for example, may employ only one or two translators), and yet others rely on outsourced translations. While the basic tenets of institutional translation are not dependent on the size, location or prestige of the institution, the issues of power, status and authority colour the contexts in numerous significant ways. The various settings for institutional translation are regulated differently by legislation and official requirements, and their degree of institutionalisation varies. Institutions also differ in their approaches to institutional translation, and the related customs and (often unwritten) guidelines are in no way uniform (Šarčević 1997: 22). It follows that the underlying rationale for institutional translation can result in a whole range of different translation strategies and routines, and different translation cultures and professional roles can emerge. Understanding institutional translation (or interpreting) thus requires "local explanation", that is, detailed case studies of different institutional contexts. This research has only just begun in Translation Studies.

References

Baker, Mona. 2007. "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics* 17 (2): 151–69.

Calzada Pérez, María. 2001. "A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies." *Target* 13 (2): 203–239.

Hermans, Theo. 2003. "Translation and the Relevance of Self-Reference." Paper given on 10 September 2003, at CETRA Summer School, Scuola Superiore Traduttori Interpreti 'San Pellegrino', Misano Adriatico.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2008. *Translating Institutions. An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2009. "Going Localised – Getting Recognised. The Interplay of the Institutional and the Experienced Status of Translators in the European Commission." *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 93–110.

Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.

Mossop, Brian. 1988. "Translating institutions: a missing factor in translation theory." *TTR* 1 (2): 65–71.

Mossop, Brian. 1990. "Translating institutions and 'idiomatic' translation." *Meta* 35 (2): 342–355.

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

Šarčević, Susan. 1997. *New Approach to Legal Translation.* The Hague: Kluwer.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2008. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923–1960*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Trosborg, Anna. 1997. "Translating Hybrid Political Texts." In *Text Typology and Translation*, Anna Trosborg (ed.), 145–158. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference.* London/New York: Routledge.

Linguistics and translation

Kirsten Malmkjær
University of Leicester

The relationship between translation and linguistics has not always been harmonious; in particular, translation scholars have accused linguists of misapprehending translation 'as a mere transcoding process' (Snell-Hornby 1988: 3) and of being obsessed with a notion of equivalence which does not itself remain stable with variation in the terms used to denote it in different languages.

Some translation scholars have viewed linguistics more positively. For example, Nida declares that the 'fundamental thrust' of his theory has to be linguistic, to enable a "descriptive analysis of the relationship between corresponding messages in different languages" (1964: 8). It is not usually this kind of descriptive intention that causes anxiety in the Translation Studies community; rather, it is any attempt to try to encompass translation theory within linguistics, as e.g. Catford (1965) and Gutt (1991) set out to do.

1. Linguistic theories of translation

Major examples of linguistic theories of translation include Vinay and Darbelnet's, inspired by Saussurean linguistics, Catford's, influenced by an early version of Halliday's systemic functional linguistics, and Gutt's (1991) attempt to do without translation theory because "the phenomena of translation can be accounted for by [Sperber & Wilson's (1986)] general theory of ostensive-inferential communication" (Gutt 1991: 189).

1.1 Vinay and Darbelnet ([1958] 1995)

"An utterance", according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 12), "consists of **signs**" (emphasis original). They refer to the definition of the sign complex developed by Ferdinand de Saussure. Because the sign is arbitrary – there is no necessary connection between our concept of dogs and the word 'dog'; if there were, all languages would use the same word – the same concept can be articulated in different languages by means of different words. However, quite often the concepts denoted by words that we might think of as translation equivalents are in fact rather different; for example (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 13): "English bread has neither the same appearance nor the same importance as food as French bread".

The message is one of three 'aspects' of written language (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995: 11–12), the remaining two being the lexicon and the syntactic structure. Each sign in each language has a certain *valeur* (roughly, 'value'), a range of phenomena that it can be used to denote, and such ranges rarely coincide cross-linguistically. For example Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 58):

> In French a 'clerc' is an assistant to a lawyer or an ecclesiastic; in British English 'clerk' is widened to apply to anybody whose function is to deal with paper work. In American English the function of selling is added to the French and British meanings, e.g. 'a shoe clerk'.

In addition to aspects of language, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 17) identify "a whole range of stylistic characteristics which [they] call the levels of language". In essence, the levels have to do with formality and registers.

Having identified the linguistic concepts that they consider relevant to translation, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 19) turn their attention to

> the work of translators … the units they work with, the different planes of language at which these units operate, and finally, the methods which allow the **transfer** from one language to another (emphasis original).

They point out that "the word on its own is unsuitable for consideration as the basis for a unit of translation" (1995: 20). This is because the word is rarely the unit that signifies, and because meaning, which is what translators are concerned with, is not tied to any formal unit at all. Units of translation* are, rather, "lexicological units within which lexical elements are grouped together to form a single element of thought" Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 21). There follows a long list of types of units (pp. 22–27), a discourse on the three planes of external stylistics, which are the lexicon, the syntactic structures, and the message (pp. 27–30), and finally, in the introductory chapter which outlines the authors' approach, a description "of the methods translators use" (pp. 30–50; see Translation strategies and tactics*). The book contains a wealth of examples of potential translational relationships between French and English accompanied with analyses and description informed by the approach.

1.2 Catford

The most regularly vilified proponent of a linguistic approach to translation* is probably Catford (1965), and it is undeniable that his mode of expression has the potential to alienate a sizeable proportion of the Translation Studies community.

"Translation", he begins (Catford 1965: 1) "is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another." This may suggest a very simplistic understanding of translation as a mechanical process of substitution. And the subtitle: "An essay in applied linguistics" is not likely, either, to

give the impression that the author is about to afford the subject matter attention as a phenomenon deserving of its own space in academia. However, a number of Catford's insights have remained relevant for our discipline, and his definition of translation equivalence (1965: 50; italics original): "*Translation equivalence occurs when an SL and a TL text or item are relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance*" was the foundation for Toury's (1980: 37): "Translation equivalence occurs when a SL and a TL text (or item) are relatable to (at least some of) the same relevant features".

Because translation is an operation performed on languages, continues Catford (1965: 1), it is clear that "any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language - a general linguistic theory", and Catford chooses Halliday's systemic functional grammar (1961).

Catford begins by a consideration of "how language is related to the human social situations in which it operates" as "a type of patterned human behaviour" (Catford 1965: 1), so that "saying the same thing" will amount to producing the same pattern of manifestations of language (1965: 2). At this point, therefore, it is already clear that when Catford comes to define translation equivalence, he will need something non-linguistic to measure it by, because in translating between languages, the two sets of patterns produced will only very rarely be identical. The choice of "features of substance" (see above) comes about as follows: According to the view of linguistic meaning that Catford subscribes to, the meaning of a linguistic item derives from its place in a system (1965: 35, italics original): "Following Firth, we define *meaning* as the total network of relations entered into by any linguistic form", and since these networks are intralinguistic, meaning "is a property of a language".

The relations that the linguistic forms can enter into are formal (with other terms) and contextual (1965: 36): "the relationship of grammatical or lexical items to linguistically relevant elements in the situations in which the items operate". The formal relations provide formal meaning and the contextual relations provide contextual meaning, and both are language specific. Catford provides a number of examples to illustrate the variation between languages, and it is worthwhile quoting one of these extensively (1965: 39):

> A Burushin is talking about his brother [and] … frequently uses the item *a-cho*. The interpreter translates this *my brother*. The Burushin is now replaced by his sister. She, too, talks about the same person … ; she says *a-yas*. The interpreter translates as before: *my brother*.

Catford now points out that the common sense view of this situation would be that the two Burushaski terms mean the same as each other, but that for a linguist (1965: 39–40):

> Unless *a-cho* and *a-yas* are free variants, then they cannot 'mean the same' as each other. It is clear, then, that *neither* of them mean the same as *my brother*; for *my brother* … 'means the same' [each time it is used to translate either of the Burushaski terms]. … In fact, of

> course, *brother* and *cho* do not 'mean the same'. There is no 'transference of meaning' here; only replacement of Burushaski items by an English translation equivalent.

What makes *brother* a translation equivalent of *cho* and *yas* is that they "function in the same situation" (1965: 49). So Catford is fully aware of the importance of context and function in translation. His aim is to illustrate how a particular linguistic theory can account for translational phenomena, because, being a linguist, his main interest is in the linguistic features of translation so he pays particular attention to these; but in a Hallidayan framework, studying language independently of context is impossible, because language is seen as social semiotic (Halliday 1978): It is social because it is learnt, maintained and developed in interaction with others; and it is semiotic because it allows for the symbolisation of everything social, which is also learnt along with the learning of language.

The well known notion of translation shifts was developed by Catford to account for "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL" (1965: 73); in other words, the term 'shift' is used to refer to the very numerous instances in which what is expressed at one linguistic rank (morpheme, word, group, clause, sentence in the Hallidayan system), or level (sound, lexicon, grammar, text in the Hallidayan system) in one language must often be expressed at another rank or level in another language. For instance, whereas in English, references to time affect choices within, and can be solely indicated by way of the grammatical system of tenses, Chinese generally uses the lexicon to indicate time. Therefore, there will in most cases be a level shift between Chinese and English when temporal references are translated between these two languages. Category shifts, on the other hand, include shifts of structure, class, unit, or system. Structure shifts occur between units (for example, words) that compose the same larger unit (for example, a group) in two languages, but which do not occur in the same order in the larger unit in the two languages. A well rehearsed, general example of this phenomenon is translation between English and French at group level, where (1965: 78) "there is often a shift from MH (modifier + head) to (M)HQ ((modifier +) head + qualifier), e.g. *A white house* (MH) = *Une maison blanche* (MHQ)." This example also illustrates class-shift, because although both 'white' and '*blanche*' are adjectives, they belong to different subclasses of that class; '*blanche*' is one of very many adjectives in French that operate at Q, whereas 'white' is one of very many adjectives in English that operate at M. Unit-shifts occur where items at one linguistic rank in the source text are represented in the translation by items at a different linguistic rank. Intra-system shifts occur when two languages have systems that correspond formally, but where the formally equivalent terms in the systems do not function in the same contexts. For example, although English and French both have a number system with two options (singular and plural) that operates in the nominal group and which demands concord between subject and predicator (1965: 80):

> In translation, it quite frequently happens that this formal correspondence is departed from, i.e. where the translation equivalent of English *singular* is French *plural* and vice-versa. E.g. advice = des conseils, news = des nouvelles

Catford is careful to point to the theoretical implications of these familiar phenomena: If it were not for an assumption of formal correspondence between languages, the notion of shifts would not make sense. Similarly, he uses the notion of collocation to show that aspects of culture can be accounted for by way of a concentration on language, and that cases of apparent cultural untranslatabilty may amount to linguistic untranslatability. According to Catford (1965: 10–11):

> A collocation is the 'lexical company' that a particular lexical item keeps. … We refer to the item under discussion as the *node* … and the items with which it collocates as its *collocates*. … A *Lexical set* is a group of words which have similar collocational ranges.

It is not possible here to chart the subsequent developments in technology and in corpus linguistics that enabled linguists and subsequently translation scholars to pursue this notion in the latter decades of the 20th century (see Corpora*), but it is instructive to note Catford's use of the notion of collocation to provide a linguistic account of an instance of cultural specificity by way of the notion of untranslatability.

Given Catford's definition of translation equivalence (see above), the success of a translation depends partly on commonality between the original and the translation in terms of the features of a situation that they represent. So "when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely *absent* from the culture of which the TL is a part" (1965: 99; italics original), a type of untranslatability that might be considered cultural occurs. For example, we may say that it is impossible to translate the Japanese term, *yukata* into English, because since no item is generally known among English speaking people which has the features (1965: 100): "loose robe bound by a sash, worn by either men or women, supplied to guests in a Japanese inn or hotel, worn in the evening indoors or out of doors in street or café, worn in bed …", they have neither such a concept available to them nor a term to refer to it with. Therefore, a sentence like (1965: 102; italics original) "After his bath he enveloped his still-glowing body in the simple hotel *bath-robe* and went out to join his friends in the café down the street" might effect "mild 'cultural shock'" in an English reader. But, Catford points out, this phenomenon may as well be described as collocational shock, caused by the "unusualness of collocation".

The sentence with which Catford closes his book illustrates clearly that his project is to enhance the power of translation theory and not of linguistic theory. He writes (1965: 103; italics original):

> If, indeed, it should turn out that 'cultural untranslatability' is ultimately describable in all cases as a variety of *linguistic* untranslatability, then the power of translation-theory will have been considerably increased.

1.3 Gutt's relevance theoretic approach

Catford's intention is to enhance the explanatory power of translation theory. Gutt's, in contrast, is to replace it with relevance theory (Gutt 1990, abstract: 135 and see above) supplemented with Translation Studies "as an organized investigation into any phenomena associated in some way with translating, translators, and translations" as per this handbook, for example, but devoid of any explanation "of how it is possible for a human communicator to convey to an audience in language B what someone expressed in a different language A" beyond the explanation of this provided by relevance theory.

In Sperber and Wilson's account of communication, relevance is understood, not so much as a maxim that guides conversation (see Grice 1975), but as an innate focusing mechanism of the human cognitive system. A remark is relevant to its hearer when its formal features are selected in such a way that "the greatest possible cognitive effect for the smallest possible processing effort" (Sperber & Wilson 1986: vii) can be achieved. In order to make their remarks relevant in this sense, speakers need to make assumptions about the set of assumptions available to their hearers (1986: 39; see Relevance and translation*).

What links Sperber and Wilson's theory of relevance most closely to translation theory in Gutt's mind is their notion that literal (assertive) language use is 'descriptive' and non-literal (non-assertive) language use is 'interpretive' (1986: 228–229). The latter includes speech and thought report, and Gutt (1990: 147) sees all translations as interpretive language use because they are 'texts presented in virtue of their resemblance with an original', which is why relevance suffices to account for them as well as for non-translational language use. Of course, original texts will be in a different language from their translation, so the resemblance between the two is unlikely to be at the concrete level of form, and Gutt, like Catford, is compelled to look elsewhere for the translational coin; and as his theory is cognitive as opposed to functional or systemic, he turns to the cognitive notion of 'communicative clues' arising from semantic representations, syntactic properties, phonetic properties, semantic constraints on relevance, formulaic expressions, onomatopoeia, the stylistic value of words, and sound-based poetic properties (Gutt 1991: 129–159). The optimal translation is the one that shares all of the source text's communicative clues and which will therefore "give rise to the same interpretation when processed in the same context" (Gutt 1991: 162). This may be hard to test.

2. Translation in linguistic theory

References to translation in linguistic theory have tended on the whole to be to the usefulness of translational data to cast light on linguistic phenomena. For example, Jakobson advocates that linguists constantly scrutinise translation activities (1959: 234): "No

linguistic specimen may be interpreted by the science of language without a translation of its signs into other signs of the same system or into signs of another system".

This approach to linguistic data collection is illustrated especially clearly by Edward Sapir (1921: Ch. 5), who uses the sentence, 'the farmer kills the duckling' to illustrate that languages differ in how they express concepts and that not all languages express the same concepts. Restrictions of space prevent me from reporting each step in Sapir's nine pages of analysis of this sentence in English, let alone the comparison with its German, Yana, Chinese or Kwakiutl counterparts, but he concludes from it that (1921: 126)

> No language wholly fails to distinguish noun and verb, though in particular cases the nature of the distinction may be an elusive one. It is different with the other parts of speech. Not one of them is imperatively required for the life of language.

More recently, both linguists and translation scholars have been able to make use of large corpora of machine readable texts and translations to derive insights relevant to linguistics.

For her part, Malmkjær (2005) illustrates how a careful examination of translators' manners of dealing with phenomena which literature in contrastive linguistics tends to classify as difficult to handle in translation can cast light not only on how a translator copes, but also on the nature of the linguistic phenomenon itself *and* on the nature of explanations provided in dictionaries and grammars. Having examined the translations made by Barbara Haveland of occurrences of the Danish discourse particle, *jo*, as used by Peter Høeg in one of his novels, she suggests that (2005: 64)

> In just about every case where *jo* has been translated, it seems to have helped to signal an aspect of argument structure in the source text. In contrast, in the instances in which *jo* has not been translated, it seems to have *only* the function which [a Danish grammar suggests and which is indicated in English with] 'you know'. When *jo* has this function only, it need not be translated and translating it may give the misleading impression that the speaker/writer is adopting an overbearing or even insulting attitude towards the hearer/reader. But when *jo* has the additional function of signalling an argument structure, it is safe to translate it into English and an element may be lost if it is not translated. In light of this, we might argue that dictionaries and grammars should not be considered sources of translation equivalents, because contexts of use, which grammars and dictionaries cannot cater for comprehensively, may include features which make other translation equivalents more acceptable.

References

Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and conversation." In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (eds), 41–58. London: Academic Press.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 1990. "A theoretical account of translation – without a translation theory." *Target* 2 (2): 135–164.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 2000 [1991]. 2nd edition. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Manchester: St Jerome.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1961. "Categories of the theory of grammar." *Word* 17: 241–292.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Arnold.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "On Linguistic aspects of Translation." In *On Translation*. Reuben A. Brower (ed.), 232–239. New York: Oxford University Press.

Malmkjær, Kirsten. 2005. *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1988. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sperber, Dan & Wilson, Deirdre. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Toury, Gideon. 1980. "Translated literature: System, norm, performance: Toward a TT-oriented approach to literary translation." *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 35–50. Reprinted in: *Poetics Today* (1981), 2 (4): 9–27.

Vinay, Jean-Paul & Darbelnet, Jean. 1958. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Editions Didier. English translation and edition by Juan Sager & M.-J. Hamel. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Literary translation

Dirk Delabastita
University of Namur and CETRA Leuven

The vagueness of the phrase "literary translation" enables it to cover the "non-literary" translation of "literary" texts (e.g. literal renderings of a poem for pedagogical or for philological purposes) as well as the "literary" translation of "non-literary" texts (e.g. religious ones). But in most cases the phrase refers to "literary" translations made of "literary" originals, whereby the translators are expected to preserve or to recreate somehow the aesthetic intentions or effects that may be perceived in the source text. It should be remembered, however, that the status which texts have as "literary" texts or indeed as "translations" is ultimately a matter of conventions, norms and communicative functions as much as being a reflection of the text's intrinsic characteristics (see Literary Studies and Translation Studies*).

1. The flow of literary texts

Translation can be looked on as an aspect of the reception of a literary text. It is one of the many ways in which a text can "live on" beyond the linguistic and cultural milieu of its origin and find ever new readerships, thereby releasing or prompting new meanings in the process. As such, literary translations function alongside with source-text editions, quotations, commentaries, adaptations, allusions, parodies, and so on within the wider web of intertextuality. Descriptive Translation Studies* was the first paradigm in the field to emphasize how much is to be gained by looking at these translational afterlives from the viewpoint of the receptor cultures.

1.1 Patterns of import

Translation (*import*) can make up a sizeable proportion of the total literary field in cultures when we compare it with newly produced works in the literature (*production*) or with works from the past that are still being pressed into literary service in the present (*tradition*). These exact proportions may vary strongly between cultures and they are likely to fluctuate across time within a culture. The interactions between production, translation and tradition may be taken to reflect the dynamics of cultural change (Lambert 2006: 15–21). It is well-known that "minority" cultures will usually generate a proportionately higher number of translations than "major" literary markets. Venuti (2008 [1995]) strongly criticises the ethnocentrism that tends to result from the more self-reliant situation of majority languages.

The conditions under which translation is likely to be more visible and to exert an innovative influence on the receptor system have famously been hypothesised by Itamar Even-Zohar (e.g. 1978). Translations are more likely to perform a so-called primary function when a "young" literary system is in the process of being established; when a system is "weak" in its dealings with another, more powerful system; and when a system is in a period of "crisis". For a more detailed discussion of these hypotheses, see Polysystem theory and translation*.

Many studies have demonstrated the validity of Even-Zohar's basic intuitions, whether they use the terminology of Polysystem Theory or not. As it happens, many descriptively oriented scholars taking an interest in the occurrence, distribution and impact of translated literature now seem to have increasing recourse to sociological models such as those of Pierre Bourdieu (see Sociology of translation*). Increasing attention is thereby given to the role of individual agency opposing normative and institutional forces in literary translation as well as to repressive mechanisms such as censorship (see Censorship*; Agents of translation**).

1.2 The sociolinguistics of literary translation

Translations have often been used to enhance the status of the target language by lifting it from the inferior position of a dialect or *patois* to the rank of a real language of culture and by expanding its expressive range. Newly emancipated or recognized languages (e.g. Afrikaans in the 1920s, various Creoles today, various Sign Languages) or newly constructed ones (e.g. Esperanto in the late nineteenth century) quite systematically engage in the translation of canonical texts in order to enrich their textual repertoires, flex their stylistic muscles and showcase their ability to accommodate even the most demanding texts. The Bible and Shakespeare are typically found at the top of their "to translate" list. There are surely no speakers of Esperanto who do not also have a natural mother tongue that can offer them trustworthy versions of the Scriptures and of Shakespeare. The "normal" reasons for translation (semantic access, spiritual regeneration through sacred texts, aesthetic enjoyment through a foreign classic…) would not seem to be the prime motives driving the translation project here, but rather what translation can do for the status of the target language and, ultimately, for the cohesion, visibility and recognition of the social group or culture identifying with it.

This may be observed with particular clarity when we attend to translation and related activities (e.g. the making of bilingual dictionaries) occurring between mutually intelligible languages, and especially when this happens in politically sensitive contexts. Examples such as Serbian/Croatian or Bulgarian/Macedonian may spring to mind here. While literary translations and bilingual dictionaries are traditionally supposed to serve as mediators overcoming a linguistic and cultural divide ("*translation is a bridge*"), in such cases their function is no less to formalise and consolidate the divide in the first place ("*the gap of otherness is so deep and wide that a bridge is needed*").

1.3 Empire and after

How do the volumes and directionalities of translation correlate with the permanently shifting and increasingly globalised economy of linguistic, literary and cultural values? These issues of language, translation, power and cultural identity may be observed anywhere in literary and cultural history, but they have particular urgency in postcolonial situations in which by definition linguistic and other cultural transactions do not take place on an equal basis (see Post-colonial literatures and translation*). This particular issue has invited some fascinating research in Translation Studies: see e.g. the work done on "cannibalistic" theories and practices of postcolonial translation in Brazil; the research of Annie Brisset (1996), Sherry Simon (2006) and others on translation in Quebec; Roshni Mooneeram's book (2009) on literary translation into Mauritian Creole; and so on. Such efforts towards a more inclusive, truly international and culturally balanced approach to translation are gaining momentum (e.g. Maria Tymoczko 2007) and are sometimes reframed within what has been dubbed the "international turn" in the discipline.

2. Charting the history literary translation: panoramic views

Historically oriented questions about literary translation are now being addressed in several places of the world in what begins to look like a concerted research effort. Perhaps the most impressive example of such systematic literary translation research to this date has been the Göttingen-based SFB 309 on *Die literarische Übersetzung* (a SFB or *Sonderforschungsbereich* is a temporary collaborative research centre). This project ran formally from 1985 to 1996 and has continued in more informal ways since; it has produced an impressive number of articles and books on the history of literary translation in German-speaking countries (e.g. Frank and Turk 2004).

The new millennium saw the publication of two very useful reference works that can serve as a compendium of existing knowledge and a platform for further investigations into literary translation in the English-speaking world: the *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English* (Classe 2000) and *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (France 2000). These books were a prelude to the more ambitious initiative of the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (France and Gillespie, in progress). Similar projects are under construction elsewhere. In France, for instance, Yves Chevrel and Jean-Yves Masson are coordinating a *Histoire des traductions en langue française*, which will cover the history of literary (but not only literary) translation into French. The three-volume reference work *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung* (Kittel et al. 2004–2010) also contains many entries of literary interest.

3. More specific issues and interests

The many forms and manifestations of literary translation also raise a host of more specific issues. Some of these are discussed in the entries on the translation of drama* and poetry**. The following themes found in recent research literature reflect the many dimensions of literary translation as a study object as well as the changing priorities of literary studies:

- the role of translation in the international career of an individual writer: e.g. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation* (Hoenselaars 2004);
- the role of translation in the dissemination and international perceptions of a national literature: e.g. *One Into Many. Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature* (Chan 2003);
- the role of translation in the creative development of an individual author/translator: e.g. *Translation as Stylistic Evolution: Italo Calvino Creative Translator of Raymond Queneau* (Federici 2009);
- specific translations of specific texts: e.g. *The Vision of Dante. Cary's Translation of the "Divine Comedy"* (Crisafulli 2003);
- the translation of specific intertextual devices, literary techniques, narrative strategies, and so on: e.g. *How Does It Feel? Point of View in Translation. The Case of Virginia Woolf into French* (Bosseaux 2007);
- the role of translation in the development and/or spread of a specific genre, as well as the specificities of translating it: e.g. *The Problem of Translating "Jabberwocky": the Nonsense Literature of Lewis Carroll and Edward Lear and their Spanish Translations* (Orero 2007); see also Children's literature in translation*; Comics in translation*;
- the specific stylistic challenges that face the translator of literature: e.g. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (Boase-Beier 2006); see also Stylistics and translation**;
- the role of retranslation* in translation history: e.g. *The Breach and the Observance. Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's* Hamlet *(1777–2001)* (Mathijssen 2007);
- the effect of literary translations on their readers: e.g. *Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsäquivalenz dargestellt an der Rezeption von Multatulis "Max Havelaar" und seinen deutschen Übersetzungen* (Stegeman 1991);
- the role of translations in the teaching of literature: e.g. *Enseigner les œuvres littéraires en traduction* (Chevrel 2007);
- the continuities and discontinuities between literature, translation and various processes of adaptation*, whereby the borders between media may or may not be crossed (see Audiovisual translation*).

Needless to say, this highly selective and randomly organized list doesn't even begin to do justice to the abundance of research avenues already taken or waiting to be further explored. Among other things, we need to specifically acknowledge the growing number of publications that take an openly critical, political or activist line in their approach of (literary) translation (see also Committed approaches and activism*). We have already alluded to the work carried out within the context of a postcolonial sensibility which specifically critiques the lingering Eurocentric or western bias in the study of translation. To this growing body of work, we need to add the authors who look at literary translation from the gender viewpoint (see Gender in translation*).

4. (Literary) discourses on (literary) translation

The epistemological skepticism of postmodernism and poststructuralism has in the past decades created an open discursive space in which the conventional distinction between "creative work" and "academic writing" is deconstructed. This is a reminder that discourse about literary translation is definitely not the exclusive privilege of academically-based researchers with a scholarly mindset. The translators themselves and authors have also written intriguing texts on the nature or functions of literary translation. In the days before Translation Studies got formally established as a discipline, practising translators were among the main writers about literary translation (prefaces, correspondence, treatises, and so on; see Paratexts**).

Much of this material is now being made available to us in anthologies. Some of these are very wide-ranging such as *Western Translation Theory from Herodotos to Nietzsche* (Robinson 1997) and *Translation: Theory and Practice. A Historical Reader* (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006), but anthologies of "prescientific" metatexts on literary translation can also adopt a narrower scope in terms of author, period and/or language. See, for instance, *Traduir Shakespeare. Les Reflexions dels Traductors Catalans* (Pujol 2007) or *Cent ans de théorie française de la traduction. De Batteux à Littré (1748–1847)* (D'hulst 1990).

4.1 Text and metatext

The question remains what status should be given to these "older" and "prescientific" discourses on translation produced by translators and authors. Should they be regarded as "object texts" to be correlated with the translations and then to be contextualized and discussed by scholars who are themselves operating on the methodologically higher ground of the descriptive "meta-level"? Or should they be allowed to frankly take their place among the "scholarly" pronouncements on translation,

claiming quite the same levels of metadiscursive interest and validity? If so, would this second course of action mean that the whole idea of distinguishing between object-level and meta-level has to be jettisoned?

The answer to this question depends very much on one's own epistemological position; it is bound to remain a matter of controversy. Be that as it may, one has the impression that the above-mentioned anthology by Weissbort and Eysteinsson (2006) is very much in tune with our postmodern times when we see that it includes fictional texts (e.g. the biblical story of the Tower of Babel and Jorge Luis Borges' "Pierre Menard, Author of Don Quichote") side by side with sternly academic selections (e.g. Jakobson, Even-Zohar, Snell-Hornby). From a methodological viewpoint these are very strange bedfellows indeed, but the editors of the anthology insist on emphasizing the continuity between the various voices speaking about translation: those of the "theoreticians" and those of the "practitioners", those of the "scholars" and those of the "artists".

4.2 Translation as literary criticism

It is not a coincidence that one of the two editors of the afore-mentioned anthology, Daniel Weissbort, had been actively involved in the strong American tradition of "literary translation workshops" at Iowa University and in other places from the 1960s onwards. These workshops brought poetry and translation together in sessions of close reading and creative writing that aimed to experience and recreate the singularity of each poem (somewhat in the spirit of the New Criticism). Such a project is a far cry from what would have been the more "scholarly" ambition of trying to formalize or explain the various translational choices in terms of general models, categories or theories.

The belief that literary meanings can be captured and communicated in their sameness in another language has since the 1960s progressively made way for a keen sense that the meanings of the source text are always elusive and that their representation in the translation is bound to remain provisional and problematic (a change that mirrors the paradigm shift in Literary Theory from the New Criticism to its de facto successor Deconstruction). But what has remained constant in this tradition of authors/translators reflecting on their art is the close, creative and personal involvement with literary texts and consequently the reluctance to sacrifice the unique intensity of these experiences on the scholarly altars of generalization, rationalization, logic or maximum neutrality. In her *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis* (1997) Marilyn Gaddis Rose introduces a hermeneutic and pedagogical practice she names "stereoscopic reading" which uses "both the original language text and one (or more) translations while reading and teaching. Stereoscopic reading makes it possible to intuit and reason out the interliminal" (p. 90) and it is this

"interliminality" which is "the gift translation gives to readers of literature" (p. 7). Translations and their study can thus be made to enhance the literary experience in a manner which defeats strict rationality and whose effect is therefore best suggested by metaphor or neologism ("interliminality").

Translators who draw on their own experience and who have written personally, eloquently and influentially on the art of literary translation are too many to name. Any recent list within the English-speaking world is likely to include Ezra Pound, Vladimir Nabokov, Robert Bly, Gregory Rabassa, Suzanne Jill Levine and Douglas Hofstadter. Outside English (but also, overwhelmingly, in English after it was first translated in 1968), Walter Benjamin's "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers" has to be singled out as a massively influential essay. It was initially published as a preface to his own translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens* from 1923. Benjamin's diffuse style and the abstract nature of his philosophical speculations (e.g. his concept of the "reine Sprache" or pure language which translation supposedly allows to shine through) have not stopped it from becoming "arguably the single most important piece of modern Translation Studies" (Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006: 297). Benjamin became a major source of inspiration to the adherents of hermeneutics* and deconstruction** especially. While never achieving a similar cult-like status, other twentieth-century literary translators outside the English sphere to have written influential prefaces and essays on their art include Valery Larbaud, Haroldo de Campos, Henri Meschonnic and Yves Bonnefoy.

Needless to say, their work should be distinguished from the practical handbooks that some practitioners and teachers of literary translation have written for the benefit of neophytes and in which in they explain the ins and outs of how to write a literary translation and how to get it published; an example of this hands-on approach would be *Literary Translation: a Practical Guide* by Clifford E. Landers (2001).

4.3 Multilingualism and translation as literary devices

We should note the growing interest in bilingual writing and in fictions that play out issues of multilingualism and translation* either through their emplotment within the fictional world or through some or other metafictional device. Indeed, translation is not merely something that happens "after" literature and as an extension of it. In many cases it is already present "within" the literary text as a component of the story content and perhaps even as a central theme. Considering writers such as Borges, Márquez and Vargas Llosa, and referring to translation critics such as Else Vieira, Rosemary Arrojo and Adriana Pagano, Edwin Gentzler (2008: 108) has argued that "translation is perhaps the *most* important topic in Latin American fiction, more important even than the widely circulated magic realism theme". But the theme is prevalent in original writing and critical work in other places too, as may be illustrated by the papers collected

in *Fictionalising Translation and Multilingualism* (Delabastita and Grutman 2005). As Michael Cronin (*Translation Goes to the Movies*, 2009) and others have recently demonstrated, it is no less present in cinematic fictions. Growing attention to these various crossovers between translation and fiction has led some to speak of a "fictional turn" in the discipline (see Turns of Translation Studies*).

A closely related area is that of literary multilingualism or heteroglossia (Grutman 1997). Many writers are bilinguals or even polyglots; they may have a cosmopolitan background, live in a bilingual country, or belong to a borderline situation. This may be expressed by the multilingual nature of their writings, whereby special attention needs to be given to the social presuppositions and values attached to each language and language variety represented in the text. It goes without saying that the translation of such multilingual texts creates quite unique translation difficulties. Just try to envisage the mind-boggling obstacles facing the translator of Shakespeare's *Henry V*, which combines among others, English, French, "broken" English spoken by French characters and "broken" French spoken by English characters, not to mention a range of regional accents (Delabastita 2002). We find that in many cases the interlingual tensions present in the source text are somehow diminished in translation. Whether their texts are multilingual or not, bilingual writers can engage in self-translation*, which raises fascinating questions about the status and primacy of these different versions (e.g. Tagore, Julien Green, Nabokov, Beckett, I.B. Singer, to name but a few). For recent and wide-ranging surveys of such issues, one may refer to *The Bilingual Text. History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (Hokenson & Munson 2007) or *Heterolingualism in/and Translation* (Meylaerts 2006).

References

Boase-Beier, Jean. 2006. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation.* Manchester: St Jerome.

Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2007. *How Does It Feel? Point of view in translation. The case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Brisset, Annie. 1996. *A Sociocritique of Translation. Theatre and Alterity in Quebec*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Chevrel, Yves (ed.). 2007. *Enseigner les œuvres littéraires en traduction*. Versailles: Centre Régional de Documentation Pédagogique de l'Académie de Versailles.

Classe, Olive (ed.). 2000. *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*. 2 vols. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Crisafulli, Edoardo. 2003. *The Vision of Dante. Cary's Translation of the "Divine Comedy"*. Market Harborough: Troubador Publishing.

Cronin, Michael. 2009. *Translation Goes to the Movies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Delabastita, Dirk. 2002. "A Great Feast of Languages: Shakespeare's Multilingual Comedy in *King Henry V* and the Translator." *The Translator* 8 (2): 303–340.

Delabastita, Dirk and Grutman, Rainier (eds). 2005. *Fictionalising Translation and Multilingualism*. Special issue of *Linguistica Antverpiensia* New Series 4. Antwerpen: Hogeschool Antwerpen, HIVT.

D'hulst, Lieven. 1990. *Cent ans de théorie française de la traduction. De Batteux à Littré (1748–1847)*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1978. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Literature and Translation*: *New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, James S Holmes, José Lambert & Raymond van den Broeck (eds), 117–127. Leuven: Acco.

Federici, Federico. 2009. *Translation as Stylistic Evolution: Italo Calvino Creative Translator of Raymond Queneau*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

France, Peter (ed.). 2000. *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

France, Peter & Gillespie, Stuart (eds) (2005-). *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*. Five volumes (in progress). Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Frank, Armin Paul & Turk, Horst (eds). 2004. *Die literarische Übersetzung in Deutschland: Studien zu ihrer Kulturgeschichte in der Neuzeit*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2008. *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory*. London/New York: Routledge.

Grutman, Rainier. 1997. *Des langues qui résonnent. L'hétérolinguisme au XIXe siècle québécois*. Montréal: Fides.

Hoenselaars, Ton (ed.). 2004. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation* (The Arden Shakespeare). London: Thomson.

Hokenson, Jan Walsh & Munson, Marcella. 2007. *The Bilingual Text. History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester/Kinderhook: St Jerome.

Kittel, Harald, et al. (eds). 2004–2010. *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*. 3 vols. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Lambert, José. 2006. *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation. Selected papers by José Lambert.* Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Reine Meylaerts & Lieven D'hulst. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Landers, Clifford E. 2001. *Literary Translation: a Practical Guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mathijssen, Jan Willem. 2007. *The Breach and the Observance. Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's* Hamlet (*1777–2001*). Utrecht: s.l.

Meylaerts, Reine (ed.). 2006. *Heterolingualism in/and Translation.* Special issue *Target* 18:1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mooneeram, Roshni. 2009. *From Creole to Standard. Shakespeare, Language, and Literature in a Post-colonial Context*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Orero, Pilar. 2007. *The Problem of Translating 'Jabberwocky': the Nonsense Literature of Lewis Carroll and Edward Lear and their Spanish Translators*. Lampeter/New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Pujol, Dídac. 2007. *Traduir Shakespeare. Les Reflexions dels Traductors Catalans.* Lleida: Punctum & Trilcat.

Rose, Marilyn Gaddis. 1997. *Translation and Literary Criticism*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Simon, Sherry. 2006. *Translating Montreal: Episodes in the Life of a Divided City*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Stegeman, Jelle. 1991. *Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsäquivalenz dargestellt an der Rezeption von Multatulis "Max Havelaar" und seinen deutschen Übersetzungen*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

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

Venuti, Lawrence. 2008 [1995]. 2nd edition. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Weissbort, Daniel & Eysteinsson, Astradur (eds). 2006. *Translation – Theory and Practice. A Historical Reader*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Medical translation and interpreting

Vicent Montalt
University Jaume I

One of the oldest types of translation, dating back to Ancient Mesopotamia, is that dealing with medicine. In subsequent civilizations it has played a major role in the construction and dissemination of medical knowledge through Greek, Latin, Arab, English and many other languages.

Medical knowledge is constructed, communicated and used in a great variety of contexts and situations, ranging from the highly specialized and interdisciplinary teams of researchers involved in ground-breaking projects, to health professionals of all kinds working together in clinical settings, to patients and the general public in their everyday lives. Knowledge mediation between communities of practice, social groups, languages and cultures has become a critical activity in medical and health care settings.

Traditionally, medical translation has been viewed mainly in terms of highly specialized texts and the terminological problems posed by them. In current professional practice, however, it is not restricted to highly specialized genres, but embraces many other communicative events in contexts ranging from clinical practice, to education, to popularizations of all kinds. Online information for patients, commentary on videos of surgical operations used in medical training and TV documentaries about medical innovations addressed to the general public all fall within the ambit of medical translation, which is no longer limited to the written mode but includes audiovisual and online, digital formats as well (Montalt forthcoming).

Medical translation refers to a specific type of scientific* and technical translation* that focuses on medicine and other fields closely related to health and disease such as nursery, public health, pharmacology, psychiatry, psychology, molecular biology, genetics and veterinary science. It shares a considerable number of key principles, concepts, methods and resources with the different types of interpreting and mediation in medical and health care contexts, as well as with scientific and technical translation.

Medical translation also has some specific features that distinguish it from other types of translation. In the first place, it is conditioned by the ethical codes of biomedical research and health care. Accuracy and reliability of the information contained in the texts, confidentiality and sensitivity towards patients are paramount. Secondly, most conceptual networks, terminological repertories, text genres, social contexts and resources are specific to medical and health care settings. Competence* in medical translation depends on being familiar with them all.

English is the main source language in medical translation practice because most biomedical research is published originally in this language and then transferred to clinical practice and education, and exported to other languages and cultures. For the same reason, it is an important target language: biomedical researchers from all over the world need to publish their results in English if they want to make them known to the international community.

1. Terminology

One of the most characteristic features of medical translation is terminology*. The language of medicine is full of terms based on Greek and Latin forms. They can refer to parts of the body, such as Greek "kraníon" or Latin "oculus"; to substances, such as Greek "glykys" or Latin "sebum"; to position in space and time, such as Greek "éktos" or Latin " infra"; to light and colour, such as Greek "glaukós" or Latin "albus"; to mention a few.

From the viewpoint of translation practice, there are two main tendencies in medical terminology: one towards standardization (*in vitro* terminology), the other towards variation (*in vivo* terminology) (Montalt & González 2007: 230–255). In addition to all Greek and Latin forms and terms, which are highly internationalized and vary only in spelling between modern languages, standardization also refers to all types of international classifications and nomenclatures, such as the International Classification of Diseases or the Nonproprietary Names of Pharmaceutical Substances, both published and promoted by the World Health Organization.

At the same time medical terminology is highly dynamic, constantly reflecting discoveries and innovations through neologisms. New terms giving names to new realities such as immunostain, drunkorexia, cyberchondria or unpatient (Navarro 2007) are frequent in medical texts and constitute one of the most challenging and time-consuming aspects of medical translation (Montalt, forthcoming). Dynamism and variation can also be seen in synonymy and, to a lesser degree, polysemy. One of the commonest forms of synonymy in languages such as English are the doublets formed by technical names and their popular equivalents, such as cephalalgia and headache, or hemorrhage and bleeding. Such synonyms may be a source of translation problems because languages are not symmetrical in their use: for example, what in Catalan or Spanish may be considered to be low register may be perfectly acceptable in English in the same text genre (Pilegaard calls this 'register mismatch', 1997: 171).

2. Genres

Understanding the content of the source text and finding the correct terminological equivalents are necessary but not, of themselves, sufficient to produce reliable and

appropriate translations. Knowledge about how texts work formally, socially and cognitively in the two languages and cultures involved is also required. For example, medical translators need to know how patient information leaflets may vary formally to comply with different legislation in different countries or regions. The same can be said about highly specialized genres such as biomedical patents or original articles in research journals. Translators who are familiar with these genres – their functions, their participants' expectations and needs, their typical structure, tenor, terminological usage and other conventions – can more confidently predict text progression and anticipate possible translation problems. They will have a better appreciation of the overall context and will find it easier to generate appropriate renderings for the target text and select more quickly from among them. Familiarity with genres can also be useful when adapting texts and writing original texts (Montalt, forthcoming).

Medical genres can be grouped by their social function in four general categories: research, professional, educational and commercial. Research genres are those used by researchers to communicate their findings and arguments: original articles, case reports, doctoral theses, etc. Professional genres comprise those used by health professionals in their everyday work: clinical guidelines, summaries of product characteristics, disease classifications, nomenclatures, vademecums, and all the documents contained in clinical histories, among others. Educational genres are used to teach and learn in a variety of contexts, from university courses to domestic situations: course books, fact sheets for patients, patient information leaflets, popularizing articles, and so on. And finally, commercial genres, used in buying and selling products or services of all kinds in the medical and healthcare sectors: drug advertisements, catalogues of medical equipment, press releases for new drugs, etc. (Montalt, forthcoming). For translators, familiarity with these genres is essential. They need to develop specific skills to enable them to deal with: terminology and specialized information resources; a great variety of textual and rhetorical devices that often vary between genres and languages; different health systems and organizations where these genres are used; diverse cultural concepts of health, disease and communication; and knowledge asymmetries between different discourse communities both within one language and between different languages that may involve changes of genre and original writing.

3. Research

Traditionally, research in medical translation has been limited to terminological equivalence and has had a prescriptive character, seeking to enhance the translator's ability to make choices at the lexical level. However, in spite of being one of the most productive types of translation in the professional arena, medical translation has not yet received much attention from researchers in Translation Studies. It is only in the

last decade and a half or so that some areas of enquiry have attracted attention and have produced some valuable insights.

Research into the history of medical translation is still in its infancy (with just a few flashbacks, such as those by Fischbach 1993). The teaching of medical translation (Wakabayashi 1996) and the competences that medical translation students should develop (Montalt & González 2007) have been analyzed in response to the need for specialized training. Register mismatches between languages and cultures have been approached descriptively from the point of view of medical terminology as a translation problem (Pilegaard 1997). Cross-linguistic/cultural aspects of communication in medical and health settings have interested a variety of researchers (Angelelli 2004). Interpersonal aspects reflected in medical genres – mainly epistemic and deontic modality – relevant to translation have been analyzed by means of corpora (Vihla 1999). From a more cognitive angle, conceptual metaphors and coherence in biomedical translation have been studied in order to map metaphors** as a translation problem** (Vandaele 2002). Research in readability, comprehension and patient literacy (Davis et al., 1990) is of particular relevance both to medical translation practice and Translation Studies because it is directly associated with *skopos*. More recently, specific aspects of given text genres have also attracted considerable attention – for example, theme-rheme structures in biomedical research articles, and moves and hedging devices in biomedical patents. Finally, researchers are beginning to examine sociological aspects of translation in medical and health settings, particularly the role of genres as social constructs in patient-centred environments.

References

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2004. *Medical interpreting and cross-cultural communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, Terry C. et al. 1990. "The gap between patient reading comprehension and the readability of patient education materials." *The Journal of Family Practice* 31 (5): 533–538.

Fischbach, Henry. 1993. "Translation, the Great Pollinator of Science: A Brief Flashback on Medical Translation." In: Sue Ellen Wright & L.D. Wright, 89–100. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Montalt, Vicent & González, Maria. 2007. *Medical Translation Step by Step. Learning by Drafting.* Manchester, UK/Kinderhook (NY), USA: St. Jerome.

Montalt, Vicent (forthcoming). "Medical Translation." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Carol A. Chappelle (ed.). Wiley-Blackwell: New Jersey & Oxford.

Navarro, Fernando. 2007. "Minidiccionario crítico de dudas." *Panace@* 9 (26): 108–115.

Pilegaard, Morten. 1997. "Translation of Medical Research Articles." In *Text Typology and Translation*, Anne Trosborg (ed), 159–183. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vandaele, Sylvie. 2002. "Métaphores conceptuelles en traduction biomédicale et cohérence." *TTR* 15 (1): 223–239.

Vihla, Minna. 1999. *Medical Writing. Modality in Focus.* Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
Wakabayashi, Judith. 1996. "Teaching Medical Translation." *Meta* 41 (3): 356–365.

Further reading

Delisle, Jean & Woodsworth, Judith. 1993. *Translators through History.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Fischbach, Henry (ed). 1998. *Translation and Medicine. American Translators Association*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Gutiérrez-Rodilla, Bertha. 1998. *La ciencia empieza en la palabra. Análisis e historia del lenguaje científico.* Barcelona: Península.
Montalt, Vicent & González, Maria. 2007. *Medical Translation Step by Step. Learning by Drafting.* Manchester, UK/Kinderhook (NY), USA: St. Jerome.

Metaphors for translation

James St. André
University of Manchester

Given that the original meaning of the term "translation" in various European languages is itself a metaphor (usually for "to carry over" or "to bring over"), it should not be surprising that metaphorical language has commonly been used to describe the translation process* in many different cultures and time periods. Indeed, Guldin (2010) argues that the two terms translation and metaphor are deeply homologous, seeing them at once as translations of each other and also as metaphors for each other. The multiplication of metaphorical expressions to describe translation is bewildering in its variety: from witticisms such as "*les belles infidèles*" (beautiful traitresses) and "*traduttori, traditore*" (translator traitor); simple and widely applied metaphors such as the translator as a bridge between cultures or translation as the process of pouring old wine into new bottles; positive metaphors such as bearing truthful witness or alchemy; negative ones such as the translator as slave to the author or copyist; passive metaphors such as mirror or conduit; active ones such as maestro or master chef; to more outré ones such as the translator as bumblebee or a blind man describing an elephant.

The rise of logical positivism in the twentieth century and the intellectual cachet of 'science' in all fields of knowledge in the post-war period led to a move away from figurative language of all kinds, including metaphors, and toward more 'straightforward' descriptive definitions. Yet despite the pressure from scientific discourse and other factors (see St. André 2010), from the 1990s to the present there has been growing attention paid to the ways in which metaphors play a crucial role in many fields of human endeavour, including Translation Studies*. An important article by D'hulst (1992) demonstrated that definitions that on the surface may seem simply descriptive, such as "translation is a process of communication", actually rest on metaphors; furthermore, there has been no dearth of new metaphors since the emergence of Translation Studies as a discipline in the 1950s, including recent debates over the nature of translation. Recent publications bear D'hulst out when he says that metaphors continue to play a crucial role in the field of Translation Studies (Round 2005; St. André 2010).

This renewed interest in metaphors of translation can be related directly to two developments in the study of metaphoric language on a more general level.

First, there is growing recognition in the sciences that metaphors can be useful, not just as a tool to explain an already proven hypothesis, but also to develop new

models and paradigms. An example is the billiard-ball model for the behaviour of gases, whereby the manner in which billiard balls ricochet off each other and the sides of the table is used to conceptualize the way in which gas molecules behave as they move about in three-dimensional space. Various essays in Ortony (1979) see metaphors in science being used in the construction of new theoretical models, in the ensuing battle to persuade others to adopt the resulting 'paradigm shift', and finally for pedagogical purposes (textbooks, for example) after the new paradigm has been accepted. In particular, they point out that there is often a root or "constitutive" metaphor which may produce a whole subset of related metaphors and/or ideas regarding an activity.

In Translation Studies, several works look at major constitutive metaphors. Hermans (2002) looks at translation as mirror or reflection, while Chamberlain (2000) discusses various existing gendered metaphors, such as the translator as wife, handmaiden or lover. These historical studies have tended to emphasize the negative implications of existing metaphors and how translators and translation are denigrated by them. Morini (2006), who deals with the clothing metaphor, puts more emphasis on the way in which changes in thinking about translation are reflected in the ways in which the metaphors are re-interpreted or discarded in favour of new ones. Still other studies either advocate more positive, empowering metaphors or propose new ones in an effort to influence the way in which translation is perceived (Tyulenev 2010 on translation as smuggling; St. André 2010 on translation as cross-identity performance; Henitiuk 2010 on translation as squeezing a jellyfish).

In some cases, this empowerment may be accomplished through a process of re-interpreting what was originally a negative metaphor (St. André 2010). The translator as slave labouring on another person's land traditionally summons up images of a lack of freedom, tiring drudgery, and not owning the result of one's labour. Yet from a postcolonial perspective (see Post-colonial literatures and translation*), this metaphor can be re-read from the slave's point of view: the slaves may be wily and trick the master, or be lazy, or find ways to steal or hide part of what they produce. They may also undermine or resist the master; finally, we may argue that the slaves are more important than the master, because it is the slaves' labour that produces all the wealth, and urge them to rebel.

A second development in thinking about metaphor was the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) on the role of conceptual metaphors. By conceptual metaphors they meant basic templates, often based on bodily experience, which were then used in a wide variety of ways to help us understand the world around us. Far from seeing metaphorical language as new, strange, or unusual, they emphasized the fact that we used metaphorical language all the time. These metaphors, which had often been referred to as dead metaphors, have in fact been demonstrated to be vital to our world view.

These insights have been applied in Translation Studies by several scholars. Roy (1993) explores the role of translation as conduit in interpreting. As with some of the studies of constitutive metaphors, Roy emphasizes the harm that this metaphor seems to have caused to the status of interpreters, and suggests that we should use more positive ones such as helper or facilitator. Halverson (1999) looks at early English terms for translation and discusses the underlying conceptual metaphors, mainly related to transfer. More recently, Celia Martín de León (2010) discusses the transfer* metaphor and the imitation/action metaphor in texts from the late medieval and early Renaissance period.

There is thus a tendency for scholars to see existing conceptual and constitutive metaphors as passive (if the translator is a conduit, then she or he is something that the message passes through without change), disempowering, and emphasizing the mechanical role of translation. The hope seems to be that a substitution of more active, positive, and empowering metaphors (facilitator, actor, musical conductor) in the public discourse on translation might help to improve the status of translators and interpreters.

In terms of time period studied, much of the scholarship to date has concentrated on classical, medieval, and Renaissance uses of metaphor; see for example Tymoczko (2010) for an overview from classical antiquity through the medieval period, Hermans (1985) for the late medieval and Renaissance period, and Morini (2006) on Tudor England. In terms of geographic coverage, little has been published in English on metaphors of translation outside of Europe (see Tymoczko 2010 for some discussion).

St. André (2010) provides an annotated bibliography for most works in English and French.

References

Chamberlain, Lori. 2000. "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti (ed.), 314–29. London/New York: Routledge.

D'Hulst, Lieven. 1992. "Sur le rôle des métaphores en traductologie contemporaine." *Target* 4 (1): 33–51.

De León, Celia Martín. 2010. "Metaphorical Models of Translation: Transfer vs Imitation and Action." In *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, James St. André (ed.), 75–108. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Guldin, Rainer. 2010. "Metaphor as a Metaphor for Translation." In *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, James St. André (ed.), 161–91. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Henitiuk, Valerie. 2010. "Squeezing the Jellyfish: Early Western Attempts to Characterize Translation from the Japanese." In *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, James St. André (ed.), 144–60. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hermans, Theo. 1985. "Images of Translation. Metaphor and Imagery in the Renaissance Discourse on Translation." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, Theo Hermans (ed.), 103–36. London: Croom Helm.

Hermans, Theo. 2002. "Translation's Representation." In *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 4: Building Bridges*, Eva Hung (ed.), 3–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morini, Massimiliano. 2006. *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*. London: Ashgate.

Ortony, Andrew (ed.). 1979. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Round, Nicholas. 2005. "Translation and its Metaphors: The (N+1) Wise Men and the Elephant." *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 1 (1): 47–69.

Roy, Cynthia B. 1993. "The Problem with Definitions, Descriptions, and the Role Metaphors of Interpreters." In *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, Franz Pöchhacker & Myriam Shlesinger (eds), 344–53. London: Routledge.

St. André, James (ed.). 2010. *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Tyulenev, Sergey. 2010. "Translation as Smuggling." In *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, James St. André (ed), 241–74. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1993. "The Double Role of a Dialogue Interpreter." In *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, Franz Pöchhacker & Myriam Shlesinger (eds), 354–71. London: Routledge.

Methodology in Translation Studies

Peter Flynn & Yves Gambier
Lessius University College / University of Turku

Methodology could be defined as the study of or the body of knowledge relating to method(s). Viewed in other terms, it can be considered as the hallmark or defining feature of a discipline or an approach within a discipline. In this respect any methodology is the site of constant contention, refinement and re-evaluation (Kuhn 1962). So strictly speaking, a discussion of methodology should also include the position(ing) (Marcus 1998: 98) of the scholar or school with regard to it, both inside any given approach and other approaches adjacent to it and within the discipline as a whole. This has been the case in Translation Studies*, viz. the long-standing debate on the use and effectiveness of the Liberal Arts Paradigm and Empirical Science Paradigm (Gile 2005) in tackling and understanding translational and interpreting phenomena. The same holds for the various turns* in Translation Studies, all of which are manifestations of its attempt to expand, define and establish itself as a specific academic discipline (Snell-Hornby 2006).[1] Furthermore, an awareness of positioning and its ethical and political implications for researchers has given rise to studies in this area (see Committed approaches and activism*; Gender and translation*; Political translation*; Post-colonial literatures and translation*).[2] All of these turns have brought changes in methodology with them or have rejected previous approaches and their respective methodologies. As Interpreting Studies* has developed and outlined its own methodological concerns, the discussion that follows will focus on translation.

Many disciplines within the humanities borrow concepts and methodologies from each other. Given the complexity of translation* proper and the numerous ways of approaching it as an object of study, translation scholars often adapt methodologies from elsewhere and tailor them to fit the data, practices, situations and population they are examining. These methodologies are built on a set of sometimes unarticulated assumptions and previously articulated givens and concepts that often are at odds with translation data. Historically speaking within Translation Studies, these adaptations

1. For related debates on developments within the humanities in general and sociology in particular, see Bourdieu 2001.

2. For a discussion of the main issues in the debate on reflexivity and research, see also Marcus 1998: 181–202.

have arisen from former inroads into comparative linguistics and literature or more recently from forays into sociology and cultural and post-colonial studies. Such adaptations are not without their perils, particularly given the fact that Translation Studies has gradually identified and articulated its own basic assumptions, methodological concerns, research criteria and questions. As Michaela Wolf points out in Sociology of translation*, there is indeed a danger in "outsourc[ing] the problem of methodology". In this respect, a given methodology cannot be disassociated from the phenomena it has been designed to scrutinise or a fortiori from the concerns of the scholars who have drawn up the method in the first place. Among other things, outsourcing the problem of methodology to other disciplines may cause us to lose track of the intricate links between (translation) phenomena and method. This would further involve our forsaking the rigour required to adapt and fine-tune a method in order to increase its explanatory power with regard to a particular set of data under scrutiny, in our case translation data in whichever form.

1. Data types and methodologies

The form of translation data under scrutiny will already give us an indication of which method of investigation to use. In what follows an attempt will be made to draw up an overall scheme of approaches to translation, moving from more general relations of data and method to specific data sets and their related methodologies.

In tracing developments in Translation Studies over the past thirty years one can notice a growing interest in studying the socio-cultural contexts in which translation is carried out. Translation indeed intersects with a multiplicity of other (language) activities ranging from highly institutionalised practices like (international) law (see Legal translation*), politics, education (see Curriculum*; Language learning and translation*; Translation didactics*) and science (see Scientific translation*; Technical translation*) through various forms of (multinational) business and media communication (see Journalism and translation*; Audiovisual translation*) and translation for the arts (see Drama translation*; Literary translation**) to lesser visible everyday interaction, including translation in the informal economy. In this respect scholars have expanded their focus to include such complex contextual factors, next to studying individual translations or bodies of translated text, all with a view to enhancing the explanatory power of their studies and hence increasing our understanding of translation as a socio-cultural fact.

Within the complexity touched on above we can already recognise a number of basic factors relating to translation, each with its own set of methodological implications, i.e. discourses, practices, contexts and actors, not to mention the intricate relations between them. Given these intricate relations, it is important to note here that

the four factors, i.e. discourses, practices, contexts and actors have been separated out from the messy reality of translation for methodological purposes only.

1.1 Discourses

Translation discourses are understood here in the broadest possible sense as including translations as such, all the (multilingual) interaction involved in bringing about these translations and all subsequent comment, evaluation or explanation coinciding with or issuing from translations. Traditionally speaking, translation scholars have often used qualitative approaches in studying literary texts, then moving on to other genres, which in fact form the bulk of translation work worldwide. Such studies have been helped enormously by the advent of powerful computers that can treat large bodies of source and target texts or translation corpora. Corpora, their construction and analysis, along with the findings gleaned from corpora and their interpretation, have brought with them their own set of methodological concerns (see Corpora*). Under the heading of discourse we can also include compilations and studies of historical writings on translation (Robinson 2002, among others). Contemporary studies of such discourse often draw on modern recording techniques like audio and video to record structured or unstructured interviews or talks with individuals or focus groups. Among the methodological concerns related to such studies are issues of face-to-face interaction and the nature and form of the knowledge being co-constructed in such interactions. Discourse of this type can also be obtained through open questions in (on-line) surveys. Such discourses, whether in written or in spoken form, have been subjected to various forms of analysis including (critical) discourse analysis, studies in narrative, gender and power analyses, etc.

1.2 Practices

Next to actual translation activities as such, practices are understood here as also comprising a multiplicity of factors that go along or coincide with these activities, including the theories, ad hoc, fully developed or otherwise, informing the activities and the tools used in the process. Studies of norms or ethics in or the various functions of translation are mainly based on the assumption that translations and their related 'paratexts'** (translators' comments, forwards and prefaces to translated works, etc.) are actual entextualisations of particular translation practices at given times and places in the world. It then remains to be discovered whether and to which extent the norms or ethics revealed actually reflect common translation practices at a given time and place. Here we can see how it is impossible to separate discourses from practices in the real world. In more recent studies, scholars have used Bourdieu's framework (Bourdieu 1980) – not without criticism and adaptation – to explain practices in terms of a translator's habitus in a given subfield of translation.

A translator's habitus would typically include a set of embodied translational practices, either acquired through formal training or through experience or both. As translators often specialise, they often know or have to learn the best way to go about things in their subfield. In this way, they can accumulate (or even sometimes lose) what Bourdieu called forms of capital. This not only involves economic capital (monetary gain) but also symbolic capital like, prestige, recognition, etc., or cultural capital like knowledge, expertise, etc. Such forms of capital are intricately linked to forms of practice. These notions have often been used in studying literary translation but can be equally applied in studying other subfields of translation. In contemporary studies, aspects of practices can be observed in situ by using qualitative methods such as (participant) observation and think-aloud protocols*, for example. Various aspects of practice can also studied by using modern computer tools like screen and key loggers, and eye tracking software to gather quantitative data (see Cognitive approaches*; Translation process*). The accumulated capital resulting from particular practices can be understood as forms of validation of such practices.

1.3 Contexts

The contexts involved, which are as various in nature as translations, are not considered here as fixed or static givens encompassing or surrounding translation, but rather as sets of factors, both "real" and discursive that need to be established by empirical study in each case. Context is understood as being real and also as being co-constructed through discourse. An example of this would be a translation agency (see Agents of translation**). An agency will typically have its own working space and operate globally or locally or both. But it will also present itself and its ethos discursively to its clients: how it perceives/constructs the subfield of operations and the best practices involved. In this way those running the agency help shape the context in which they work.

The further we go back in history the harder it becomes to determine the contexts of translation activity or to trace the actors involved. In the main, we only have recourse to written materials found in books and archives, all of which requires the rigour of historical inquiry (see Translation history*). Next to explorations of older periods, studies have been made of actual translations in colonial and post-colonial contexts and of a range of issues related to the contexts of these translations and the actors involved, not least the colonial institutions commissioning translations or individuals and groups translating in resistance or compliance to orders of hegemony extant at the time. Many of these studies draw on insights from other disciplines like cultural studies, post-colonial studies, (critical) discourse analysis and narrative, building and problematising the classical role of the translator as cultural mediator or bridge builder. Others draw on insights from sociology and ethnography in laying bare translation practices in given cultural spaces and periods.

Determining contexts in contemporary situations is no easy task either. With increased activity over the internet and other global media, context cannot be considered as being framed by regional or national borders. Again this needs to be determined by study in each case. Furthermore, as was argued above in the case of the translation agency, scholars have increasingly come to consider context as also being constructed and maintained by actors working in given institutional or cultural spaces (Goodwin & Duranti 1992). In this respect contexts to have be considered along with the actors who participate in them.

1.4 Actors

The term actors cannot be reduced solely to "the translator" and includes all those involved in a translation event, some of whom will have a greater impact on the event than others (Latour 2005). Actors have been traditionally considered as belonging to the same language or cultural community (see below), but given the existence of on-line or virtual communities, whose members are scattered across the globe, this can hardly be the case. These insights will most probably change our views on traditional communities. In this respect, scholars have turned to such notions as "communities of practice" (Wenger 1998) (see Networking and volunteer translators*). As was already mentioned in relation to practices, various aspects of actor participation can be observed by using qualitative methods such as (participant) observation, think-aloud protocols* or by using modern computer tools like screen and key loggers, and eye tracking software to gather quantitative data (see Cognitive approaches*; Translation process*). It goes without saying that these overlapping factors have been identified and set apart for methodological purposes only, that in the real world they coincide and are in fact inseparable.

Functional approaches* to Translation Studies had already identified a set of criteria for examining translation as a form of social action, viz. the various features of Skopos Theory, for example. These features can be used as specific nodes of inquiry, the theory as a whole providing a methodological framework in which to place various sets of data collected. It must be pointed out, however, that the researcher should not consider this theory as a catch-all self-explanatory system and forget the specifics of the subfield under investigation, including the genres being translated within it. In this respect, the explanatory power of functional approaches can be further enhanced by quantitative and qualitative analyses. Here too, the various roles involved are not givens and also need to be established through study.

1.5 A Family Snapshot: Viewing the four factors together

To recapitulate, two main methods of analysis can be used to study any of the four factors outlined above: quantitative or qualitative or a combination of the two. Listed

under quantitative methods we have noted surveys, (cloze) tests, corpus analyses, key-logging, eye-tracking, screen-logging and related statistical analyses. Under qualitative methods we have noted various forms of text and discourse analysis, narrative and related studies, interviews with individuals or focus groups, think-aloud protocols, ethnographies*, inquiries into power, gender and other sets of relations.

Again, no matter where and how translation takes place, be it carried out by those working for the United Nations or the European Parliament or by an immigrant child helping her parents buy a piece of furniture at a local store in the "new" language, it is and remains inherently complex (see Natural translator and interpreter**). Scholars will therefore examine the literature for descriptions or definitions of translation that will allow them to frame the phenomena they plan to study. It is safe to assume that such descriptions and definitions will include these four factors to varying degrees or may foreground one or two of them. Once the prominent factors have been identified in the description of the phenomena, particular methods of analysis will then suggest themselves. Take this quote on 'translatorship' by Gideon Toury, for example:

> Consequently, 'translatorship' amounts first and foremost to being able to *play a social role*, i.e., to fulfil a function allotted by a community -- to the activity, its practitioners and/or their products -- in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. The acquisition of a set of norms for determining the suitability of that kind of behaviour, and for manoeuvring between all the factors which may constrain it, is therefore a prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment[3]."
>
> (Toury 1995:53)

The quote can be understood as a succinct family snapshot of translation and was formulated with a view to studying norms in translation. Nonetheless, it comprises a whole programme of research for translation scholars and hence brings with it a set of methodological questions and implications. The main term in the quote is 'translatorship' which can be broken down into the four factors and examined accordingly. The suffix *-ship* added to the word translator implies, among other things, the "quality or condition", the "status" or the "competence" pertaining to individual translators or groups of translators (practices and actors). "Quality or condition, status and competence" are all aspects that are recognised to varying degrees in a society and its institutions (discourses, practices and contexts). In relation to translators, this recognition can take various forms, ranging from institutionalised training and certification to broader types of consensus and recognition in particular social groups which become manifest in such things as awards, prizes, prestige, etc. All of this can

3. See Katan 2004 on translation and culture. For a discussion of various interpretations of the term as such, see Duranti 2001.

be considered as forms of accumulated capital in the Bourdieusian sense (actors, practices and contexts). Competences* are developed through training and practice, or even through practice alone, and status is adjudicated and proclaimed either institutionally through accreditation or by popular consent and acclaim (actors, contexts, practices). It can still be argued, despite the growing number of institutes of higher education offering programmes in translator training, that the condition or quality of being a translator need not necessarily be the consequence of institutional training and certification. Again this is an empirical matter which has to be determined by examining it in the light of any of the four factors.

So, one can ask what is understood by "translatorship" in institutional terms. Here both quantitative and qualitative methods can be used to study the discourses, practices, actors and institutional contexts involved[4]. One can then ask what "translatorship" means outside the institution, when the knowledge and competences developed during training are put into practice and further developed. It is then that translators learn to play a more complex social role (Toury 1995: 23) outside the relatively protected educational environment they have come from. Here too other institutions (e.g. European Commission and Parliament, government translation agencies, etc.) and associations (international, national or regional associations of translators and interpreters) may play an important part in defining and regulating what this social role means in practice (see Institutional translation**). One could then ask what "translatorship" means in an even broader social sense. Which form does this social role then take. Again the four factors discussed above can be used as separate lines of inquiry. It must be noted, however, these four factors once examined in the various setting mentioned till now may reveal conflicting views on what translation, "translatorship" and social role mean.

Translators' social roles become visible or manifest in their discourses, practices, the contexts in which they work and which they help to construct and maintain, along with the networks of actors they are involved in. Once again these factors can be approached and examined qualitatively or quantitatively or both, which has given rise to a whole array of studies ranging from (on-line) surveys of the profession to ethnographic studies of translators at the European Commission. Following the cultural turn in Translation Studies, the social role and status** of translators has been studied from a variety of perspectives, most of which have mainly used qualitative approaches to explore power and gender differentials and imbalances.

4. For a detailed set of areas and aspects on which qualitative and quantitative studies can be carried out, see "Competences for professional translators", DG Translation, European Union at http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/index_en.htm (25/01/2011)

2. Concluding remarks

With regard to how quantitative and qualitative methods may complement each other, we would like to point out the following: quantitative methods can be used to gather large amounts of data on a variety of subjects, e.g. the number books or documents translated at a given place or time, findings from large and smaller scale corpora, views or opinions on a variety of translation issues in a group or society, etc. Qualitative methods, like discourse and text analysis, in-depth interviews, etc. can be used to discover less visible theorising, ideologies, political and other stances on gender and power that quantitative studies like focussed surveys may not reveal. In this respect, each approach can be used to expand on or provide more depth to findings from the other. As regards using a combined approach, this would perhaps be far too time consuming and labour intensive for the individual researcher, and hence would seem more appropriate in group research projects. Whether the research project is being carried out by an individual or by a group, triangulation can be used both within and across quantitative and qualitative research methods to reduce bias and heighten explanatory power. This would involve, among other things, using various methods to gather data, having the same phenomenon investigated by multiple researchers or using various theories to explain the findings gleaned from a study.

References

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Science de la science et réflexivité. Cours du Collège de France, 2000–2001*. Paris: Raisons d'agir.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1980. *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Les éditions de minuit.

Duranti, Alessandro. 2001. *Linguistic anthropology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gile, Daniel. 2005. *Research issues in Translation Studies*. Online reference materials. European Society for Translation Studies at http://www.est-translationstudies.org/publications/publications.html [Accessed 3 February 2011]

Goodwin, Charles & Alessandro Duranti (eds). 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katan, David. 2004. 2nd edition. *Translating cultures: an introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Robinson, Douglas (ed.). 1997. *Western translation theory. From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge U.K/ New York: Cambridge University Press.

Further reading

Briggs, Charles L. 2002. "Interviewing, Power/Knowledge, and Social Inequality." In *Handbook of Interview Research Context & Method*, F. Jaber (eds), 911–922. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Holliday, Adrian. 2007. *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.

Jaber, F. Gubrium, J.F & Holstein, J.A. (eds). 2002. *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Singleton, Royce & Straits, Bruce C. 2010. *Approaches to Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minority languages and translation

Albert Branchadell
Autonomous University of Barcelona

Any discussion of minority languages and translation must begin with a suitable definition of "minority language". Since Translation Studies* has not provided a definition of its own, we must rely on definitions forged in other fields. A quite operative definition, sociolinguistic in origin, is the one enshrined in the single international treaty devoted to the protection of minority languages, namely the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. According to the Charter, "regional or minority languages" means languages that are both *(i)* traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state's population and *(ii)* different from the official language(s) of that state, on the understanding that such definition *(iii)* does not include either dialects of the official language(s) of the state or the languages of migrants. According to this definition, the term "minority language" is not to be confused with "minor language", as it is used (for instance) in the journal *MTM. Minor Translating Major – Major Translating Minor – Minor Translating Minor*.

As Michael Cronin observed in a pioneering paper, what becomes clear is that *minority* "is a relation not an essence" (1995: 86). First, the concept is relative in numerical terms: no matter how large, minority languages are spoken by *fewer* people than a corresponding majority language. Second, the term is relative in political and historical terms: the minority – majority asymmetry takes place in a given state and under given (changing) circumstances. This has a methodologically inconvenient consequence: the *same* language can be a minority language in one state but a majority language in another state. For Translation Studies, the more interesting cases are what we could label as "absolute minority languages", that is, minority languages that are not presently used as a majority language in any state. This is the case of the vast majority of the world's languages. Cronin (1995: 87f) has pointed out that "all languages are potentially minority languages"; to be more exact, one should say that most languages *are* actually minority languages.

Once a suitable definition is at hand, the question arises as to why Translation Studies should care about minority languages at all. As in John F. Kennedy's inaugural address, we should ask not what translation can do for minority languages but rather what minority languages can do for translation. This issue was settled by Gideon Toury in a seminal paper. For Toury (1985: 7), the main justification for isolating "translation into minority languages" as an object of study is the assumption that they constitute

"weak target systems". As such, they "offer a unique opportunity to detect translational mechanisms in a more or less bare form […]. Regularities thus uncovered may well throw light on basic traits of the process of translating in general (see Translation process*) and may contribute to the elaboration of the theory of translation itself". After Toury, a number of scholars have concurred with this argument. It is striking to notice that two decades after Toury's paper Millán-Varela (2004) repeated his stance almost literally: texts translated into minority languages are supposed to be "an ideal arena in which to explore translating processes".

The contribution of translation to minority languages was also tackled in this seminal paper. According to Toury (1985: 7), translating "may certainly serve as a means for both actual preservation and development" of minority languages in their endeavor to "resist displacement" by the corresponding majority languages. This flows naturally towards Lawrence Venuti's conception of translation as a cultural political practice and clearly intersects with the translation-and-power connection so familiar to postcolonial translation scholars. But Toury (1985: 7f) warned that translation has a double edge: too much translating can bring about an undesired amount of interference. Cronin (1995: 89) aptly summarized the "fundamentally paradoxical" relationship of minority languages with translation: "As languages operating in a multilingual world with vastly accelerated information flows from dominant languages, they must translate continually in order to retain their viability and relevance as living languages. Yet, translation itself may in fact endanger the very specificity of those languages that practice it". Others have stressed the same paradox. Millán-Varela (2003), for instance, argued that translation "contributes to processes of linguistic and cultural normalisation while it is a painful reminder of the existence of asymmetrical relations of power". This double role is well known to scholars working within postcolonialism, where the notion that translation takes place between cultures that maintain asymmetrical power relations is a paramount theme.

Despite Toury's 1985 expectations of the contribution of minority languages to the theory of translation, in the past 25 years minority languages have not been a central object of attention within mainstream Translation Studies. In Mark Shuttleworth's *Dictionary of Translation Studies* there is no entry for "minority language". The same is true of the first edition of Mona Baker's *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Neither is there an entry for "minority language" in Sin-wai Chan's *A Dictionary of Translation Technology*. Nevertheless, certain efforts have been made. A groundbreaking moment was the publication of an issue of *The Translator* on minority translation edited by Venuti. In his contribution, Cronin proclaimed the interplay of minority languages and translation to be "the single, most important issue in Translation Studies today" (1998: 151). In fact, the notion of minority Venuti had in mind was not specifically linguistic, and despite Cronin's contribution the volume fell short of opening up a tangible venue of research to substantiate his claim. In 2005 the edited volume

Less Translated Languages (Branchadell and West) became the first monograph ever to devote a substantial part of its content to minority *language* translation. In the introduction to this innovative collection, a certain effort was made to chart the state of the field and to situate minority language translation within the so-called "cultural turn" in mainstream Translation Studies and the subsequent "power turn" advocated by certain scholars (see Turns of Translation Studies*).

This relative neglect notwithstanding, there is more research and reflection on minority language translation than meets the eye. To begin with, there is valuable research on minority language translation that is overlooked simply because it is not written in the English tongue. Yet even if we confine ourselves to works in English, we are beginning to have a respectable body of literature on this topic. Whereas certain attempts have been made at developing a theory of minority language translation (witness González-Millán 1996), probably the most noteworthy scholarly contributions lie not with the general theory of translation but rather with particular case studies. In the area of literary translation**, one finds some remarkable monographs. For Irish (regarded a minority language despite its status – largely symbolic – as Ireland's first official language), Michael Cronin's *Translating Ireland* (1996) deserves to be named a landmark. For Scots, John Corbett's *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation: A History of Literary Translation into Scots* (1999) and Bill Findlay's *Frae Ither Tongues: Essays on Modern Translation into Scots* (2004) are two outstanding contributions. Carmen Millán-Varela is the author of a PhD dissertation on literary translation into Galician (1999). Some research papers are also worth mentioning. Languages as diverse as Basque, Catalan, Corsican, Galician, Gbaya, Khasi, Oriya, Romansch, Scots, and Welsh have all been dealt with in at least one noteworthy paper.

If we leave literary translation aside, in our globalised and technological world Machine Translation* (MT) is an expanding mode of translation where minority languages have won their day. Starting from a 1987 paper by Janet Barnes ("A User Perspective on Computer-Assisted Translation for Minority Languages"), through a number of contributions by leading MT scholar Harold Somers, one could say that nowadays there is a whole branch of Machine Translation studies devoted to minority languages. Noteworthy in this connection is the interest group SALTMIL (Speech And Language Technology for Minority Languages). For instance, the 5th Workshop (2006) focused on "Strategies for developing machine translation for minority languages". Another area in which translation in general is especially prominent nowadays is the audiovisual media (see Audiovisual translation*). The contributions by Eithne O'Connell are of crucial interest. As in other areas, advocacy and research often go hand in hand: witness the works sponsored by the Mercator Media Centre such as Jones (2001).

This is no place to establish any research agenda, but some wishes (by way of conclusion) are not entirely out of place. First of all, the desirability remains for a theory

of minority language translation. As for case studies, hundreds of minority languages are still awaiting scientific consideration. Attention should be paid also to translation *from* minority languages into languages of wider communication; if translation benefits minority languages as TL it also benefits them as SL. On the other hand, the notion of minority language should also be broadened to include both non-traditional languages (Lingala in Belgium) and regional varieties of traditional ones (West Flemish). And translation *between* minority languages should also become a matter of scientific interest. In the Translation Studies landscape there is ample room for a series (not just a volume) titled *Minority Language Translation*.

References

Branchadell, Albert & West, Lovell M. (eds). 2005. *Less Translated Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cronin, Michael. 1995. "Altered States: Translation and Minority Languages." *TTR* 8: 85–103.

Cronin, Michael. 1996. *Translating Ireland: Translation, Languages, Cultures*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Cronin, Michael. 1998. "The Cracked Looking Glass of Servants. Translation and Minority Languages in a Global Age." In *Translation and Minority,* Lawrence Venuti (ed.), 145–62. Special issue of *The Translator* 4 (2). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

González-Millán, X. 1996. "Towards a Theory of Translation for 'Marginal' Literary Systems. The Galician Situation." In *The Knowledges of the Translator*, M. Coulthard & P. Odber de Baubeta (eds), 279–90. Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.

Jones, George. 2001. "Linguistic Minorities and Audiovisual Translation." http://www.aber.ac.uk/cgi-bin/mercator/images/linguistic_minorities_and_audiov.pdf [Accessed 7 June 2011]

Millán-Varela, Carmen. 2003. "'Minor' Needs or The Ambiguous Power of Translation." In *Minority Languages in Europe. Frameworks, Status, Prospects,* Gabrielle Hogan-Brun & Stefan Wolff (eds), 155–72. Houndmills/New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Millán-Varela, Carmen. 2004. "Hearing voices: James Joyce, narrative voice and minority translation." *Language and Literature* 13: 37–54.

Toury, Gideon. 1985. "Aspects of translating into minority languages from the point of view of Translation Studies." *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 4: 3–10.

Venuti, Lawrence (ed.). 1998. *Translation and Minority*. Special issue of *The Translator* 4 (2). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Further reading

Millán-Varela, Carmen. 2000. "Translation, Normalisation and Identity in Galicia(n)." *Target* 12 (2): 267–82.

O'Connell, Eithne. 2000. *Minority Language Dubbing for Children*. Unpublished doctoral thesis Dublin: DCU = O'Connell, Eithne. 2003. *Minority Language Dubbing for Children: Screen Translation from German into Irish*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

O'Connell, Eithne. 2007. "Translation and Minority Language Media – Potential and Problems: An Irish Perspective." In *Minority Language Media. Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies*, Mike Cormack & Niamh Hourigan (eds), 212–28. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pattanaik, Diptiranjan. 2000. "The Power of Translation: A Survey of Translation in Orissa." In *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, Sherry Simon & Paul St-Pierre (eds), 71–86. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Zabaleta, Jesus M. 1991. "Hedadura txiki eta ertalneko hizkuntzetako itzulpena aztertzeko zenbait aldagai bakantzeko saloa." *Senez. Itzulpen eta Terminologiazko Aldizkaria* 12: 17–37. English version: 2002. "To Find Variables for the Analysis of Translation between Lesser-diffused and Medium-diffused Languages." *Senez. Itzulpen eta Terminologiazko Aldizkaria* 24: 193–206.

Natural translator and interpreter

Rachele Antonini
University of Bologna

A natural translator/interpreter is an untrained and very often unremunerated bilingual individual who acts as a linguistic and cultural (inter)mediator in a variety of formal and informal contexts and situations.

The concept of natural translation was first put forward in 1973 by Brian Harris who defined it as "the translation done in everyday circumstances by bilinguals who have had no special training for it", and who argued that the ability to translate and interpret is not the exclusive realm of professionals, but a natural aptitude for bilingual speakers. By stating their case with a number of case studies with young bilingual children Harris and Sherwood tried to demonstrate that "translating is coextensive with bilingualism" (1978: 155), and that translational behaviour evolves through specific and chronological stages.

In 1980 Gideon Toury put forward the seemingly similar notion of the 'native translator'. While not disputing the existence of an innate human predisposition to translate, his proposal did not consider bilingualism as a precondition for the development of translation competence and stressed the importance of other factors that "trigger off the 'specialized predisposition' for translating" (Toury 1995: 246) and which include "the social motivation for, and […] the social functions of translating and/or its end products" (ibid.: 248).

Most of the studies that followed Harris' and Toury's work have focussed on child language brokering (CLB) and were mostly centred on specific linguistic minorities and ethnic communities (Spanish-speaking communities) in Northern America, particularly in the US (Orellana 2009; Tse 1995; Weisskirch 2007).

In Europe the study of natural translation is still a marginal and quite neglected area of research, especially within Translation and Interpreting Studies (see Translation Studies*; Interpreting Studies*), and, with very few exceptions (Antonini 2010; Meyer 2010), almost exclusively UK-based (Hall 2004). References to the existence and practice of natural translation (performed by either adults or children) are made only in passing in studies devoted to professional interpreting and translation. Such references generally express the concern shared by professional translators/interpreters and academics alike (particularly in the field of community interpreting*) towards what is perceived as a dangerous practice both for the professional category and the parties involved in interactions mediated by non-professional translators/interpreters as

> it may result in improper diagnosis, unneeded tests, loss of income, criminal charges being wrongfully laid or the failure to lay criminal charges when warranted. Unfortunately, most community interpreting is done by volunteers (see Networking and volunteer translators*), often family members, who have had no training, whose competence is unknown, and who have had no exposure to the ethical issues inherent in this type of interpreting. (Garber quoted in Marzocchi 2003: 42)

Despite increased immigration trends and the consequent exponential increase in the demand for linguistic and cultural mediation, which many countries are still not equipped to provide, whenever no professional language services are available, or owing to either economic or cultural reasons, immigrants are very likely to resort to the help of members of their family or linguistic community who are (relatively) fluent in the language of the host country (Antonini 2010).

Many are the aspects of this hugely submerged yet extremely widespread phenomenon that would benefit from further research, ranging from issues related to identity construction, culture brokering, attitudes and opinions shared by the beneficiaries of language brokering activities (family, members of the language/ethnic community, institutions, etc.), and to the strategies that language brokers adopt and implement when translating.

References

Antonini, Rachele. 2010. "The study of child language brokering: Past, current and emerging research." In *Child Language Brokering: Trends and Patterns in Current Research*, Rachele Antonini (ed.). Special issue of *mediAzioni* 10: 1–23.

Hall, Nigel. 2004. "The child in the middle: agency and diplomacy in language brokering events." In *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, Gyde Hansen et al. (eds), 285–297. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Harris, Brian. 1973. "La traductologie, la traduction naturelle, la traduction automatique et la sémantique." In *Problèmes de sémantique* [Cahier de linguistique 3], Judith McA.Nulty et al. (eds), 133–146. Montreal: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Harris, Brian & Sherwood, Bianca. 1978. "Translating as an innate skill." In *Language Interpretation and Communication*, David Gerver & Wallace H. Sinaiko (eds), 155–170. New York: Plenum Press.

Marzocchi, Carlo. 2003. "Summary of discussion on interpreting." In *Innovation and E-Learning in Translator Training*, Anthony Pym et al. (eds), 41–44. Intercultural Studies Group: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Meyer, Bernd, Birte Pawlack & Ortrun Kliche. 2010. "Family interpreters in hospitals: Good reasons for bad practice?" In *Child Language Brokering: Trends and Patterns in Current Research,* Rachele Antonini (ed.), 297–423. Special issue *mediAzioni* 10.

Orellana, Marjorie. 2009. *Translating Childhoods: Immigrant Youth, Language, and Culture*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Toury, Gideon. 1980. "The translators as a nonconformist-to-be, or: How to train translators so as to violate translational norms." In *Angewandte Übersetzungswissenschaft: Internationales*

Übersetzungswissenschaftliches Kolloquium an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Århus / Dänemark, 19.-21. Juni 1980, *Århus*, Sven-Olaf Poulsen & Wolfram Wilss (eds), 180–194. Århus: [s.n.].
Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tse, Lucy. 1995. "Language brokering among Latino students: Prevalence, attitudes, and school performance." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 17 (2): 180–193.
Weisskirch, Robert S. 2007. "Feelings about language brokering and family relations among Mexican American early adolescents." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 27 (4): 545–561.

Further reading

Harris, Brian. 1977. "The importance of natural translation." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 12: 96–114.
Pöchhacker, Franz & Kadric, Mira. 1999. "The Hospital Cleaner as Health Care Interpreter. A case study." *The Translator* 5 (2): 161–178.

Neurolinguistics and interpreting

Barbara Ahrens
Cologne University of Applied Sciences

Ever since the identification of the brain areas responsible for speech processing, research has focused on the neurocognitive processes underlying listening/comprehension and speech production in order to understand how human cognition and speech processing work (see Cognitive approaches*).

Interpreting* is an activity of bilingual speech processing under very specific conditions. It has attracted the interest of researchers from other disciplines dedicated to speech processing, especially neuropsychology and neurolinguistics.

Interpreters convert the message and the contents of speeches that are presented in one language into another language. From a speech processing point of view, simultaneous interpreting* (SI) is the more spectacular and complex mode as it involves the simultaneous processing of two languages. Specialists from the aforementioned fields have thus largely focused on SI. In consecutive interpreting (CI), listening/comprehension and speaking are similar to monolingual speech processing, although the interpreter is acting on a message from another speaker.

A theoretical framework for the complex task of SI which integrates neurolinguistic and neurophysiological aspects of speech processing has been proposed by Paradis (1994). It comprises the different stages of the SI process in relation to the functional language system of a bilingual brain: It takes into account the neurophysiological structure of the human brain and the operations that can be deduced from this, such as different memory structures or the activation and inhibition of one language or the other in bilingual brains. Paradis (2000) argues that bilingual brains only have one cognitive system for non-linguistic mental representations to which both languages have access. He also considers pragmatic and linguistic findings about right and left hemisphere involvement in speech processing. According to these findings, the left hemisphere is responsible for the context-independent processing of language (literal meaning, syntax and grammar) whereas the right hemisphere is active in the context-dependent, i.e., pragmatic interpretation of nonliteral meaning, as expressed by means of prosody, facial expressions, gestures, etc. He further differentiates between implicit, and thus automatically available, knowledge and metalinguistic knowledge that professional interpreters have acquired during their training and later on in their professional life. Paradis's model (1994) reflects the overlapping processing of consecutive

chunks of speech in the different stages of the SI process, thus leading to a complex, multilayer chart representing SI.

Questions about the human functional system of language processing and its actual operation in SI, where two language systems are activated, but are not supposed to interfere with each other, had already been tackled by interdisciplinary empirical research into SI prior to Paradis's description of its basic cognitive principles. However, empirical neurolinguistic and neurophysiological research on interpreting is a methodologically and technically complex task. This explains the small number of studies that have been conducted so far by interpreting researchers.

Neurolinguistic studies on SI have focused largely on lateralization and cerebral activation patterns in order to understand how interpreters are able to manage the demanding cognitive task of processing two languages at the same time. Dominant left hemisphere involvement in speech production has been reported for monolinguals, whereas studies on cerebral lateralization in speech processing have proved a less asymmetrical involvement of both hemispheres in the case of proficient bilinguals and experienced interpreters. When the degree of proficiency in a second, i.e. foreign language increases, or when – in interpreting – the degree of experience which an interpreter has acquired increases, hemisphere involvement in language comprehension and production becomes more symmetrical accordingly (e.g. Ilic 1990; Kurz 1996). This more symmetrical activation of both hemispheres in the interpreters' bilingual brains has been observed especially when it came to SI into their B language (Kraushaar & Lambert 1987; Gran & Fabbro 1988; Kurz 1996). It was also possible to show that interpreting is based on semantic processing of the incoming text rather than on processing of mere surface structures, such as words, grammar and syntax (Ilic 1990; Green et al. 1994).

Methods that have been applied in this type of research comprise dichotic listening tests (Gran & Fabbro 1988; Ilic 1990), shadowing as well as interpreting in combination with tapping (Green et al. 1994) or electroencephalography (EEG) (Kraushaar & Lambert 1987; Gran & Fabbro 1988; Kurz 1996). More recent studies have used positron emission tomography (PET; Rinne et al. 2000; Tommola et al. 2000) or functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI; Ahrens et al. 2010) in order to visualize different brain activation patterns in SI as compared to other language-related activities, such as shadowing or spontaneous monolingual speech production. These more recent studies confirmed the changes in brain activities among interpreters which might be due to the fact that interpreters have been trained in this specific kind of bilingual speech processing.

The problems of empirical research on human speech processing and cognition result from the "black box" phenomenon: It remains difficult to gain insight into activities and operations in the human mind even if methods such as PET or fMRI allow more precise and more reliable insights into the interpreting brain at work. Nevertheless, these methods still cannot definitely explain how mental representations are actually converted into language.

References

Ahrens, B., Kalderon, E., Krick, C.M. & Reith, W. 2010. "fMRI for exploring simultaneous interpreting." In *Why Translation Studies matters?*, D. Gile, G. Hansen & N.K. Pokorn (eds), 237–247. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gran, L. & Fabbro, F. 1988. "The role of neuroscience in the teaching of interpretation." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 1: 23–41.

Green, A., Vaid, J., Schweda-Nicholson, N., White, N. & Steiner, R. 1994. "Lateralization for shadowing vs. interpretation: A comparison of interpreters with bilingual and monolingual controls." In *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation*, S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (eds), 331–355. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kraushaar, B. & Lambert, S. 1987. "Shadowing proficiency according to ear of input and type of bilinguality." *Bulletin of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics* 9 (1): 17–31.

Ilic, I. 1990. "Cerebral lateralization for linguistic functions in professional interpreters." In *Aspects of applied and experimental research on conference interpretation. Round table on interpretation research, November 16, 1989*, L. Gran & C. Taylor (eds), 101–110. Udine: Campanotto.

Kurz, I. 1996. *Simultandolmetschen als Gegenstand der interdisziplinären Forschung*. Vienna: WUV.

Paradis, M. 1994. "Toward a neurolinguistic theory of simultaneous translation: The framework." *International Journal of Psycholinguistics* 9 (3): 319–335.

Paradis, M. 2000. "Prerequisites to a study of neurolinguistic processes involved in simultaneous interpreting. A synopsis." In *Language processing and simultaneous interpreting: Interdisciplinary perspectives*, B. Englund Dimitrova & K. Hyltenstam (eds), 17–24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rinne, J.O., Tommola, J., Laine, M., Krause, B.J., Schmidt, D., Kaasinen, V., Teräs, M., Sipilä, H. & Sunnari, M. 2000. "The translating brain: Cerebral activation patterns during simultaneous interpreting." *Neuroscience Letter* 294: 85–88.

Tommola, J., Laine, M.J., Sunnari, M. & Rinne, J.O. 2000. "Images of shadowing and interpreting." *Interpreting* 5 (2): 147–167.

Further reading

Fabbro, F. 1999. *The neurolinguistics of bilingualism: An introduction*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Krick, C., Behrent, S., Reith, W. & Franceschini, R. 2005. "Das gläserne Hirn des Dolmetschers. Vorläufige Forschungsergebnisse über Code-Switching bei mehrsprachigen Personen." *MDÜ – Mitteilungen für Übersetzer und Dolmetscher* 51 (6): 6–9.

Price, C.J. 2000. "The anatomy of language: Contributions from functional neuroimaging." *Journal of Anatomy* 197: 335–359. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1468137/pdf/joa_1973_0335.pdf [Accessed 29 January 2011]

Tommola, J. 1999. "New trends in interpreting research: Going psycho – or neuro?" In *Anovar/Anosar estudios de traducción e interpretación*, vol. 1, A. Álvarez Lugrís & A. Fernández Ocampo (eds), 321–330. Vigo: Universidade de Vigo.

Orality and translation

Paul Bandia
Concordia University

1. Orality: A pluridisciplinary concept

The concept of orality has been of growing interest in a wide range of disciplines dealing with the past or the present. It is concerned with cultural or aesthetic practices involved in pre-modern traditions, modernist representations of the past, or postmodernist expressions of artistry such as in audiovisual media. Orality represents different realities or interests for various disciplines or spheres of knowledge. For the anthropologist and the historian, orality assumes its importance in the recording and documentation of non-literate cultures; for the colonialist, orality provides an insight into the traditions and cultures of so-called primitive societies in dire need of civilization. For the early Christian missionary, tapping into the oral culture provided the channel for proselytism, although in more recent times evangelical groups, particularly those working on Bible translation, have been mainly concerned with developing a linguistic and literary basis for non-literate cultures. For the modernist, orality becomes the sounding board for calibrating the privileges of modernity; for the postmodernist, it has become an important factor in the aesthetic representation of otherness, the assertion of marginalized identities through a variety of art forms such as literature, cinema, music and the spoken word. In all these instances, the manifestation and subsequent appraisal of orality is often made possible through the process of translation or interpretation. Even in traditional settings, where orality is of utmost importance, the mere pronouncement and performance of oral narratives and histories by specialists such as the griot, the bard, the praise-singer, or the professional linguist, is through translating or interpreting. Translation is involved as oral performances are often interpreted and adapted to particular circumstances and occasions. Also, some oral narratives are enunciated in esoteric language that would require translating or interpreting for the lay audience. In other words, the expression or representation of oral discourse, whether spoken or written, is always the result of an act of translation.

2. The significance of orality for translation

The significance of orality for translation is due mainly to the literacy bias of modernity based on privileging writing over orality. Modernity has ascribed a stigma to the

concept of orality which has become synonymous with "backward" and "primitive." When modernism began to seek traces of its nostalgic past, cultures of orality became a sounding board for modernity and the stages of its progress and enlightenment. The concept of orality has evolved far beyond this modernist preconception, a development enhanced by the influential work of Albert Lord (1960), Jack Goody (1977) and Walter Ong (1982). From a mainly negative perception as unwritten, non-literate and exotic, orality has grown into a major field of scientific interest and the focus of interdisciplinary research including Translation Studies*.

Although the intersection of orality studies and translation research is fairly recent, oral expression and performance have long been integral to the art of translation. The history of oral translation, in the form of consecutive*, simultaneous* or community interpreting*, is as long as the history of migration and contact of civilizations. For instance, the historical foundation of early travel literature is heavily grounded in oral translation practices in what Mary Louise Pratt has called the "contact zone" (2008: 1) of encounter between explorers and indigenous populations. The growing interest in orality in translation research seems to have followed two trajectories. One is directly related to interlingual translation practice such as interpretation and audiovisual translation* research. The other is indirectly related to translation research introduced via the preoccupations of academic disciplines dealing with issues of representation of otherness. Postcolonialism and cultural studies have been instrumental in locating orality within the purview of translation inquiry.

Following the cultural turn in Translation Studies (see Turns of Translation Studies*), preoccupation with issues of ideology, identity and power relations led to a growing interest in the translation and representation of minority cultures. These formerly colonized cultures where mostly oral in nature, and had suffered the negative stereotyping associated with non-literate cultures. The need to preserve a rich cultural heritage and to assert identity in the face of imperialism and cultural hegemony led colonized societies to resort to translation, both metaphorically and pragmatically, as a means of cultural preservation and endurance. Colonized peoples have had to translate themselves and their cultures, as their languages are often marginalized in the global cultural space. The entire gamut of African European-language literature is a glaring example of this practice (see Literary Studies and Translation Studies*). Other examples can be found in former colonies in Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean where local languages – some of historical import and others of hybrid formation such as creoles – have assumed a secondary role to global languages such as English, French and Spanish. A similar phenomenon can also be observed in contexts of internal colonization and domination, where regional languages with strong oral antecedents such as the Provençal in France and Gaelic in the United Kingdom are often neglected in favour of the imperial language for creative purposes. The quest for a global reach has given rise to multiple ways of enscribing oral narratives and performances into written

form through pseudotranslation** or translation-related practices such as transcription, entextualization, transformation, transcreation, intercultural writing, and indeed translation proper. Many oral texts come from cultures with colonial histories, which are often stereotyped as primitive, marginal or exotic because of the predominance of oral tradition. Hence the urge for the enscription of oral aesthetics by literate cultures through writing and other forms of encoding in conformity with the modernist preference for the permanence of writing over the ephemerality and unpredictability of orality. Translation therefore assumes a mediating role between the perceived timelessness of the primitive "other" and the modernising West.

3. Aesthetics of orality

The enscription of oral aesthetics in postcolonial texts is a double transposition process involving, on the one hand, translating as textual transformation from oral to written form and, on the other, translating between distant or remote language cultures further set apart by unequal power relations derived from colonial historiography. In other words, "The transfer from an oral to written form has already been one kind of translation – far from a transparent or automatic representation – so this second translation between languages is already at a double remove from the original" (Finnegan 2007: 172). In postcolonial contexts, the textual encapsulation of orality can occur in two ways: (1) the deliberate and direct transcription of oral narratives and performances such as epics, panegyrics, elegies, poetry or theatre as oral artefacts; (2) the selective use of oral artistry for creative purposes by writers of postcolonial fiction. Oral artefacts pose specific problems in that the translation process has to do with initial capture, transcription and text-creation. Such translations are often carried out by the anthropologist or historian and mediated by a local performer or informant. It is therefore translation through mediation highly dependent upon the performance of the local agents involved. Unlike the commonly held view in translation, the entextualization of oral narratives is often as varied as the performances, given that there is hardly any claim of authorship or original in oral tradition practice. Orality has figured prominently in religious translation* practice in many traditions including Christianity. From its very beginnings, the Christianization of Hebrew texts involved the entextualization of oral narratives into the Septuagint in classical Greek and subsequently into classical Latin, and eventually into European vernacular languages. In more modern times, the spread of Christianity in non-Western societies in Africa, Asia and the Americas has been enabled by the translation of the Scriptures into indigenous languages. Such translations often called for the entextualization of oral narratives in local languages, with the potential to better convey Christian doctrine and belief systems to indigenous populations.

4. Oral narratives in post-colonial literatures

Post-colonial literatures* have been characterized by the orality/writing interface, a textual transformation which can be described as a form of intersemiotic translation (see Bandia 2008). The creative use of oral narratives in postcolonial fiction has had a tremendous impact in defining these literatures within the context of competing literary expressions in the global marketplace. The divide between orality and writing, as well as the implied superiority of the latter, become rather insignificant in postcolonial literature where some measure of creativity depends on the interweaving of both the oral and the written. In this context, "oral forms … have a continuing and *equal* relationship with the written" (Aschroft et al. 1998: 166–167). Therefore, orality and literacy are brought together in European-language fiction, as the postcolonial writer draws from the oral tradition, emulating oral formulations or styles. This creative blend or hybridity disrupts the generalized dichotomy of "oral-traditional-old" versus "written-modern-new." There is an imperative on writers from historically-dominated cultures to use the language of hegemony for purposes of emancipation and recognition on the global stage. This in itself imposes a bilingual state of being, which calls on translation as a writing strategy for dominated writers.

Faced with the choice of either writing in a local language without literary capital or in a global language, these writers opt for the colonial language with its global reach, but seek to mould the language to suit local forms of literary expression. They resort to various strategies to appropriate the colonial language and resist its hegemony. The works of these writers abound in transliterations or literal translations from their native languages into the global language. This has given rise to hyphenated conceptualizations of global languages such as the Africanization, Indianization or Creolization of English or French. Infusing the global language with traces of oral content and style allows the postcolonial writer to deploy mechanisms for asserting cultural difference and identity in the global literary space. The fictionalizing of orality through the translation of indigenous narratives may result in a local variety of the global language or in an autonomous language of creolization for a national literature. Besides asserting identity, fictionalizing oral language also challenges imperial impositions of acceptable literary and linguistic practices, while enacting a rift or shift away from the political and literary establishment of the colonial metropole.

Translation has therefore played an important role in shaping the literary discourse of formerly colonized nations by creating a unique idiom through the writing of orality. This unique literary language has turned out to be a double-edged sword for minority cultures, as its very existence has stifled indigenous language writing, while its possibilities have placed minority literatures squarely within the realm of world literature. The oral antecedents of postcolonial literature have been the hallmark of many prize-winning works by minority writers on the world stage, such as

the Nobel laureates Wole Soyinka and Derek Walcott, the Goncourt laureates Tahar Ben Jelloun and Patrick Chamoiseau, and the Booker Prize winners Salmon Rushdie and Ben Okri.

The representation of oral artistry in writing or through other media recalls translation as a strategy for creativity, asserting identity, and a means for cultural and linguistic appropriation and adaptation.

References

Aschroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths & Helen Tiffins. 1998. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge.

Bandia, Paul F. 2008. *Translation as Reparation. Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Finnegan, Ruth. 2007. *The Oral and Beyond. Doing Things with Words in Africa*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Goody, Jack. 1977. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lord, Albert B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ong, Walter. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Methuen.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2008. 2nd edition. *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London/ New York: Routledge.

Further reading

Ben Zvi, Ehud & Floyd, Michael H. (eds) 2000. *Writings and speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern prophecy*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Gambier, Yves & Lautenbacher, Olli-Philipe (eds). 2010. *Oral et écrit en traduction*. Special issue of *Glottopol* 15 (July 2010). http://www.univ-rouen.fr/dyalang/glottopol/numero_15.html [Accessed 15 June 2011].

Jousse, Marcel. 2000. 2nd edition. *The Anthropology of Geste and Rhythm*. Trans. by E. Sienaert & J. Conolly. Durban: Mantis Publishing.

Makutoane, Johannes T. & Naude, Jakobus A. 2008. "Reanimating orality. Towards the design for a new Bible translation in Sesotho." *Acta Theologica* 28 (2):1–33.

Noss, Philip A. (ed.). 2007. *A history of Bible translation*. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia e Letteratura.

Paratexts

Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar
Boğaziçi University

The analysis of verbal and visual material surrounding and presenting published translations is increasingly becoming integrated into empirical research on translated texts. These materials which lie at the threshold of translations are referred to as 'paratexts', a term initially conceived to cover presentational elements of works in the literary field, including, but not limited to, translations. Typical examples of paratexts include titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces, intertitles, notes, epilogues, and afterwords (Macksey 1997: xviii) which all constitute devices and conventions, both within a book and outside it, which mediate the work to the reader. The term 'paratext' was elaborated by Gerard Genette in his book *Seuils* (1987) translated into English as *Paratexts: The Thresholds of Interpretation* (Genette 1997) and has rapidly caught the attention of translation scholars who wish to focus on elements that bridge translated texts with their readers and therefore shape their reception in a major way.

In an attempt to reveal the norms* observed by translators, scholars have been analysing textual material, i.e. translations and comparative analyses of source and target texts, and extratextual material, i.e. secondary sources in the form of statements on translation or on specific translated texts or translators (Toury 1995: 65). The study of paratexts complements this framework and contributes to revealing the way translations are presented to their readers, which in turn informs the researcher about the conventions, concepts and expectations of a society regarding translated texts. Although paratextual elements are often part and parcel of the translated texts, they also have an independent existence since they stand physically separate from the translated text and are more likely to meet the reader before the translation itself.

Genette maintains that paratexts can be defined spatially (in terms of where they are located), temporally (in terms of when they appear or disappear), substantially (their modes of existence), pragmatically (the sender and addressee) and functionally (in terms of what they aim to do). In terms of their location, paratexts can be either in the same volume as the text (peritexts) or at a distance from the text (epitexts), disseminated through the media or private communication, such as interviews and letters (Genette 1997: 5). Paratexts of both the peritextual and epitextual kind offer a great deal of information when they accompany translations, including clues regarding the visibility of the translator, the target readership, the aim of the translation or

the concept of translation favoured by the specific culture and/or publisher, as reflected in the way the text is presented in the title page.

The place of translation within Genette's conceptualization of paratexts, though, is somewhat dubious. Genette does not elaborate on translation in his book but remarks that translations, especially self-translations, have an "undeniable" paratextual relevance since they "serve as commentary on the original text" (1997: 405). This problematic statement means that, according to Genette, a translation can only serve in relation to an 'original' because paratexts are "always subordinate" to the texts which determine their existence (1997: 12). Considering translation as a form of paratext thus reinforces the conventional hierarchy between the source text and its translation and encourages disregard of the separate life a translation may lead in the target context, assuming a different genre, addressing a different readership or taking on a completely different function than the source text. Furthermore, limiting translation to a mere commentary on the original text prevents the inclusion within the ambit of Translation Studies of marginal translation cases, such as pseudotranslations* and concealed translations, since these texts challenge the very existence of the notion of the 'original'.

Genette's misplacement of translation notwithstanding, the growing emphasis on cultural and ideological issues in translation research has made the study of paratextual elements surrounding translations methodologically indispensable. While many researchers prefer to adopt Genette's concepts and terminology explicitly, some have concentrated on presentational elements around translated texts without explicit reference to paratexts, an example being Harvey (2003), who opts to use the term 'binding' to deal with more or less the same phenomenon.

One of the earliest studies bringing together translations and their paratexts is Urpo Kovala's essay analyzing how paratextual mediation serves ideological closure (1996). Based on a corpus of Anglo-American fiction translated into Finnish, Kovala creates a typology of paratexts and argues that paratexts may belong to four distinct categories: the "modest" paratext, which only offers basic information including the author's name and the title, the commercial paratext, advertising other books by the same publisher, the informative paratext, describing and contextualizing the work, and the illustrative paratext, drawing attention to the illustrations in and around the text (Kovala 1996: 127). Obviously these types are context-dependent, and other cultures and periods may give rise to new typologies.

The 2000s have seen a rise in the interest shown in paratexts of translations. Tahir Gürçağlar (2002) invoked the methodological relevance of paratexts for historical translation research and argued that paratexts can offer valuable information about translations, especially in the field of popular literature, where extratextual statements or self-reflexive theorization by translators are rare. Based on a corpus of classics and popular fiction translated into Turkish, she maintained that peritexts in particular help reveal patterns of production and reception for translations, enabling

a problematization of concepts such as authorship, originality and anonymity, which are hardly identifiable in translations themselves. Numerous case studies have demonstrated the way in which paratextual data challenge, tease out and complement translational issues that are latent in translated texts themselves. A few examples include Watts (2000), who has explored paratexts as instruments of cultural translation in the various editions of *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal*, Torres (2002), who has examined the status of the translated text through searching for indicators of translation in the paratexts of Brazilian literature translated into French, or Asimakoulas (2006), who has demonstrated the way in which paratexts served as parts of a strategy of political defiance and resistance in the context of translations of Brecht's works into Greek during the Junta era.

The need to incorporate available paratextual data into translation research is by now widely recognized; however, caution needs to be observed in studies which focus solely on paratexts of translations and not on translations themselves. The findings of such studies reveal the mediational features of the paratexts and show how translations are presented, but not how they *are*. Examination of paratexts such as titles, prefaces or translator's notes may provide the researcher with information pertaining to translation strategies and the concept of translation operational in the specific work, yet it cannot be a substitute for textual translation analysis; that is, analyses of paratexts are best fit to serve as complementary devices in revealing the actual translation norms observed by translators. A further problematic aspect of studies based on paratexts is the issue of agency. Paratexts may reveal different types of agents** at work, depending on their nature. While translator's notes or prefaces/postfaces may be seen as strong indicators of the translator's agency, illustrations, covers, blurbs and epitexts located further away from the translated text are usually not controlled by translators and are shaped by agents such as publishers or editors, either exclusively, or in interaction with the translator. Therefore, attributing these types of paratexts to a translator can be misleading in terms of identifying the limits of the translator's agency in a given context.

References

Asimakoulas, Dimitris. 2006. "Translation as a Means of Resistance: Paratexts in Translations of Brecht's Works during the Greek Junta (1967–1974)." In *CTIS Occasional Papers* 3, Samh Fekry Hanna (ed.), 79–103. Manchester: University of Manchester.

Genette, Gérard. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: éditions du Seuil.

Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts*: *Thresholds of Interpretation*. Tr. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, Keith. 2003. "'Events' and 'Horizons'. Reading Ideology in the 'Bindings' of Translations." In *Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology-Ideologies in Translation Studies*, María Calzada Pérez (ed.), 43–70. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kovala, Urpo. 1996. "Translations, Paratextual Mediation and Ideological Closure." *Target* 8 (1): 119–148.

Macksey, Richard. 1997. "Foreword." In *Paratexts*: *Thresholds of Interpretation*, Gerard Genette (tr. Jane E. Lewin), xi–xxiii. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2002. "What Texts Don't Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, Theo Hermans (ed.), 44–60. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Torres, Marie-Hélène C. 2002. "Indices de statut de roman traduit - 1. Paratexte." *Meta* 47 (1): 5–15.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Watts, Richard. 2000. "Translating Culture: Reading the Paratexts to Aimé Césaire's *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal*." *TTR* 13 (2): 29–46.

Poetry translation

Francis R. Jones
Newcastle University

The nature of poetic text makes it challenging to translate, which has stimulated much debate about how these challenges should be tackled. This entry describes these issues, plus the skills, working processes and professional conditions involved in translating poetry.

1. Features and functions of poetry

Like any genre, poetry may be characterized in terms of textual features and communicative function. In textual-feature terms, poetry typically communicates meaning not only through surface semantics, but also by using out-of-the-ordinary language, non-literal imagery, resonance and suggestion to give fresh, "defamiliarized" perception and convey more than propositional content; among its specific techniques are linguistic patterning (e.g. rhyme or alliteration), word association, wordplay**, ambiguity, and/or reactivating an idiom's literal meanings (see e.g. Shklovsky 1917, Jakobson 1960, in Lodge 1988: 15–29, 32–61). These may combine in 'conventional forms' – the 14-line fixed-metre, rhymed sonnet, say, or the classical Chinese *lüshi* with fixed syllable-counts and parallelism. Other genres may also use such features (e.g. rhyme in advertisements), and some poems may use few of them; however, the denser or more prominent their use, the more 'poem-like' a text will seem.

The communicative function of poetry is rarely informative or persuasive, but rather to entertain or to give heightened emotional or intellectual experience. Though usually written, sound's centrality to poetry often gives it an oral performance element (henceforward, therefore, 'readers' also implies 'listeners').

2. Source-target relationships

This textual complexity, which often exploits the resources of one specific language (that *moon* and *June* rhyme in English, say), makes poetry challenging to translate. Scholars, most of them also translators, have long debated the implications of this for source-target text relationships, as outlined below. These debates sometimes have

prescriptive aspects, revealing how poetry-translation and general-literary norms can stimulate and constrain translating decisions.

Firstly, three classes of source-target relationship have been identified (Boase-Beier 2009: 194):

- 'Literals' or 'prose renderings' recreate source semantics but delete source poetic features. These often aim to help readers understand source poems published alongside them, or give raw material for co-translators to reshape into receptor-language poems. They are sometimes advocated in their own right: this entails believing that the "perfect essence" of a poem lies in its semantics and imagery (Dacier 1699, Goethe 1811–1814, in Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006: 161–165, 199–120).
- Conversely, 'adaptations'*, 'versions' or 'imitations' (cf. Dryden 1680, in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006: 145–146) change or abandon key aspects of source-poem semantics, and sometimes its poetic features, for the sake of target-poem effectiveness. Their producers may claim explicitly that these are not translations, in order that they be judged as receptor-language poems without reference to other-language sources.
- What might be called 'recreative translations' try to recreate a source poem's semantic and poetic features in a viable receptor-language poem – perhaps the most challenging option. Most recent Western poetry translation seems recreative in intent, apparently reflecting a wider ethic that translations should have "relevant similarity" to their source, whilst performing a receptor-language function – in this case, being a poem (Jones 2011: 202, citing Chesterman).

Most published discussions focus on recreative translation. One debate asks whether translators should try to replicate source-poem semantics and poetics, or should be free to recreate them more loosely (cf. Dryden's 'metaphrase' versus 'paraphrase', 1680, in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006: 145–146). The former, though aptly characterized as "like dancing on ropes with fettered legs" (Dryden ibid.), probably dominates recent European practice (Jones 2011: 141). Advocating the latter implies believing that target-poem quality is crucial, and that translators should therefore 'play' creatively with source-poem structures rather than try to replicate or explicitate them (Folkart 2007: 430; Bassnett 1998: 65).

In a parallel debate echoing Venuti's foreignization-domestication opposition, some advocate retaining source-culture-specific poetic features in translation, although this risks deterring potential readers (e.g. Newman 1856, in Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006: 225–226). Others advocate replacing them with "counterparts" or "matchings" which resemble source features in function rather than form (Holmes 1988: 54), although this risks deleting what is "characteristic of the original" (Newman ibid.; cf. Cowper 1791, in Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006: 185; Bassnett 1998: 64).

Using formal patterning, especially rhyme, in target poems can shift semantics relative to the source. In receptor literary cultures where free verse (poetry using no rhyme or rhythm) dominates, some advocate abandoning rhyme because they feel that such shifts "falsify" or "destroy the poem's integrity" (Bly 1983: 44–45; Lefevere 1975: 56–59); literary norms (rhyme as 'old-fashioned', say) and the practical difficulty of finding rhymes may also be factors. Others advocate recreating formal patterns, because they see them as crucial to the source poem's effect. The risks and merits of recreating formal metre are less often debated – perhaps because they are less likely to cause semantic shifts (unless coupled with rhyme: Jones 2011: 170).

Holmes identifies three approaches to recreating formal patterns (1988: 25–27):

- 'Mimetic': reproducing the original form. This does not guarantee reproducing its effect: French source readers would see hexameters (six-beat lines) as a 'basic' poetic line, for example, whereas English target readers, more used to five-beat pentameters, might perceive them as 'heavy'.
- 'Analogical': using a functionally similar target form (e.g. replacing French hexameters with English pentameters).
- 'Organic': using a form which the translator judges appropriate for the content – for instance, replacing Chinese five-syllable lines (e.g. Li Po's 举头望明月) with English iambic pentameters (e.g. *I raise my head and see the shining moon*).

These debates often have an ethical note: 'loyalty' to the source poet versus 'responsibility' for creating a poetically valid target poem, for instance. The difficulty of reconciling the latter two imperatives has generated two contrasting discourses. Discourses of loss are negative, seeing poetry translation as "betraying" source meaning to keep poetic effects (Lefevere 1975: 56) or vice versa (as in Robert Frost's reputed remark that "poetry is the first thing lost in translation"). Discourses of creativity are positive, arguing that these imperatives can be reconciled if translators are loyal not to the source poem's surface features, but to their interpretation of its 'spirit' or 'intent'.

3. Translator expertise and translating processes

Translating poems within these constraints and opportunities requires multiple skills (see Competence*). Translators need to be expert source-poem readers and expert target-poem writers (Bassnett 1998; Folkart 2007). They also need cross-language expertise, to find appropriate counterparts for complexes of source-poem features – and when this proves impossible, the literary judgement to decide what to reproduce, what to recreate more loosely, and what to abandon. A long tradition of translators' self-reports, supplemented recently by real-time 'think-aloud' studies, describe how this expertise is put into (largely recreative) action (e.g. Weissbort

1989; Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006; Jones 2011; see Think-aloud protocol*). Key details are summarized below.

Recreative translators produce several successive target-text 'versions', over several drafting sessions interspersed with 'time in the drawer', until one version feels adequate. They typically start by pre-reading and analysing the source poem; after this, reading the source alongside the emerging target poem usually merges with (re)writing into a single process. The first version is often semantically literal. This is rewritten in later versions to incorporate poetic features (associative meanings, sound-patterns, etc.). However, when recreating formal patterning (a rhyme scheme, for instance), some translators tackle this in the first version, and develop a full semantic structure later. Early versions are usually handwritten, probably because this retains alternative solutions, notes, etc. that may be useful later; later, word-processing allows translators to assess their versions as receptor-language poems.

Translators spend most time tackling lexis and imagery. Lexis is central, because many poetic and stylistic effects (e.g. associative meanings or emotional nuance) require analysis of source-poem and proposed target-poem wording. Work on imagery, i.e. underlying text-world meaning, supports this. Here, translators typically try to deduce the source poet's intent (from the poem, via scholarly analyses, and/or by asking the poet), but their target-poem decisions are also influenced by their reading of the source poem itself, and their wish to construct a semantically and poetically coherent target poem. Sound, even in formally-patterned translations, is important, but takes less translating time.

Variations in preferred approach between translators, and hence between different translators' renditions of the same poem, reflect the debates described earlier. Translators have different "hierarchies of correspondence" – whether semantics or sound, for example, should be prioritized (Holmes 1988: 86). They may also show different degrees of creativity (Jones 2011: 140–142). When literal equivalents seem ineffective, most translators consider adapting meanings within the source semantic field, but fewer consider moving outside it: translating Dutch poet Gerrit Kouwenaar's *de kleine kou van het najaar* ('the small cold of the autumn') as *the slight autumn chill* and *autumn hinted at winter* respectively, for example.

4. Professional aspects of poetry translating

Poetry translators' wider working conditions share many features with other literary producers, like poets or anthology editors. Poetry translators have higher working autonomy and visibility (translators' names appearing on book covers, for instance) than translators in other genres (see Status of translators**). Translator expertise is vouchsafed via approval of translations by source poets, editors, and publishers rather

than via formal qualifications. Poetry translating's intrinsic challenges and high quality demands mean that words-per-hour output is low. As poetry is usually published in small print-runs or on free-to-view websites, however, its translators – unless subsidized – rarely earn a living wage. Hence they usually work part-time and voluntarily, motivated by the desire to convey works to new readers, often coupled with the enjoyment of translating. Poetry translators are often also involved in wider text-production processes: choosing poems for a selection of a source poet's work, for instance; writing a critical commentary about the source poet, poems and cultural background, and often explaining their own translation approach; or giving public readings with the source poet. Moreover, poetry translators' decisions may be explicitly assessed by critics – whether or not the latter can read the source language.

Poetry translators typically originate from one of two backgrounds: foreign-language 'linguists' with a poetry specialism, or published target-language 'poets' with an interest in translation. Published translations, especially from less widely read languages, often involve two co-translators pooling their expertise: for instance, a source-language-native linguist and a target-language-native poet (though the latter may get more public recognition – Csokits, Hughes, in Weissbort 1989). Even 'solo' translators typically rely on others: source-language informants, target-draft readers, etc. (Bly 1983: 42–43). Source poets are among the most valued informants; sometimes, however, they may insist that source and target semantics match closely, giving translators little room for creative reshaping.

Translating poetry, therefore, is a complex task, with high expertise demands and few financial rewards. As with other areas of literary production, however, its intrinsic enjoyment and cultural value make it a task worth doing.

References

Bassnett, Susan. 1998. "Transplanting the seed: poetry and translation." In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Susan Bassnett & André Lefevere (eds), 57–76. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bly, Robert. 1983. *The Eight Stages of Translation*. Boston, MA: Rowan Tree.

Boase-Beier, Jean. 2009. "Poetry." In *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha (eds), 194–196. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Folkart, Barbara. 2007. *Second Finding: a Poetics of Translation*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Jones, Francis R. 2011. *Poetry Translating as Expert Action: Processes, Priorities and Networks*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lefevere, André. 1975. *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Lodge, David. 1988. *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Harlow: Longman.

Weissbort, Daniel. 1989. *Translating Poetry: The Double Labyrinth*. London: Macmillan.

Weissbort, Daniel & Eysteinsson, Astradur. 2006. *Translation – Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Further reading

Allén, Sture. 1999. *Translation of Poetry and Poetic Prose: Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 110*. Singapore: World Scientific.

Honig, Edward. 1985. *The Poet's Other Voice*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Koster, Cees. 2000. *From World to World: an Armamentarium for the Study of Poetic Discourse in Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Matterson, Stephen & Jones, Darryl. 2000. *Studying Poetry*. London: Arnold.

Osers, Ewald. 1998. "Translation norms: do they exist?" In *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*, Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová & Barbara Moser-Mercer (eds), 53–62. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pseudotranslation

Carol O'Sullivan
University of Portsmouth

Pseudotranslations, or 'texts which resemble translations', have referred to a number of different phenomena over the decades. Pseudotranslations may generally be defined as "texts which have been presented as translations with no corresponding source texts in other languages ever having existed – hence no factual 'transfer operations' and translation relationships" (Toury 1995: 40). In this definition, Toury follows Anton Popovič, who included in his 1976 taxonomy of translation types 'fictitious translation' (1976: 20) whereby an author 'may publish his original work as a fictitious translation in order to win a wide public, thus making use of the readers' expectations'. Pseudotranslations tell us, inevitably, much more about the patterns of the receiving culture than about the patterns (faked, imitated or pastiched) of the putative source culture. It is for this reason, and for the questions they raise about the permeability of systems, that pseudotranslations constitute an attractive object of study for Descriptive Translation Studies*-oriented research and research grounded in Polysystem Theory*; they tell us "about the notions shared by the members of a community, not only as to the *status* of translated texts, but also as to their most conspicuous *characteristics*" (Toury 1995: 46).

Pseudotranslation functions as a way of importing texts not otherwise acceptable as 'original' writing into a literary system. These texts may be unacceptable as originals either because the material does not conform to existing norms or because the writer of the pseudotranslation lacks sufficient cultural capital to have traction in the target culture. Pseudotranslations may be accompanied by more or less extensive metatextual apparatus destined to consolidate their status as translations, as in the case of *Papa Hamlet*, a German work initially presented and received in 1889 as a translation from Norwegian (Toury 1984). Such texts can have considerable literary influence, as in the case of James MacPherson's late-eighteenth-century 'translations' of the Scots Gaelic poet Ossian which had an enormous influence on Romantic literature (Lefevere 2000). They may also exert linguistic influence, helping to extend the expressive capacities of a minority 'target' language (cf. Naudé 2008).

Pseudotranslational practices extend beyond literary innovation or forgery to encompass explorations of style and norms* (Bassnett 1998; Lefevere 2000). They offer writers a way of adopting an alternative writing voice, as in the case of the 'Greek fisherman' Andreas Karavis, the alternative persona of Canadian poet David Solway. They may supply a space for play, as in the case of the 'Roman' poet Quintilius, really

Irwin Peter Russell (1921–2003), whose poems cross over into pastiche, containing many hints and clues to readers of their real nature. Pseudotranslation may constitute a narrative strategy for fiction (du Pont 2005) as in Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote* or James Kelman's *Translated Accounts*. In 1979 György Radó used the term to refer to adaptations*, poetic rewritings and travesties, rewritings too loose to retain a translational relationship with a source text. This definition has not found favour with critics.

Pseudotranslational practices are common in cinema. Scripts for multilingual films are often written in a single language and relevant segments are then translated into the putative source language(s) or even improvised during shooting. In the final film, the heterolingual dialogue becomes what Anthony Pym, drawing on Toury, calls a 'pseudo-original', or a 'translated text falsely presented and received as original' (Pym 1998: 60). The subtitles*, which appear to be a translation, may in fact be the original script; in other words, pseudosubtitles (e.g. *Dances With Wolves*). Such practices illustrate the complexity of pseudotranslation and suggest that pseudotranslation may not be reducible to an absence of translation.

Pseudotranslation raises a number of ethical questions (see Ethics and translation*). If the precision of its adherence to an original text is the condition of translation, as opposed to imitation or adaptation, then pseudotranslation has the potential to destabilise the basis on which translation theory is built. For Emily Apter, it may be 'the premier illustration of translational ontology, insofar as it reveals the extent to which all translations are unreliable transmitters of the original' (2005: 160). This tension underlies the unease of readers when a writer succeeds in 'passing' (ibid.: 167). Ultimately, for Apter, pseudotranslation marks an ethical shift from source-text oriented critical thinking to translation 'in its most scandalous form, […] as a technology of literary replication that engineers textual afterlife without recourse to a genetic origin' (ibid.: 171).

Pseudotranslation may also refer to a simulation practice common in Localization* involving the replacement of strings within digital content with target-language strings.

References

Apter, Emily. 2005. "Translation with No Original; Scandals of Textual Reproduction." In *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, Sandra Bermann & Michael Wood (eds.), 159–174. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bassnett, Susan. 1998. "When is a translation not a translation?" In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Susan Bassnett & André Lefevere, 25–40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Lefevere, André. 2000. "Pseudotranslations." In *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, Olive Classe (ed.), vol. 2, 1122–1123. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Naudé, Jacobus A. 2008. "The role of pseudo-translations in early Afrikaans travel writing." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 26 (1): 97–106.

Du Pont, Olaf. 2005. "Robert Graves's Claudian novels: A case of pseudotranslation." *Target* 17 (2): 327–347.

Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Toury, Gideon. 1984. "Translation, literary translation and pseudotranslation." *Comparative Criticism* 6: 73–85.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Realia

Ritva Leppihalme
University of Helsinki

Since all texts are anchored in their culture, it follows that culture-bound items in the source text can present problems for translators, especially if there are notable differences between source and target cultures. The problems are often described as extralinguistic, that is, referring to the surrounding physical and sociocultural reality 'outside' language, as opposed to intralinguistic translation problems, which arise from differences between source and target language systems and language usage (Nedergaard-Larsen 1993: 238, note 1). Because of their referential link with reality, words and phrases that are "intimately bound up with the universe of reference of the original culture" (Lefevere 1993: 122) are often referred to as *realia* (Latin for 'real things'), following usage in Eastern European Translation Studies (e.g. Vlakhov & Florin 1970).

In the broad sense then, references to realia may include not only references to material items (*machete, sari, gravad lax*) but also culture-bound notions and phenomena, such as religious or educational concepts, taboos, values, institutions, etc. A variety of other terms (culture-bound items, cultural terms, culture-specific elements, culture-markers, extralinguistic cultural references, etc.) are also used. Distinctions between terms vary depending on the focus of individual scholars and their definitions of what is 'real'. Some researchers find realia a problematic term when applied to fictional texts: Loponen (2009), discussing the translation of fantasy literature and science fiction, proposes the neologism *irrealia* for invented items presented as real in the fictional world but non-existent in our world.

In Translation Studies*, the term realia is used to refer to concepts which are found in a given source culture but not in a given target culture. However, the boundaries of the term are somewhat fuzzy. Concepts may cross linguistic and cultural borders; loanwords or calques are introduced into the target language via for example transmission of international news (*tsunami, hijab*). Once such items are absorbed into the target language, they no longer meet the criterion of unfamiliarity in the target culture though they are still characteristic of their original culture.

Most often, references to realia are nouns or noun phrases without precise target-language equivalents, but other word classes may also present similar problems. In their contrastive study of English and French usage Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1975: 69) note that the English verb *nod* and the French phrase *hocher la tête* refer to culture-specific gestures that cannot be described as easily in the other language.

Culture-specific references by name to persons, geographical areas, events and suchlike (*Dickens, Omaha Beach, St. Patrick's Day*) may sometimes be difficult to distinguish from the allusive use of proper names (e.g. *I felt like Benedict Arnold* 'I felt like a traitor'). Intralinguistic elements like certain grammatical categories, vocative forms, metaphors and idioms as well as dialectal or sociolectal speech variants (Nedergaard-Larsen 1993: 210) are not regarded as types of realia even though these, too, may be culturally determined.

1. Classification of realia

Typologies of realia differ in detail but are in general agreement that exhaustive classification is not feasible. Early Translation Studies brought up examples of Translation problems** arising from cultural differences, such as "problems of cultural equivalence" especially when translating the Bible into aboriginal languages (Nida 1945/1964: 90–91) or "metalinguistic divergences" between French and English (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958/1975: 260 ff). Nedergaard-Larsen (1993: 211) presents four main categories of extralinguistic culture-bound problem types, namely (1) geography, (2) history, (3) society, (4) culture, all further divided and subdivided. Society, for example, contains the subcategories of industrial level/economy, social organization, politics, social conditions, and ways of life and customs – with this last subcategory in its turn including "housing, transport, food, meals; clothing, articles for everyday use; family relations". Kujamäki (1998: 26–27) classifies the realia in a 19th century Finnish novel under the following headings: (1) society, (2) leisure activities, (3) proper names, (4) nature, (5) mythology, (6) everyday items (clothes, food, tools, etc.). Typologies of realia as a rule reflect the type of textual material examined: realia in a contemporary institutional text will differ from those in an 18th century comedy or a television soap opera.

2. Addressing the translation problem with realia

Realia tie the text to its local and temporal surroundings, giving it a certain degree of local 'colour' and 'flavour'. In translation, this foreign flavour is (some say, inevitably) lost or diluted. The problem of translating realia has been described as resulting from target-language lexical gaps or from flaws or gaps in the translator's cultural and encyclopaedic knowledge. One aim of translator education is therefore to increase translators' intercultural awareness and their cultural and metacultural competence. A lack of lexical equivalence concerning some areas of life is unavoidable as language users mostly have names for what they observe and need. Hence Sámi and Inuit hunters have words for various conditions in the Arctic, such as different types of snow and ice

and degrees of darkness in their long winters, but these are irrelevant to city dwellers in warmer climates, who have no need of such distinctions and hence no names for them. Yet the claim that realia are "untranslatable as a rule" (Florin 1993: 125) because of a lack of precise equivalents rests on a fairly narrow view of translation. Translators do not consider only individual lexical items when solving translation problems but look for solutions that serve current target-cultural norms and other aspects of the translation situation. They have many ways of coping with realia, conveying information and filling lexical gaps, even though some of the connotations of the items may change or get lost in the process.

3. Translation strategies for realia

Quantitative and qualitative case studies show how translators deal with realia (see Translation strategies and tactics*). They reveal that one translation may reduce or delete what is culturally and historically strange in the source text while others try to mediate it to target readers in one way or another (Kujamäki 1998: 276). Comparing renderings for realia in several translations of one source text into one target language over time (or contemporaneous translations of one source text into different languages) may provide rich material for investigating how translation aims and norms have changed from one period to another in the target culture or how they vary between cultures. Translators may choose to foreground the foreign or play it down, depending on how they see their task and what they want to achieve. Decisions are made with the overall function of the translation in mind – though the choice is not necessarily the translator's alone: commercial and sociocultural considerations also come into play. A study of translation strategies for realia in a given translation will often reveal macrolevel aspects of the translation product: the cultural, literary and linguistic profile of the text (Kujamäki 1998: 14), as well as the translation situation, the attitudes and even the ideology of the translator and the target culture.

Categorizations of translation strategies (methods, techniques, procedures) for realia are proposed for example by Florin (1993), Nedergaard-Larsen (1993), Kujamäki (1998), Leppihalme (2001) and Pedersen (2007). The terms used vary (Pedersen [2007: 31] comments on the "rich and varied flora of names"), but they all describe roughly the same range of strategies. Quantitative case studies show that some strategies are used more often than others, and that the genre of the text often has an effect on the choice of strategy: television comedy subtitles allow cultural substitutions that would be out of place in the translation of a highbrow novel, while the visual element of genres like film, television, comics and the like may obviate the need to find lexical solutions to some problems with realia. A viewer who sees the item in question on the

screen will not necessarily require a target-language name for it in the subtitle (see also Subtitling*).

Translation strategies for realia range from transfer of the source-language word to calques and to different types of approximations such as the use of target-language superordinate words for source-text hyponyms. Pedersen (2007: 35–40) notes that in certain domains like titles, education and government, cultural substitution is the norm in his material: many such substitutes have become official equivalents recognized in bilingual dictionaries (*junior high* > Swedish *högstadiet*). Leppihalme (2001) adapts earlier classifications to present seven local (microlevel) strategies and briefly evaluates their likely effects; her aim is that the list could be used by students examining translatorial practices for their theses. The strategies are: (1) direct transfer of the source-text word except for possibly some minor change like slightly altered spelling, italics or the like: *assegai, brioche*. Personal and geographical proper names are usually transferred directly (*Bill Gates, Madrid*) but for some names, language cultures have conventional assimilated or translated forms (e.g. *Aristoteles/Aristotle/Aristote; Helsingør/Elsinore; Tierra del Fuego/Feuerland, Schwarzwald/Black Forest*); (2) calque, or a word-for-word translation resulting in a target-language neologism: *kick sled* from Finnish *potkukelkka*; (3) cultural adaptation, where a cultural analogue is substituted for the original realia item, often in translations for children or to avoid a culturally sensitive reference: a target culture that frowns on drinking alcohol may substitute *lemonade* for *beer*; (4) superordinate term: the target-language word for 'biscuit' replacing source-text *Oreo*; (5) explicitation, where implicit elements of the realia are made explicit in the text itself: *Tuonela* of Finnish mythology explicitated as *Tuonela, the Land of the Dead*; (6) addition of a text-external (paratextual) explanation, as in a footnote or glossary; and (7) omission of the realia item altogether. The acceptability of this last strategy is strongly norm-governed and tends to coincide with a translation culture that accepts extensive adaptation and deletion. The acceptability of paratextual additions also varies from culture to culture and depends on genre: it is rarely seen in crime fiction, for example. Combinations of strategies also occur: for instance, an explicitating footnote is mostly added to a calque or to a directly transferred item.

Clearly, some translation strategies for realia fit in with a foreignizing, others with a domesticating global (macrolevel) strategy and are therefore not all equally applicable in a given context. By focusing more on the macrolevel aspects of the translation of realia, future research could contribute to a deeper understanding of the role of translation in intercultural communication.

References

Florin, Sider. 1993. "Realia in translation." In *Translation as Social Action. Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*, Palma Zlateva (ed.), 122–128. London: Routledge.

Kujamäki, Pekka. 1998. *Deutsche Stimmen der* Sieben Brüder: *Ideologie, Poetik und Funktionen literarischer Übersetzung.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lefevere, André [A.L.]. 1993. Untitled introduction to Florin (1993). In *Translation as Social Action. Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives,* Palma Zlateva (ed.), 122–123. London: Routledge.

Leppihalme, Ritva. 2001. "Translation strategies for realia." In *Mission, Vision, Strategies, Values: A Celebration of Translator Training and Translation Studies in Kouvola,* Pirjo Kukkonen & Ritva Hartama-Heinonen (eds), 139–146. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Loponen, Mika. 2009. "Translating irrealia: Creating a semiotic framework for the translation of fictional cultures." *Chinese Semiotic Studies* 2: 165–175.

Nedergaard-Larsen, Birgit. 1993. "Culture-bound problems in subtitling." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 2: 207–241.

Nida, Eugene. 1964 [1945]. "Linguistics and ethnology in translation-problems." *Word* 1: 194–208. Republished in *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology,* Dell Hymes (ed.), 90–100. New York, N.Y.: Harper Row.

Pedersen, Jan. 2007. "Cultural interchangeability: The effects of substituting cultural references in subtitling." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 15(1): 30–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/pst003.0 [Accessed 5 June 2011]

Vinay, J.-P. & Darbelnet, J. 1975 [1958]. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction.* Nouvel édition revue et corrigée. Paris: Didier.

Vlakhov, Sergei & Florin, Sider. 1970. "Neperevodimoe v perevode: realii." *Masterstvo perevoda* 6 (1969): 432–456. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel'.

Further reading

Bödeker, Birgit & Freese, Katrin. 1987. "Die Übersetzung von Realienbezeichnungen bei literarischen Texten: Eine Prototypologie." *TextconText* 2 (3): 137–165.

Denton, John. 1994. "Translation criticism, translation teaching and intercultural transfer." *Koiné: Problems and Trends in the Teaching of Interpreting and Translation* IV: 49–65.

Straight, H. Stephen. 1981. "Knowledge, purpose and intuition: Three dimensions in the evaluation of translation." In *Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice*, Marilyn Gaddis Rose (ed.), 40–51. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Witte, Heidrun. 2000. *Die Kulturkompetenz des Translators.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Zimmer, Rudolf. 1981. *Probleme der Übersetzung formbetonter Sprache: Ein Beitrag zur Übersetzungskritik.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Remote interpreting

Barbara Moser-Mercer
University of Geneva

Remote interpreting (also called tele-interpreting) is the term used to describe a bi- or multilingual video-conference where interpreters are physically remote from the meeting room and thus do not have a direct view of speakers and delegates. Video-conference interpreting relates to a meeting scenario where participants are distributed across two or more sites with interpreters located at one of these sites. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) uses video or web cameras and telephone lines to provide sign language interpreting* services for deaf or hard-of-hearing individuals, through an offsite interpreter, in order to communicate with hearing persons. It is similar to a Video-Relay-Service, where the hearing and signing parties are each located in different places. The term remote interpreting also covers telephone interpreting, where the interpreter is connected to the service provider via a standard phone line attached to a speaker phone and works in the consecutive mode. Video-conference technologies are used in a variety of interpreted settings: conference, court, public service, healthcare, and education, and involve both spoken and signed languages.

1. Technical solutions to emerging needs

Remote interpreting (RI) is not an entirely novel idea. Originally designed to facilitate meetings where parties could not physically come together, the prospect of European enlargement and the difficulty of retrofitting a large number of meeting rooms to accommodate simultaneous interpretation into 23 languages, led to a series of studies designed to explore its feasibility (Mouzourakis 2006). Globalization* and migration further increased the need for interpretation from and into a large number of languages, many of them less widely used, in a variety of health care and legal settings. The first telephone interpreting service was developed in Australia in 1973, while the service was started around 1985 in the United States (Heh & Qian 1997; Phelan 2001). With qualified interpreters being a rare commodity, the idea of distributed presence has gained ground. While the technical infrastructure was rather rudimentary during the introductory phase of RI, the 1960s and 1970s, latest compression as well as audio to video synchronizing (AV-sync) technology, decreased signal latency and stable large bandwidth have greatly improved the audio-visual quality of point-to-point and multi-point video-conferenced meetings. The International Telecommunications

Union (ITU), a UN specialized agency, has developed the following two important standards for video-conferencing: H.320 for video-conferencing over integrated services digital networks, accessible to anyone with a stable high-speed internet connection, and H.264 SVC to enable IP video transmission over the public Internet. It is the latter that has revolutionized desk-top video-conferencing with interpreting, putting it within reach of any computer user. The latter has also enabled pedagogical developments such as multi-point video-conferenced simultaneous interpretation classes with remote assessors, staff interpreters at the European Parliament and the European Commission, providing feedback to interpreting students around Europe (see: www.emcinterpreting.org, http://live.eti.unige.ch). In the case of standard telephone interpreting, dual handset phones offer greater privacy as parties can listen to the interpretation individually without the need to pass the handset back and forth. Noise-cancelling headsets free the interpreter's hands for note-taking and enhance acoustics.

2. Challenges

Several interrelated challenges increase the complexity of the remote interpreting scenario compared to live simultaneous and consecutive interpreting; they include cognitive, psychological and physiological factors, such as virtual presence, multi-sensory integration, multi-tasking, emotions, and psychological stress and fatigue. A skill that is clearly specified, such as simultaneous interpreting for an expert interpreter, offers ample opportunity for automation, which characterizes routine expert performance. Expert interpreters who are new to RI thus find it often difficult to meet these challenges. Novice interpreters rely largely on consciously controlled processing and exposure to RI settings during their learning phase allows for a considerable degree of adaptation to the RI scenario due to the plasticity of the brain (Moser-Mercer 2010), although not all cognitive challenges can be successfully overcome. From the interpreter's perspective, one of the fundamental problems with human communication is that the literal meaning of an individual utterance underspecifies the speaker's intended meaning (Grice 1975), which is why interpreters have to supplement what was said with contextual information and the effect of the speaker's utterance on the audience in the meeting room. This feedback is crucial for anticipation without which simultaneous interpreting would not be possible. This parallel processing of multiple cues (multi-sensory integration) allows the interpreter to feel present in the meeting room, while in RI the number of cues is constrained by the image(s) delivered to the interpreter as selected by the camera team that cannot anticipate interpreters' visual needs (Moser-Mercer 2005a). The interpreter is thus unable to develop situation models that correspond to reality; fatigue and feelings of alienation set in (Moser-Mercer, 2005b; Mouzourakis 2006). Past experiments with

RI also highlighted a number of technical challenges, but these have mostly been addressed through rapid technological advances as described above. In the case of telephone interpreting there are a number of advantages such as availability of more qualified interpreters on demand and for a large range of languages, confidentiality and impartiality, while lack of visual clues, poor acoustics and lack of preparation of the interpreter compromise interpreting quality in that setting as well (Mikkelson 2003) and the standard consecutive mode prolongs proceedings.

3. Outlook

While genuine RI in traditional conference settings is slow to gain ground, in part perhaps because of strict standards drafted by professional organizations such as AIIC (Code for the use of new technologies 2005 – http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm?page_id=120), its application in legal, healthcare and immigration settings is rapidly increasing. Projects such as AVIDICUS (http://www.videoconference-interpreting.net/index.html), an EU-funded project that explores the use of video-conference interpreting in criminal proceedings for hearing witnesses and experts, and HealthAccess (http://www.videoconference-interpreting.net/index.html) to ensure quick and accurate communication between doctors and patients, or studies in the field of migration (Sperling 2011) provide evidence of how this technology is revolutionizing the field of interpreting and ensuring equal access to public services irrespective of potential language barriers.

Useful weblinks

AIIC (www.aiic.net) Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence
AVIDICUS (http://www.videoconference-interpreting.net/Avidicus.html) Assessment of Videoconference Interpreting in the Criminal Justice Service
EMCI (www.emcinterpreting.org) European Masters in Conference Interpreting (http://live.eti.unige.ch)
IMIA (http://www.imiaweb.org/default.asp) International Medical Interpreters Association
ITU (www.itu.int) International Telecommunications Union
NAJIT (www.najit.org) National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators

References

Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. "Logic and conversation." In *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts,* Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds), 225–242. New York: Academic Press.

Heh, Yung-Chung & Qian, Hu. 1997. "Over-the-phone interpretation: A new way of communication between speech communities." In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference*, Muriel Jerome-O'Keeffe, Muriel (ed.), 51–62. Alexandria, VA: American Translators Association.

Mikkelson, Holly. 2003. "Telephone Interpreting: Boon or Bane?" In *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users*, Luis Perez Gonzalez (ed.), 251–269. Valencia: Universitat de Valencia.

Moser-Mercer, Barbara. 2005a. "Remote interpreting: Issues of multi-sensory integration in a multilingual task." *Meta* 50 (2): 727–738.

Moser-Mercer, Barbara. 2005b. "Remote interpreting: The crucial role of presence." *Bulletin Suisse de linguistique appliquée* 81: 73–97.

Moser-Mercer, Barbara. 2010. "The search for neuro-physiological correlates of expertise in interpreting." In *Translation and cognition*, Erik Angelone & Greg Shreve (eds), 263–287. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mouzourakis, Takis. 2006. "Remote interpreting: A technical perspective on recent experiments." *Interpreting* 8 (1): 45–66.

Phelan, Mary. 2001. *The interpreter's resource*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters.

Sperling, Jessica. 2011. *Communicating more for less: Using translation and interpretation technology to serve limited English proficient individuals*. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Further reading

Braun, Sabine. 2003. *Kommunikation unter widrigen Umständen? – Fallstudie zu einsprachigen und gedolmetschten Videokonferenzen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Hewitt, William E. 1995. *Court interpretation: Model guides for policy and practice in the state courts*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.

Hornberger, John.C., Gibson, Count .D., Jr., Wood, William, Degueldre, Christian, Corso, Irene, Palla, Barbara, Bloch, Daniel A. 1996. "Eliminating language barriers for non-English-speaking patients." *Medical Care* 34 (8): 845–856.

Revision

Brian Mossop
York University

Revision is the process of looking over a translation to decide whether it is of satisfactory quality, and making any needed changes. This very broad definition covers a range of activities, which will be considered here on the basis of who performs them: the original translator, a second translator, or a non-translator.

There is no uniformity in the English-speaking world about what to call the various activities. What one person calls revising, another may call checking, or re-reading, or reviewing, or proofreading, or editing.

1. Quality concepts governing revision

When should a change be made in a translation? The answer depends on the concept of quality* which – consciously or not – governs revision work.

For some translation departments and companies, quality means customer satisfaction: if experience suggests that the party paying for the translation will not be happy with some aspect of it, then a change is needed. This approach may lead to a focus on highly visible linguistic errors such as typos or the customer's special terminology (see Translation 'errors'*).

In some countries, quality in translation means protecting the local language against interference from a dominant language, usually English. Revision may then be seen not as correcting language errors and mistranslations but as a quasi-literary exercise in improving writing quality.

A third concept of quality (endorsed by the European Quality Standard for Translation Services EN 15038) is 'suitability for purpose': a change is needed if the translation is in some way not suited to the future readers of the translation (are they experts in the subject matter or not? what level of education do they have?), or not suited to the use that will be made of it (prestige publication? signage in a building? quick reading for information only? home page of a Web site?).

2. Revision by the original translator

It is widely recognized that translators should look over their own translations. EN 15038 calls this 'checking'; it is also known as 'self-revision'.

Self-revision may take place while the translator is drafting the translation and also in a separate post-drafting phase. Discussions in professional development workshops as well as empirical studies (Asadi & Séguinot 2005) reveal differing approaches to self-revision. Individuals often have a preferred approach, but vary it depending on factors such as text familiarity, text length, quality of writing in the source language, and time available to complete the translation.

In the drafting phase, some translators consider several possible wordings, then finally write one of these down and move on to the next sentence; some do not ponder much but instead write down a hasty translation and move on to the next sentence; finally, some write down a hasty translation but immediately revise it, perhaps several times, before moving on. The last group might be said to translate by self-revising.

Englund Dimitrova (2005, Sections 2.3.5, 4.5, 4.6.4 and 6.2.2) found that experienced translators make far fewer changes than less experienced ones, and most of these changes are made during the drafting phase. They do read over their translation once they come to the end of the text, but make few changes during this final reading as compared with less experienced translators. Englund Dimitrova also found that experienced translators focus on target-language-related issues in the post-drafting phase, paying very little attention to accuracy. Presumably they are confident that they have the right message, and what remains to determine is whether this message is getting across.

If the source text is poorly written, many translators will mentally 'edit' it as they translate: they will eliminate awkward wordings, redundancies and poor inter-sentence connections as they compose the translation.

3. Revision by a second translator

Translations may be looked over by a second translator; this is the activity which is often simply called 'revision'.

The revising translator may work for a translation agency, examining and if necessary correcting the translations submitted by the translators to whom the agency sends work. Self-employed translators who deal directly with clients sometimes exchange work with each other for revision purposes. Finally, in government or corporate translation departments, senior salaried translators may be designated as revisers, and they will examine the work of the junior translators (both to prepare the final translation for the client and to train the less experienced translators) as well as any work done by outside translators on contract (to prepare the final translation and also to decide whether the translation is good enough to merit full payment of the agreed amount).

The reviser is on the lookout for a very wide range of problems: sentences that don't make sense, omissions, unidiomatic language, awkwardly constructed sentences, a word whose level of language is not consistent with the rest of the text, incorrect terminology or failure to use the client's preferred terms, paragraph divisions that are not suitable in the target language, and much more (Mossop 2007 Chapter 10; Hansen 2009: 278–80).

The degree of revision effort may depend on the importance of the job (is the translation to be a high-prestige publication or is the text simply being translated for the information of one or two people whose reading knowledge of the source language is inadequate?). Effort may also depend on the reviser's confidence in the translator (has he or she produced many excellent translations in this field before?). Where there is high confidence, or the text is of lower importance, revision may be partial: the reviser does not bother to look over the entire text. Indeed, since revision by a second translator adds considerably to the cost of translation, and to the time required to complete a job, it may not be done at all with less important texts, or those by translators known to be reliable.

The reviser may or may not check the translation against the source text. If a reading of a few paragraphs suggests that there are no problems with accuracy, and the reviser has confidence in the translator, he or she may simply read the translation by itself, perhaps glancing occasionally at the source text if, for example, there is ambiguous wording in the translation. This is sometimes called 're-reading' or 'unilingual/monolingual revision'.

Some translators use Translation Memory software, with the result that wordings from previous translations, usually produced by other translators, are inserted into their draft translations. These wordings need to be examined and often adjusted, either to make the meaning conform to that of the source text or to make the inserted chunk fit into the surrounding target-language text in terms of cohesion or style. If the software finds a large number of matches in its database, then translating becomes a kind of revision since the translator is mostly examining and adjusting the inserted wordings rather than composing his or her own sentences.

In some cases, each member of a group of translators is presented with segments of a single text in a Translation Memory interface. It is then the reviser who has the task of pulling the translated segments together (Garcia 2008: 58).

4. Revision by a non-translator

Various people other than translators may look over a translation and make changes in it. Their work is often called 'editing' or 'reviewing'. Typically it does not involve comparison with the source text; indeed, such revisers may have no knowledge of the source language.

Translation departments and agencies sometimes employ proofreaders to read and correct the 'mechanical' aspects of outgoing translations: conformance with house style (will it be 'eight' or '8'?), grammar errors, page layout mistakes such as inconsistent typographical treatment of headings, and much more. Some proofreaders also make stylistic corrections.

A subject-matter expert may alter terminology, substitute phraseology more familiar to experts, correct any conceptual errors, and eliminate any unnecessary explicitations by the translator (who may have 'unpacked' ideas which do not in fact need to be spelled out for the experts who will be reading the translation).

Some non-translator revisers may make substantive changes. These may be minor or, at the other extreme, they may amount to using the translation as a springboard for creating a different text: a journalist might read a translation prepared by an international news agency and then make major additions and subtractions for local consumption (see Journalism and translation*).

Now that Internet users have easy access to on-line machine translation (in Google for example), there is probably a good deal of revision (called 'post-editing') of machine output being performed by non-translators.

5. Issues for revisers

The central challenge in revision is simply noticing problematic passages in the first place: you can't correct an error until you've found it! We do not know why errors are overlooked, because we lack empirical studies of revisers' reading process. One reason may be the need for different types of attention: can revisers notice a problem in the logical connection between two sentences at the same time as they are attending to microlinguistic matters such as gender agreement?

Also not known is whether some particular revision procedure is superior in the sense that it allows greater speed or produces better quality. Different revisers approach the task quite differently (Rasmussen & Schjoldager 2011; Robert 2008; Shih 2006; Mossop 2007 Chapter 12).

There may be little correlation between the time spent on revision and how much improvement is made. Beginners spend a lot of time making changes that make no difference in quality or even make the translation worse! Unnecessary changes are the main feature of poor revision. Beginners revising the work of others tend to substitute their own translations rather than ask whether the draft is acceptable as is. They also focus on relatively inconsequential matters, often missing major errors. Meanwhile, some experienced revisers are perfectionists, perhaps because they see themselves as defenders of the target language. They therefore spend extra time searching for the best possible translation rather than being content with what is adequate, and this may

bring them into conflict with those who fund translation services and want translations to be completed more quickly (Mossop 2006: 18–21).

Finally, revision problems may arise from the organization of work in a translation office and the relationships among those working on a text. Revisers are often operating in a vacuum: they have no contact with the translator or the author of the source text. The translator may have had a perfectly good reason for what appears to be a very odd rendering, but the reviser never finds this out. In the opposite situation, where the original translator and the revising translator work in the same office, the translator may not be open to criticism of his/her work, or the reviser may make changes that are simply matters of personal preference and thus create an antagonistic relationship, especially if the reviser does not know how to state justifications for the changes. Good translators do not necessarily make good revisers of other translators' work (Hansen 2009: 265–70).

References

Asadi, P. & Séguinot, C. 2005. "Shortcuts, strategies and general patterns in a process study of nine professionals." *Meta* 50 (2): 522–547.

Englund Dimitrova, B. 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Garcia, I. 2008. "Translating and revising for localisation: what do we know? What do we need to know?" *Perspectives in Translatology* 16 (1–2): 49–60.

Hansen, G. 2009. "The speck in your brother's eye – the beam in your own: Quality management in translation and revision." In *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research*, G. Hansen, A. Chesterman & H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds), 255–280. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mossop, B. 2006. "From Culture to Business: Federal Government Translation in Canada." *The Translator* 12 (1): 1–27.

Mossop, B. 2007. 2nd edition. *Revising and Editing for Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Rasmussen, K. & Schjoldager, A. 2011. "Revising Translations: a survey of revision policies in Danish translation companies." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 15. http://www.jostrans.org [Accessed 5 June 2011]

Robert, I. 2008. "Translation Revision Procedures: An Explorative Study." In *Translation and its Others. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2007*. http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/papers.html [Accessed 5 June 2011]

Shih, C.Y. 2006. "Revision from translators' point of view: an interview study." *Target* 18 (2): 295–312.

Further Reading

Künzli, A. 2007. "Translation Revision: a study of the performance of ten professional translators revising a legal text." In *Translation Studies: doubts and directions*, Y. Gambier, M. Shlesinger & R. Stolze (eds), 115–126. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mossop, B. 2007. "Empirical studies of revision: what we know and need to know." *Journal of Specialised Translation* 8. http://www.jostrans.org [Accessed 5 June 2011]

Status of interpreters

Cecilia Wadensjö
Stockholm University

The concept of 'status' can refer to *social ranking* as well as to *group membership*. The term can also refer to alignment in social interaction, or *participation status*, to use Goffman's (1981) terminology. In all three respects, the status of interpreters can be characterised as ambiguous and ambivalent.

1. Status as social ranking

Historical documents from antiquity and onwards reveal that ancient rulers, warriors, religious leaders and traders needed interpreters. A useful interpreter could advance socially, as did for instance Doña Marina, also known as *la Malinche*, who in 1519 was offered as a slave to the conquistador Hernán Cortés and subsequently became his interpreter and also his mistress and political adviser. Her posthumous reputation shows that the status of an interpreter may not become less ambivalent in time, as she is still admired by some and detested by others.

There is ample documentation of individuals acting in the role of interpreter in a more or less distant past, but little historical evidence of interpreters as an established occupational group. (For more information on interpreters in ancient times, see e.g. Roland 1999; Bastin & Bandia 2006).

As globalisation has continued, more types of situations have required interpreters in a growing number of language combinations. Changes in attitudes concerning the rights and obligations of people with speech and hearing impairment (see Sign language interpreting and translating*) have also increased the demand for signed language interpreters of various kinds (for people with signed as L1, for people with minimal language skills, for deaf-blind individuals, etc.). Moreover, authorities have increasingly recognised the need to ensure due process when dealing with people who are unable to communicate in the official languages, and this adds to the demand for interpreting services. Thanks to new technologies, on-site interpreting is no longer the only option.

With these changes in circumstances and attitudes has followed a development of educational programmes for interpreters needed in hospitals, police stations and other institutional settings (see Community interpreting*). With an increasing emphasis on competency rather than availability (a theme discussed by Morris (2010) regarding

court interpreters), it could be expected that education would improve the individual interpreter's status as a professional. At present however, the link between professional education and professional status is somewhat insecure for interpreters. This is partly due to how the interpreting business is structured. Interpreters are normally freelancers and get their assignments via service providers and conference organisers. Normally, the agent who offers the most interpreter services at the lowest cost gets to sign the biggest contracts, even when there is no guarantee that the interpreters with the most suitable educational background will be provided. The fact that consumers of interpreter services are unaware of the existence of interpreter education and the content of such education also weakens the link between interpreter education and status. In a survey conducted among lawyers and medical practitioners about their perceptions and expectations of interpreters' work, Hale (2007: 149) concludes that "many still think of Interpreting as an unskilled occupation, requiring no training and hence not meriting professional remuneration".

Paradoxically, the interpreting business is thriving at the same time as it is suffering from what Witter-Merithew and Johnson (2004), focusing on the case of sign language interpreting in the US, describe as *market disorder*, implying that formal requirements for employment of interpreters vary immensely.

2. Status as group membership

Outlining the scope of a new area of research devoted to questions concerning translators' and interpreters' identities and statuses, Sela-Sheffy and Shlesinger (2009: 125) estimate that "the professional status of translators and interpreters is, by and large, ambivalent and insecure". The theme has not been dealt with much as a separate one before, however it is not new in the literature. Already in the 1970s, Anderson (1976), in a pioneering article, discusses ambiguities and conflicts in the role of interpreter, due to their position "in the middle". More recently, e.g. Palmer and Fontan (2007) discuss the significant but uncertain role and status of interpreters, or "translators/fixers" in modern conflict journalism*.

Seemingly, the professionalisation of interpreting has engendered two opposing and co-existing trends – unification and diversification. On the one hand, a growing number of professional (and scientific) journals and conferences are devoting attention to interpreting as a consistent field and a field of its own. On the other hand, practicing interpreters do not always agree on what it is that constitutes professionalism in interpreting (cf. Wadensjö et al. 2007 on the professionalisation of interpreters) and about how interpreting should be conceptualised.

In scientific literature, interpreting practices are normally explored as specific kinds of interpreting, often distinguished in terms of the setting in which they occur

(community, conference, court, media, medical, telephone, and so forth), by a membership term (certified interpreter, AIIC[1] member, natural translator[2]) or in terms of interpreting mode (signed language, simultaneous*, consecutive*, relay*, whispering interpreting or *chuchotage*).

Terms like *chuchotage*, simultaneous and consecutive interpreting were established when the first schools for interpreters appeared during the beginning and middle of the 20th century. In such schools, students were trained to be part of diplomatic work and to give voice to players on the international stage. Their advanced education and proximity to prestigious environments did not, however, unambiguously enhance the social status of these interpreters. Pöchhacker (2009), reviewing 40 survey-based studies of conference interpreters' self-perception, concludes that they confirm what Herbert suggested in the fifties, when he expressed dissatisfaction with interpreters being increasingly directed to the booth to perform simultaneous interpreting, instead of being assigned to perform consecutively at the rostrum or at the conference table. As a consequence of this development, Herbert argued, interpreters' sense of agency and appreciation has diminished. This suggestion is also confirmed by Angelelli's (2004) study, based on questionnaires, and Mullamaa's (2006) study, based on in-depth interviews with interpreters performing in various modes and settings.

Regardless of differences in individual interpreters' role perceptions, the relatively higher levels of remunerations for interpreters performing at conferences, compared to those performing in community-based, institutional settings, reflects – and in the public eye, cements – a difference in status between groups of interpreters. (See Mikkelson 2009 on practical implications of drawing distinctions among different types of interpreting.)

The public image of the interpreter as *non-person* (Goffman 1990: 150) also adds to the ambiguity of the interpreter's status and occupational identity. In a study of a British talk show interview, Wadensjö (2008) shows how the primary participants, taking the illusory 'invisibility' or 'non-involvement' of the interpreter seriously, help the interpreter act as someone holding no stake in the interaction and thereby appearing as someone 'just translating'. This was possible partly because interpreters can be understood as non-persons, i.e. individuals who are "present during the interaction but in some respects do not take the role either of performer or of audience" (Goffman 1990: 150). In some sense, non-persons' activities are not expected to contribute to

---

1. *Association Internationale des Interprétes de Conférence* (International Association of Conference Interpreters).

2. Brian Harris (1992) coined the term *natural translation* for the interpreting and translation activity performed by young bilinguals, who have no formal training but display evident knack for this.

or be part of an event as such. Assuming the role of non-person in a situation, the individual (e.g. a servant, a technician in a televised talk show, or an interpreter) is supposed to be active but in some respect not seen. The presence of a non-person creates a certain *communicative wiggle room* (Wadensjö 2008: 187), as participants can alternatively orient to this non-person as somebody either sharing or not fully sharing the ongoing exchange.

3. Participation status or alignment in social interaction

The public image of the interpreter, and interpreters' self-perception are based on partly different assumptions. Diriker (2004), in her multi-method exploration of the presence and performance of interpreters assisting at an international colloquium, concludes that the ways in which simultaneous interpreters' services are generally described and advertised tend to mystify, rather than clarify, their actual professional needs and demands. The author finds that conference organisers and delegates failed to recognise how their own behaviour would affect interpreters' performances and explains this with the formers' simplistic understanding of the interpreters' task. Diriker (2004: 137) concludes that rather than being predetermined and unambiguous, the status of the interpreter has to be "*negotiated* on site amidst a complex and rather fuzzy network of relations, expectations and assessments prevailing in an actual conference context". Also Monacelli (2009) shows that interpreters performing in the simultaneous mode routinely engage in practices that seldom are part of the advertised image of interpreters – they "distance themselves from, avoid, or mitigate ST [source text] speakers' threats to receivers" (ibid.: 133–134), in the interest of maintaining the integrity of the system as a whole and in order to preserve their professional self. Hence, explored as situated social activity, an event where simultaneous interpreting is performed from a booth resembles an interpreter-mediated face-to-face encounter (as described by Wadensjö 1998; Apfelbaum 2004; Straniero Sergio 2007, among others) in that participants are orienting to and thereby co-producing context(s) of talk-in-interaction, including varying statuses of participation. In other words, participants' (including interpreters') alignment can change from one moment to the next, and since it is an interactional issue, alignment cannot be secured unilaterally.

In order to explore participants' shifting alignment in interpreter-mediated interaction, several studies have applied Goffman's (1981: 226) notions of 'animator', 'author' and 'principal'. Goffman introduces these analytical concepts to dissect various modes of speaking, to shed light on how individuals display to one another in what sense they are speakers of the words they produce. Goodwin (1990) in an influential study, applied these concept to demonstrate how children, when interacting in peer-groups, quote others' words and simultaneously display a certain stance towards these words

(through voice quality, gestures, mimics, linguistic means, etc.) in order to show their alignment with (or against) those talked about, at the same time as they demonstrate what kind of alignment they expect from those listening.

Goffman's model has proved itself useful particularly for shedding light on the complexity of quoted speech, which is probably why it appeals to many researchers of interpreter-mediated interaction. Interpreters principally quote (or animate) others' talk. In view of the fact that they do it in another language, there is also a certain authoring involved in most of what interpreters say, but they normally avoid aligning as principals, the party who is ultimately responsible for what is said. Being designed for monolingual talk, the Goffmanian model does not adequately capture some feature of interpreter-mediated interaction however. Most importantly, participants' indexing of how they relate to the words they speak and hear is not immediately apparent to everyone present and does not necessarily become clear as talk goes on. At a certain moment, actors can thus have a different perception of each others' participation status, of who is aligning with whom, without this becoming mutually shared knowledge. As demonstrated by Wadensjö (1998), Apfelbaum (2004) Straniero Sergio (2007) and others, this explains some of the ambiguity and ambivalence associated with interpreters.

References

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004. *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: A Study of Conference, Court, and Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anderson, R. Bruce W. 1976. "Perspectives on the Role of Interpreter." In *Translation, Applications and Research*, W. Rickard (ed.), 208–228. New York: Gardner Press.

Apfelbaum, Birgit. 2004. *Gesprächsdynamik in Dolmetsch-Interaktionen. Eine empirische Untersuchung von Situationen internationaler Fachkommunikation*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Bastin, Georges L. & Bandia, Paul F. (eds). 2006. *Charting the Future of Translation History*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Diriker, Ebru. 2004. *De-/Re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1990 [1959]. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1990. *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hale, Sandra. 2007. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harris, Brian. 1992 [1977]. "The Importance of Natural Translation." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 12: 96–114.

Mikkelson, Holly. 2009. *Interpreting Is Interpreting – Or Is It?* http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page3356 [Accessed 7 April 2011].

Monacelli, Claudia. 2009. *Self-preservation in Interpreting*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Morris, Ruth. 2010. "Images of the Court Interpreter – Professional Identity, Role Definition and Self-image." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 5 (1): 20–40.

Mullamaa, Kristina. 2006. *Towards a Dynamic Role Conception of Liaison Interpreters: An Ethnographic Study of Self-descriptions of Practising Liaison Interpreters in Estonia*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Palmer, Jerry & Fontan, Victoria. 2007. "'Our ears and our eyes': Journalists and fixers in Iraq." *Journalism* 8 (1): 5–24.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2009. "Conference Interpreting: Surveying the Profession." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 4 (2): 172–186.

Roland, Ruth, A. 1999. *Interpreters as Diplomats: A Diplomatic History of the Role of Interpreters in World Politics*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet, & Shlesinger, Miriam. 2009. "Introduction" *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 4 (2): 123–134.

Straniero Sergio, Francesco. 2007. *Talkshow Interpreting: La mediazione linguista nella conversazione-spettacolo*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction* [Language in Social Life Series] London/ New York: Longman.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 2008. "In and Off the Show: Co-constructing 'Invisibility' in an Interpreter-Mediated Talk Show Interview." *Meta* 53 (1): 184–203.

Wadensjö, Cecilia, Englund-Dimitrova, Birgitta & Nilsson, Anna-Lena (eds.). 2007. *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of Interpreting in the Community*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Witter-Merithew, Anna & Johnson, Leilani. 2004. "Market Disorder Within the Field of Sign Language Interpreting: Professional Implications." *Journal of Interpretation*. Silver Spring, MD: RID Publishing.

Status of translators

David Katan
University of Salento

As a profession, translation may be one of the oldest, but it still has "no official status" (Gouadec 2007: 245) or rather, no "relative social or professional position".[1] What is more there are no agreed indicators of the translator's status (Grbic 2010), and the concept itself is "a complex, subjective and context-dependent construct" (Dam & Zethsen 2008: 74). That said, status, here, will mean that translation is valued as an important specialist field requiring unique translating skills; and that competence* and quality* are considered key requisites for working professionally. Three contexts will be discussed: the academic, the market, and that of the translators themselves.

1. The Academic context

'Translation Studies'*, which was still in search of its name in the 1970's is now going through an academic boom, with 380 institutions in 63 countries teaching the subject (Kelly & Martin 2008: 294). A recent European Union (EU) initiative,[2] the European Master's in Translation (EMT) quality label, provides a rigorous set of criteria defining course content and minimum standards; and in the long term "sets out to enhance the status of the translation profession in the European Union". At present, 54 programmes have gained EMT status.

The growing number of specialised Translation publications – not to mention this two volume *Handbook* – along with the university programmes have now bestowed status on translation as a scholarly discipline and on the academics themselves. While early research and publications were focussed mainly on theorising the practice, the 'cultural' and 'social' turns in the discipline are focussing more strongly on the pivotal role of the translators themselves (see Turns of Translation Studies*; Natural translator and interpreter**). Delisle and Woodsworth, for example, highlight the translators who "have invented alphabets, helped build languages and written dictionaries […] have contributed to the emergence of national literatures, the dissemination of knowledge and the spread of religions" (1995: back page).

1. http://oxforddictionaries.com/view/entry/m_en_gb0810970#m_en_gb0810970

2. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/index_en.htm

Academics also began to herald new roles for the translator, as brokers, mediators, and in general, as experts in intercultural communication (Katan 2009a). A more recent turn, takes for granted the "highly professional translators who belong to the same 'world' as their clients" (Baker 2008: 22) and urges for a more socially aware, empowered, and ideologically committed translator, to gatekeep the flow of ideas, information and capitalism itself (see Committed approaches and activism*).

2. The market

The European Commission is one of the biggest employers of translators worldwide, and prides itself in treating translation with total professional status (see Institutional translation**).[3] However, a report from the EU itself (2009: v) concludes that the bidding process in an open and uncontrolled market has led to a decline in quality and to low recognition.

The origin of this low recognition probably lies with the ingrained "conduit metaphor" (Reddy 1979), which conceptualises 'language' as a static conveyor of meaning. Hence, translation is often believed to be "mere copy" (UK Copyright Act of 1911, cited in Venuti 1998: 58); and many EU countries still classify the job under "Secretarial and translation activities" despite revisions in the EU classification system (EU 2009: 6). The more recent successes of Computer Assisted Translation, such as *Google Translator*, only accentuate what is "often seen as little more than glorified secretarial work" (Gouadec 2007: 245; Katan 2009b; see Computer-aided translation*). Academics themselves have pondered on the translator's "subservient" status in society (Simione 1998) and subsequent "invisibility" (Venuti 1995).

A number of organisations, though, are striving to change this image. The very existence, for example, of The International Federation of Translators (FIT) is testament to the aim to "uphold the moral and material interests of translators throughout the world, advocate and advance the recognition of their profession, enhance their status in society and further the knowledge and appreciation of translation as a science and an art".[4] FIT promotes, for example, an International Translation Day, but its milestone so far has been its relationship with UNESCO, and UNESCO's (1976) adoption of the "Recommendation … to improve the Status of Translators".

The Recommendation begins by echoing Delisle and Woodsworth, adding that "translation promotes understanding between peoples and co-operation among

3. ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/…/quality_management_translation_en.pdf. Consulted 08/05/11

4. http://www.fit-ift.org/en/faqs.php

nations…". In general, it recommends that translators be treated fairly, and that member states "contribute generally to the development of the translating profession". Bandia (2008: 320) records some success in Africa where the UNESCO Recommendation was most promoted, but it has also been criticised for recommending too little (Newmark 2003: 3).

The European Union of Associations of Translation Companies has been instrumental in promoting the first professionally recognised translation industry standard, which aims to "establish and define the requirements for the provision of quality service for translation".[5] Gouadec (2007: 115) suggests that this EN 15038 standard will also improve translator status. However, for the moment, the voluntary standard focuses on company procedures and not on the translator or the translation (EU 2009: 24–25).

Less well publicised is the American Translators Association supported 2006 "Standard Guide for Quality Assurance in Translation", which does focus on translation quality, and goes some way to providing a common vocabulary of specialised translation terms for providers and clients (Angéli 2008).

Quality assurance for translators is felt by many to be the way to improve status (e.g. Chan 2009; Dam & Zethsen 2009). Nearly 50 years ago, Denmark passed the world's first translator's act, protecting the name of the state authorized translator with an official register and stamp. A handful of other countries have since followed suit (Gouadec 2007: 242). In 1989, the Alberta Association of Interpreters and Translators, Canada, celebrated the fact that it had become "the first translators' association in the world whose certified members are deemed professionals by law".[6] To date, though, this legal recognition has had sporadic impact on translator standing in society, due to the fact that there is no restriction on the practice (Dam & Zethsen 2009; Katan 2009b); and not all translators are necessarily in favour (e.g. Sela-Sheffey Rakefet 2008b; Setton & Liangliang 2009).

Officially recognised court translators, on the other hand, do have full professional status, as only they may legally certify that a translation is a true copy of the original. They often, however, have to compete with notaries public, and their prestige is often linked to the fact that they are usually *also* accredited interpreters (Monzó 2009: 146).

Though non-court (and non state-authorized) translators cannot legally vouch for their own translations, all translators have legal copyright of their translations, which in theory would give the translator exactly the same status as an author, and is also a UNESCO Recommendation. In practice, though, almost all translators (wittingly or no) sign away their right to copy the moment they accept payment on a "work to

5. http://euatc.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=21&Itemid=42

6. www.atio.on.ca/info/what_is_atio.asp

hire" basis, and their copyright is always derivative, dependent on the original author's copyright, whether alive or dead (Blésius 2003).

There is, of course, a status continuum, though there is no full agreement as to the ranking. Gouadec (2007:129), for example, suggests six levels, with the Localizer at the top-end of the continuum (though localizers themselves see translation as only part of their remit). He also asserts that being "self-employed gives them 'professional' status along with architects, doctors and other highly qualified practitioners". Dam and Zethsen (2008: 75) in their survey of Danish translators report, instead, that freelancers have lower status than salaried translators (see also Agents of translation**).

A number of researchers worldwide mention the "star" quality that a number of literary translators have obtained, equalling that of authors themselves (e.g. Sela-Sheffy 2006; Choi & Lim 2002; Tanabe 2010). It has also been suggested that status depends on the country (e.g. Choi & Lim 2002), though Katan (2009b) found little difference globally. Certainly, more 'exotic' language translators are better paid; and translation into one's native language will usually entail higher status (Gouadec (2007: 373).

According to Gouadec (2007: 349) "pay" is the only real measure of "legitimate accreditation". While established freelancers, star literary translators and international institution employees will be paid well, studies clearly point to below-average income in comparison with other MA-level professions (e.g. Dam & Zethsen 2009; Choi & Lim 2002; Chan 2005). One reason is that translation is "a pink-collar profession" (Sela-Sheffy & Shlesinger 2008: 80), a category which still today suffers from lower economic and symbolic capital (Wolf 2007: 136–141).

3. The translators

The viewpoint of translators themselves is extremely revealing, for, notwithstanding their full recognition of (and frustration with) their perceived low status, the question of status appears secondary (e.g. Katan 2009b; Setton & Liangliang 2009). First, literary translators tend to be intellectually satisfied, independently of pay (Dam & Zethsen 2008; Sela-Sheffy 2008a). But, more importantly, recent surveys report that translators *as a whole* are "pretty to extremely satisfied" with their situation (Katan 2009b: 204; Setton & Liangliang 2009: 202).

Indeed, the translator comments (in Katan 2009b) point to what Simeoni (1998: 28) called the "transatorial desire to spend more time polishing their work for the sake of it", which endows translators with "a dignity, independently of material achievements" (Sela-Sheffy 2008b: 3).

This dignity may then transform into status through continuing professional development and specialization over time; but most visibly through establishing

respect from individual clients (Gouadec 2007: 99; Setton & Liangliang 2009; Dam & Zethsen 2009; Monzó 2009: 152).

To conclude, there is still a wide gap between academic aspirations and the market reality, leaving – for the moment – individual clients to bestow status on those translators who have demonstrated their competence and quality.

References

Angéli, Gérard. 2008. "Do We Really Need Translation Standards After All?: A Comparison of US and European Standards for Translation Services." *Translation Journal* 12 (1). http://translation-journal.net/journal//43standards.htm [Accessed 10 March 2011].

Baker, Mona & Chesterman, Andrew. 2008. "Ethics of Renarration: Mona Baker is Interviewed by Andrew Chesterman." *Cultus* 1: 10–33.

Bandia, Paul. 2008. "African Tradition." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* 2nd edition. Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha (eds), 313–319. London/New York: Routledge.

Blésius, Corinne. 2003. "Copyright and the Translator: Who Owns your Translations?" *ITI Bulletin* November–December: 9–12.

Chan, Andy. L. J. 2005. "Why are most translators underpaid? A descriptive explanation using asymmetric information and a suggested solution from signalling theory." *Translation Journal* 9 (2). http://accurapid.com/journal/32asymmetric.htm [Accessed 10 March 2011].

Chan, Andy. L. J. 2009. "Perceived Benefits of Translator Certification to Stakeholders in the Translation Profession: A Survey of Vendor Managers." *Across Languages and Cultures* 11 (1): 93–113.

Choi, Jungwha & Lim Hyang-Ok. 2002. "The Status of Translators and Interpreters in Korea." *Meta* 47 (4): 627–635.

Dam Helle. V. & Korning Zethsen, K. 2009. "Who said low status?: A study on factors affecting the perception of translator status." *Jostrans* 12: 2–36.

Dam Helle. V. & Korning Zethsen, K. 2008. "Translator Status: A Study of Danish Company Translators." *The Translator* 14 (1): 71–96.

Delisle, Jean. & Woodsworth, Judith (eds). 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

European Commission, Directorate-General for Translation. 2009. *Studies on translation and multilingualism: the size of the language industry in the EU*. http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=HC8009985 [Accessed 08 May 2011].

Gouadec, Daniel. 2007. *Translation as a Profession*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grbić, Nadja. 2010. "'Boundary Work' as a concept for studying professionalization processes." In *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part 2*. Special issue of *TIS* 5 (1): 109–123.

Katan, David. 2009a. "Translation Theory and Professional Practice: A Global Survey of the Great Divide." *Hermes* 42: 111–154.

Katan, David. 2009b. "Occupation or profession: A survey of the translators' world." *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part 1*. Special issue of *TIS* 4 (2): 123–134.

Kelly, Dorothy & Martin, Anne. 2008. "Training and Education." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* 2nd edition. Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha (eds), 294–299. London/New York: Routledge.

Monzó, E. 2009. "Legal and translational occupations in Spain.Regulation and specialization in jurisdictional struggles." In *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part 1*. Special issue of *TIS* 4 (2): 135–154.

Newmark, Peter. 2003. "Translation in a Globalised World." *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 8 (2/3): 1–5 http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-08–2-3/beitrag/Newmark1.htm [Accessed 18 March 2011]

Reddy, Michael. 1979. "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in our Language about Language." In *Metaphor and Thought*, A. Ortony (ed.), 284–310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet. 2008a. "The Translators' Personae: Marketing Translatorial Images as Pursuit of Capital." *Meta* 53 (3): 609–622.

Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet. 2008b. "On the Status and Professional Self-Perception of Translators in Israel." http://www.tau.ac.il/~rakefet/papers/RSIsraeliTranslators[Istanbul2008].pdf [Accessed 10 March 2011]

Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet. 2006. "The Pursuit of Symbolic Capital by a Semi-Professional Group: The Case of Literary Translators in Israel." In *Übersetzen-Translating-Traduire: Towards a "Social Turn"?*, Michaela Wolf (ed.), 244–252. Vienna/Berlin: LitVerlag.

Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet & Shlesinger Miriam. 2008. "Strategies of Image-Making and Status Advancement of Translators and Interpreters as a Marginal Occupational Group. A Research Project in Progress." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, Pym Anthony, Shlesinger Miriam, Simeoni Daniel, (eds), 79–90. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal State of the Translator's Habitus." *Target* 10 (1): 1–39.

Setton, Robin & Lianglang, Alice, G. 2009. "Attitudes to Role, Status and Professional Identity in Interpreters and Translators with Chinese in Shanghai and Taipei." In *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part* 1. Special issue of *TIS* 4 (2): 210–238.

Tanabe, Kikuko. 2010. "Revealing How Japanese Translators view their own social roles." http://www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/languages/pdf/TANABE-NUOVO.pdf [Accessed 12 March 2011]

UNESCO. 1976. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13089&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 8 May 2011]

Venuti, Laurence. 2008 [1995]. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Laurence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Michaela. 2007. "The Female State of the Art: Women in the 'Translation Field'". In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, Zuzana Jettmarová (eds), 129–141. Amsterdam Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Further reading

Dam Helle. V. & Korning Zethsen, K. 2010. "Translator Status: Helpers and Opponents in the Ongoing Battle of an Emerging Profession." *Target* 22 (2): 194–211.

Commission, Directorate-General for Translation. 2009. *Studies on translation and multilingualism: the size of the language industry in the* EU. http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=HC8009985 [Accessed 08 May 2011]

Gouadec, Daniel. 2007. *Translation as a Profession*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet & Shlesinger Miriam (eds). 2009. *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part 1*. Special issue of TIS 4 (2).
Sela-Sheffy, Raqefet & Shlesinger Miriam (eds). 2010. *Profession, Identity and Status: Questions of Role and Identity – Part 2*. Special issue of *TIS* 5 (1).

Stylistics and translation

Jean Boase-Beier
University of East Anglia

Translation is closely connected with stylistics because stylistics aims to explain how a text means rather than just what it means, and knowing how texts mean is essential for translation. Stylistics explains the fine detail of a text such as why certain structures are ambiguous or how a metaphor works, and is used to describe both literary and non-literary texts. Originally a development of linguistics, stylistics began to take shape as a distinct discipline in the 1960s, influenced by the close-reading methods of literary theorists such as I.A. Richards and by the structuralist linguistic and literary methods of scholars such as Roman Jakobson. There are several different strands of stylistics, including those with a pragmatic, sociolinguistic, or literary focus, but common to all today is a concern to go beyond the words on the page to consider both the choices they represent and the effects they have on their reader. Since the 1980s, these concerns have been particularly emphasised in the type of stylistics known as "cognitive stylistics". But in fact all stylistics, in that it is concerned with choice and effect, is to some degree cognitive. When used to explain literary texts, cognitive stylistics is often referred to as cognitive poetics, because it is concerned with the way literature is crafted in both poetry** and prose (see Stockwell 2002: 1–6). In modern cognitive stylistics and poetics, the context of a text is always seen as cognitive context: it includes not only what happens in the world in which the text is situated, but also what speakers of a language, members of a culture, or readers of a poem or tourist brochure know and think and feel with respect to both text and world.

All the above considerations are essential in Translation Studies* in order to understand how the original work interacted with its original audience and how the translated work might interact with a new audience. Stylistic theory is descriptive: it aims to explain what the consequences are, for example, when a Chinese subjectless verb in a love poem has, in its English translation, taken a female subject, or when the connotations of an Italian sport are not easily conveyed in an English version of a tourist brochure. Because of its linguistic basis, stylistics allows us to describe all such aspects of original and translated texts, and the differences between them, in clear detail. And, though it is not in itself prescriptive, it allows us to consider what the effects of such explanations might be on future acts of translation.

Issues of style, choice, and effect, so central to stylistics, are the concern both of the translation critic and of the practising translator. Especially important for both scholars and practitioners is the fact that recent cognitive stylistics in particular is

concerned above all with what goes beyond the obvious in a text: with connotations and hidden meanings, with ambiguities, with gaps, silences and with the way the language of a text mirrors its subject (a phenomenon known as iconicity; see Leech & Short 2007: 187–190). Stylistics explores what such subtle features of a text suggest about attitudes or beliefs, about the world view of the narrator or a particular character, or of an author or reader; style that reflects world view or ideology is sometimes referred to as mind-style (see Leech & Short 2007: 15–167). All stylistics, but especially cognitive poetics, shares many of these concerns with modern literary theory, which, partly influenced by structuralist and poststructuralist theory, has often been drawn into closer dialogue with linguistics, for example in the area of narratology (see Fludernik 1996). Though there will always be those linguists or literary critics who argue for a separation of literary and linguistic theory, this is not an argument likely to impress the literary translator, for whom it is essential to understand both how language works in a text and how it achieves its literary effects.

Translation Studies tends to distinguish between literary and non-literary translation (see Hatim & Munday 2004: 73–4). Stylistics (and especially cognitive stylistics), on the other hand, generally assumes that the same linguistic means are at the writer's disposal in literary and non-literary texts (Stockwell 2002: 7), and yet there are important differences. For example, metaphors** that describe life as a journey (Lakoff & Turner 1989: 9–10) will be found not only in all cultures but also in all types of text. But the way different text-types work to engage the reader will be different and so, consequently, will the way they are translated. A literary text will typically be open-ended, demanding that the reader adjust his or her view or way of thinking as reading progresses, so the translator is likely to try to keep the target text similarly open to the reader's interpretation. Thus an English poem about punting on the Cam could be interpreted as an extended metaphor for life, and each reader will be able to see the journey as relevant to his or her own experiences. A translator of the poem will need to be sure that target readers can also relate the metaphor to their own lives, and may preserve or change the reference to punting depending on whether it will make sense to the target audience. But the translator of a tourist brochure about Cambridge has no such freedom of choice, and does not need it; punting on the Cam would here be much more likely to be a factual reference, not a metaphor.

In considering such differences in literary and non-literary text-types, stylistics overlaps with the study of register. 'Register' is a term used to refer to the particular stylistic characteristics typically associated with a certain text-type, subject, or degree of formality. Correctly identifying the register of a source text can be considered one of the prerequisites for successful translation (Hatim & Munday 2004: 76–81).

A description of the source text, its style and register, a consideration of its functions and effects, will go some way towards clarifying the issues involved in translation. Stylistics also aims to help explain the source text writer's choices by identifying

what the usual syntactic pattern or collocation would be (sometimes using statistical methods, see Leech & Short 2007: 34–59). Style is always closely linked to the idea of choice because, though grammar places constraints on deviation, there is still always a choice between several possible structures which only differ stylistically: whether we say "the cat sat on the rug" or "the cat sat on the mat" is not a grammatical but a stylistic choice based on sound repetition. If the reasons for the choices made by the original author are understood, it is possible to judge to what degree similar choices have been or can be made by the translator (cf. Parks 2007).

At the heart of all stylistics, and of contemporary cognitive stylistics in particular, is a concern with the act of reading, including such issues as the temporal processing of texts (Miall & Kuiken 1998) or the experiencing of emotion (Stockwell 2002: 171–173). Stylistics can help both translators and translation critics to understand the effects of features in the source text upon its reader: for example, does deviant syntax slow reading down or repetition serve to give a particular feature salience, that is, to foreground it (Leech & Short 2007: 23)? Part of the concern of recent translational stylistics (a term used e.g. by Malmkjaer 2004) is with the different cognitive contexts of original and target readers. For example, a novel written under conditions of censorship* or colonisation might represent the thoughts of a character in free indirect mode, so that it is not clear whether we are being given the character's or the narrator's thoughts. This uncertainty reflects the uncertainty of an unequal power situation: it is not clear that one can have one's own thoughts. Stylistics, and especially cognitive stylistics, would classify such instances of thought representation and discuss their effects (Leech & Short 2007: 255–281). Translational stylistics would go further, considering how the translation has preserved or changed the focal point from which the reader experiences someone else's thoughts. Such changes can be extremely subtle, but their effects on the translated text and its reception may be profound. Stylistic analysis helps the translation critic explain the ways in which some translations are stylistically closer to the original than others and also why some (not necessarily the closer ones) are more commercially successful, or regarded as being of higher literary quality.

Besides explaining how translators have actually translated, stylistics also makes predictions about what translators can and might do. Such predictions have pedagogical implications. University courses which teach stylistics as part of translation assume that stylistically-aware reading can be learned and will result in better translations. This is not merely because the source text will be more carefully read: if writing skills can also be learned, then stylistics is a crucial part of their teaching. Because style is the optional part of language, it is here that creativity resides for the literary translator, as for any other writer. To return to an earlier example, understanding how the lack of a subject in a Chinese love poem allows a range of possible meanings to be accessed by the reader can help the English translator to enable (or decide not to enable) a similar range of meanings for the new reader. Thus the two basic assumptions of stylistics – that

style reflects choice and attitude, and that it is the style that engages the reader by activating cognitive context - suggest two things about the act of translation, in particular literary translation: that it is essentially about the mind behind the text, and that it is a creative rather than a mechanical act. These in turn suggest that a translation might sometimes be evaluated less by its closeness to the source text than by whether it fulfils the stylistic criteria of the text-type it belongs to in the degree and nature of interaction it allows its reader.

In trying to pinpoint what it is that allows the evaluation of a literary translation in particular, earlier scholars of translation such as Pope or Denham have referred to the 'spirit' of the text (see e.g. Robinson 2002: 156). Because style consists of those elements that lie beyond the surface of a text, stylistics provides a more theoretically sound way of describing its 'spirit'. Literary effect, for example, can be understood in terms of changes to the cognitive context of the reader. Using stylistics to help understand translation (both as process and as product), can thus help free translation, and especially literary translation, from a narrow view of its relation to the source text, in this way playing its part in current debate by supporting the view held by many translators and translation scholars that translation is essentially a creative undertaking.

References

Fludernik, M. 1996. *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology.* London: Routledge.
Hatim, B. & Munday, J. 2004. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book.* London: Routledge.
Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. 1989. *More than Cool Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Leech, G. & Short, M. 2007. *Style in Fiction.* London: Longman.
Malmkjaer, K. 2004. "Translational Stylistics: Dulcken's Translations of Hans Christian Andersen." *Language and Literature* 13 (1): 13–24.
Miall, D.S. & Kuiken, D. 1998. "The Form of Reading: Empirical Studies of Literariness." *Poetics* 25: 327–341.
Parks, T. 2007. *Translating Style.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishers.
Robinson, D. 2002. *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Stockwell, P. 2002. *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

Further reading

Boase-Beier, J. 2004. "Knowing and Not Knowing: Style, Intention and the Translation of a Holocaust Poem." *Language and Literature* 13 (1): 25–35.
Boase-Beier, J. 2006. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Simpson, P. 2004. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
Tabakowska, E. 1993. *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*. Tübingen: Narr.

Theory of translatorial action

Christina Schäffner
Aston University

The 1970s saw the development of functionalist approaches* to translation. Previous linguistics-based theories, which dominated from the 1950s to the mid 1970s, perceived translation mainly as transfer of meaning and tried to explain by which methods equivalence between target text and source text could be achieved. In contrast, functionalist approaches make the purpose which the target text is to achieve for its addressees in a target culture context their guiding principle. Translation is primarily understood as a form of human action in contexts and cultures. Functionalist approaches were initiated in Germany, in particular by Hans Vermeer (Skopos theory 1978), and further elaborated, among others, by Hönig and Kußmaul (1982), Nord (1997) as well as Reiss and Vermeer (1984).

1. Translation as cooperative interaction

Roughly in parallel with these developments in Germany, Justa Holz-Mänttäri in Finland developed her theory of translatorial action ('translatorisches Handeln'), which was outlined in detail in her 1984 monograph. Very similar to Skopos theory, a functionally and socioculturally oriented concept of translation is presented, drawing on communication theory and on action theory. Most of her work is published in German, which unfortunately prevented her theory from receiving due attention beyond the German-speaking academic context (for summaries in English see, for example, Schäffner 1998; Snell-Hornby 2006). Her theory has been instrumental for Risku (2004), Witte (2000), and, in the context of translator training, Vienne (2000).

The main points of Holz-Mänttäri's approach can be explained as follows. The need of translation arises whenever for the purposes of cooperation language and cultural barriers have to be overcome. The primary purpose of translatorial action is thus to enable functionally adequate communication to take place across cultural barriers. Although the end product is (normally) a text whose function is to guide cooperative action in specific situations, translatorial action involves much more than text production, or text design, to use Holz-Mänttäri's term. Translatorial action is conceived as a whole network of actions performed by agents** who are experts in their own fields and roles. These roles include the initiator (the agent who needs a translation, and who may be identical with the ultimate recipient), the client (the person who commissions

a translation, who may be identical with the initiator), the translator, and other experts they may cooperate with (e.g. terminologists, revisors).

Holz-Mänttäri introduced a distinctive and highly abstract terminology, as obvious in her definition of translatorial action:

> Zweck translatorischen Handelns sei die Produktion von Texten, die von Bedarfsträgern als Botschaftsträger im Verbund mit anderen für transkulturellen Botschaftstransfer eingesetzt werden; Zweck des Botschaftstransfers sei die Koordinierung von aktionalen und kommunikativen Kooperationen. (Holz-Mänttäri 1984: 87)

Nord (1997: 13) provides the following concise English version:

> Translational action is the process of producing a message transmitter of a certain kind, designed to be employed in superordinate action systems in order to coordinate actional and communicative cooperation.

'Botschaftsträger' (literally: 'message bearer', rendered as 'message transmitter' in Nord above, also as 'message conveyor' in Snell-Hornby 2006) replaces the more traditional word 'text', and the specification as 'Botschaftsträger im Verbund' (literally: 'message-bearer compound') highlights the potentially multimodal nature of texts. Holz-Mänttäri also deliberately avoids the word 'translation' and prefers to speak of 'translatorial action' in order to move away from the expectations traditionally attached to that term. She argues that because the verb 'translate' requires a grammatical object, the attention is directed back towards the source text which is thus given much more prominence than it deserves (Holz-Mänttäri 1986: 355). When she does use the word 'Text' in her writings, she normally puts it in quotation marks and combines it with 'Botschaftsträger' (e.g. "ein Botschaftsträger 'Text' …" Holz-Mänttäri 1986: 366).

Holz-Mänttäri's theory thus has wide-ranging consequences for the understanding of the status of what is traditionally called source text and target text and the relation between these two, of the role and status of the translator, and also for translator training. In her model, the source text is viewed as a mere tool for the realisation of communicative functions in the target context and culture. It is a text to which a translation initiator has assigned the function of serving as source material for translatorial action. The source text is thus totally subordinate to the target text purpose, it is afforded no intrinsic value, and may undergo radical modification in view of the commission.

One purpose of the translatorial operations is to establish whether the content and form components of the source text are functionally suitable for the communicative cooperation the target text as a message bearer is to achieve in its new context. In making this decision, the translator cannot be guided by the source text alone. Any other material received from the client or collected as part of the research is of equal relevance. In the case of multimodal texts (e.g. an illustrated prospectus), transcultural

action also includes evaluating the photos as to their appropriateness for the target culture, and, if necessary, suggesting new photos to be selected. A translator may also recommend producing a totally independent text in the target language, if the source text is judged not to be functionally suitable in view of the client's needs. Translation is thus conceived as part of, rather than constitutive of, translatorial action.

Translatorial action is embedded in the social order, i.e. in a society organized by a division of labour. In this society, communication is essential in coordinating action-oriented cooperation between experts in their respective areas. When communication is to take place trans-culturally, this aim of coordination can only be met via translatorial action, performed by a translator as an expert in the area of transcultural message transfer. In the society based on a division of labour, it is the translator who is specialised in producing functionally adequate message bearers for successful transcultural interaction (Holz-Mänttäri 1984: 27) and who can make clients aware of potential intercultural conflicts. In order to be successful, cooperation requires that the agents involved agree (explicitly or implicitly) on who is responsible for which tasks. The actions of translators thus also include negotiating co-operatively with the client(s) whether, when and how a commission can be carried out effectively and what kind of optimal translatorial action can be guaranteed, in view of the specific circumstances, the ultimate purpose of the target text, and/or of the deadline set.

2. Text design as professional action

Holz-Mänttäri puts emphasis on translatorial action as professional action (professional profiles are discussed in Holz-Mänttäri 1986: 363ff.). It is in their professional capacity that translators design texts for others to cooperate ('professionelles fremdbedarfsorientiertes Handeln' – Witte 2000: 168). That is, in designing texts, the translator does not pursue his or her own communicative aim. Holz-Mänttäri therefore characterises translatorial competence* as an artificial-professional competence which differs from evolutionary-natural communicative competence in which people pursue their own communicate aims (including transcultural communication). The ethical responsibility of translators is thus also derived from their status as experts in their own right. Holz-Mänttäri approaches ethical aspects (see Ethics and translation*) from the perspective of professionalism, arguing that translators assume responsibility for their decisions, actions and their products, in line with the commission and clients' needs, which, in turn, earns them their status in the professional world (Holz-Mänttäri 1993: 304).

With translatorial action being initiated externally, and its conditions being determined by purposes and aims that are peculiar to each individual case, the translator's actions must be informed by relevant data. These data are (to be) gathered

prospectively on the basis of an analysis of the overall situation of the intended transcultural interaction. Professional text production thus starts with a clarification of the client's needs ('Bedarfserfassung'), proceeds to the product specification ('Produktspezifizierung'), then to the translation-oriented source text analysis and ends with a text production plan ('Vertextungsplan', Holz-Mänttäri 1984). These stages can be incorporated in translator training programmes as illustrated, for example, by Vienne (2000). In translation classes, students can be made aware that in establishing a product specification, that is, a description of the features required of the target text, text-external factors pertaining to the commissioning of the target text must be taken into account. These factors influence to a great extent the framework within which all the textual operations involved in translatorial action are to take place.

3. Conclusion: significance and status of the theory

With her theory of translatorial action, Holz-Mänttäri provided a conceptual framework which sees translation as being embedded in and subordinate to transcultural cooperation. At the time functionalist approaches to translation were introduced, they were often described as "exotic and eccentric" (Snell-Hornby 2006: 57). They were criticised for disregarding the source text (e.g. Koller 1995), for being too heavily biased towards non-literary texts, and, especially with Holz-Mänttäri, for the terminology, which Newmark (1991: 106) described as "modernistic abstract jargon of contemporary Public Relations". The rejection of the paradigm of linguistics has with hindsight also been evaluated as "exciting, even revolutionary" (Pym 2010: 56) for its time, although Martín de León (2008) exposes that the new concepts were structured in a contradictory way.

Holz-Mänttäri's focus is on the external aspects of translation and on modelling factors for professional action. As a consequence, less attention is given to the actual relationship between source text and target text, and the translators' actual operations with the linguistic elements of the texts are not explored empirically. There are hardly any examples in Holz-Mänttäri's publications which serve as evidence of the validity of her theory. Her model in essence presents principles of cooperation and provides guidelines for effective action of translators. It is thus predominantly of a prescriptive nature and useful for translator training (see Translation didactics*).

From today's perspective, it can also be argued that the ethical dimension of professional action is undervalued. For Holz-Mänttäri, the translator is at an equal status with other experts he or she is cooperating with. Or, as Pym says, "Holz-Mänttäri thus projects a world of complementary expertise, full of mutual respect, and with a prominent and well-defined place for the properly trained translator" (Pym 2010: 55). Already in 1992, Hönig argued that Holz-Mänttäri's society based on a division of

labour is presented at a horizontal level with translation correspondingly as cooperation. In his view, society is vertically and hierarchically structured, which inevitably raises the question of power (Hönig 1992: 3). Holz-Mänttäri acknowledges that in the real world, the power of clients may constrain professional expertise. She argues, however, that this does not affect the theory of translatorial action which is not intended to describe actual facts, but rather to model variables and their interrelations as a system (Holz-Mänttäri 1993: 304). It is thus a model of an ideal system, describing optimal behaviour of expert translators who act rationally. The lack of recognising the existence of several and potentially conflicting purposes has been addressed as another weakness of functionalist theories (e.g. Martín de León 2008).

In the last two decades, research on translation has become more empirically based, and questions of a social, ethical, ideological nature have moved into the centre of the discipline of Translation Studies*. Holz-Mänttäri's theory of translatorial action does not figure very prominently as a theoretical framework in modern research projects. Moreover, there is not much development of the theory either, although Risku (2004: 45–48) mentions increased consideration of cognition and creativity as new developments (e.g reference to biological-social elements of the human being in Holz-Mänttäri 1988, 1993). Risku (2004) herself uses the theory of translatorial action in combination with a model of situated action and cognition as a framework for empirical research into translation management procedures in companies. Martín de León (2008) too, sees potential in the concept of situated translational action for broadening the theoretical framework of functionalist approaches, whose value for the development of Translation Studies has been widely acknowledged.

References

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa. 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa. 1986. "Translatorisches Handeln – theoretisch fundierte Berufsprofile." In *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung,* Mary Snell-Hornby (ed.), 348–374. Tübingen: Franke.

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa. 1988. "Translation und das biologisch-soziale Gefüge ‚Mensch'." In *Translationstheorie – Grundlagen und Standorte* [Studia translatologica A 1], Justa Holz-Mänttäri (ed.), 39–57. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto.

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa. 1993. "Textdesign – verantwortlich und gehirngerecht." In *Traducere Navem. Festschrift für Katharina Reiß zum 70. Geburtstag* [Studia translatologica A 3], Justa Holz-Mänttäri & Christiane Nord (eds), 301–320. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto.

Hönig, Hans G. 1992. "Von der erzwungenen Selbstentfremdung des Übersetzers – Ein offener Brief an Justa Holz-Mänttäri." *TextconText* 7: 1–14.

Hönig, Hans G. & Kußmaul, Paul. 1982. *Strategie der Übersetzung. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch*. Tübingen: Narr.

Koller, Werner. 1995. "The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies." *Target* 7 (2): 191–222.

Martín de León, Celia. 2008. "Skopos and beyond. A critical study of functionalism." *Target* 20: 1–28.

Newmark, Peter. 1991. "The curse of dogma in Translation Studies." *Lebende Sprachen* 36: 105–108.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London/New York: Routledge.

Reiß, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

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

Schäffner, Christina. 1998. "Action (theory of 'translatorial action')." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Mona Baker (ed.), 3–5. London/New York: Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1978. "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie." *Lebende Sprachen* 23: 99–102.

Vienne, Jean. 2000. "Which Competences Should We Teach to Future Translators, and How?" In *Developing Translation Competence*, Christina Schäffner & Beverly Adab (eds), 91–100. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Witte, Heidrun. 2000. *Die Kulturkompetenz des Translators. Begriffliche Grundlegung und Didaktisierung* [Studien zur Translation 9]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Translation policy

Reine Meylaerts
University of Leuven

In its most restricted sense, a policy refers to the conduct of political and public affairs by a government or an administration, i.e. to political or public practices as implemented in legal rules. Such practices include the so-called language and translation policies (see also below). However, in a broader definition, policy embraces not only governments and government agencies but also other institutional settings and international organizations such as the EU or the UN and private companies, each of them implementing the conduct of their organization by specific rules. In addition, even relatively informal situations have their policy dimensions to the point that even a lack of policy may constitute a policy. Within Translation Studies*, a similar stretch is to be observed: 'translation policy' covers a variety of meanings, designing official institutional settings (see Institutional translation**) but also a wide range of relatively informal situations related to ideology, translators' strategies, publishers' strategies, prizes and scholarships, translator training, etc. Functioning as an umbrella term or a container concept, translation policy risks however becoming an empty notion with little conceptual surplus value. This paradox may be illustrated by the absence of the term as an entry in several companions (Munday 2009; Pöchhacker 2004), theoretical overviews (Pym 2010), readers (Venuti 2000) or encyclopedias in the field of Translation Studies (Baker & Saldanha 2008).

1. The founding fathers

Since the development of Translation Studies as an academic discipline in the late sixties and early seventies of the twentieth century, the concept of 'translation policy' was present in some of the founding fathers' seminal publications, without however ever being a core concept. In Levý's "Translation as a Decision Process" (1967), translation policy is used in the broad sense of translators' strategies during the translation process*. Observing that poetry translators prefer not to "preserve in rhymes the vowels of the original" (1967: 1179), Levý concludes that "the same policy is pursued by translators of prose: they are content to find for their sentence a form which, more or less, expresses all the necessary meanings and stylistic values, though it is probable that, after hours of experimenting and rewriting, a better solution might be found" (1967: 1180). In his groundbreaking paper "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" presented

at the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics (Copenhagen 1972) and paving the way for the future Descriptive Translation Studies*, J S Holmes urged for meta-reflection on the nature of Translation Studies and argued the case of Translation Studies as an empirical (descriptive and explanatory) science with a pure and an applied branch. Within the field of applied studies*, next to translator training and translation aids (e.g. grammars, terminologies), Holmes foresaw a third area of translation policy: "The task of the translation scholar in this area is to render informed advice (…) in defining the place and role of translators, translating, and translations in society at large: such questions, for instance, as determining what works need to be translated in a given socio-cultural situation, what the social and economic position of the translator is and should be, or (…) what part translating should play in the teaching and learning of foreign languages" (Holmes 1988: 77).

Holmes was in close contact with scholars from Tel Aviv and Leuven who shared his emphasis on descriptive explanatory models for the study of translation. They developed in other words Holmes' pure branch and especially its descriptive subfield, giving comparatively little attention to the applied branch and its policy component (in Holmes' sense). This is not to say that the concept disappears altogether from their models. According to Even-Zohar's Polysystem Theory* translated texts form a genuine system within the larger system of the target culture because they correlate, among other things, in "the way they adopt specific norms, behaviors, and policies – in short, in their use of the literary repertoire – which results from their relations with the other home co-systems" (1990: 46). As for Levý, 'translation policy' in Even-Zohar's view covers the broad range of 'translation strategies'*, i.e. the various interventions texts undergo when translated into the target culture. For Even-Zohar, translation policies differ according to the position of the translated texts within the receiving culture. If the target literature is young, peripheral or in crisis, translated literature is likely to occupy a primary position. This implies that the overall translation policies closely follow the source texts' characteristics and as a result introduce new models, genres or styles into the target literature. The 'normal' position of translated literature is however a secondary one according to Even-Zohar, with translation policies by and large adhering to existing target literary models instead of introducing novelties.

Polysystem Theory laid the basis for G. Toury's Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS): a general theory of translation that is radically target-oriented and descriptive-explanatory. Central in Toury's model is the concept of norms*: "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations" (Toury 1995: 55). Next to the initial norm (governing the basic distinction between an adequate vs. an acceptable translation) and operational norms (governing the translator's decisions during the translation process), Toury distinguishes preliminary norms which have to do with the directness of translation (whether or not

intermediate translation is tolerated) and with translation policy. Translation policy refers to "those factors that govern the choice of text types; or even of individual texts, to be imported through translation into a particular culture/language at a particular point in time. Such a policy will be said to exist inasmuch as the choice is found to be non-random. Different policies may of course apply to different subgroups, in terms of either text-types (e.g. literary vs. non-literary) or human agents and groups thereof (e.g. different publishing houses), and the interface between the two often offers very fertile grounds for policy hunting" (Toury 1995: 58). Without excluding their existence, Toury's definition of the policy concept doesn't explicitly cover legal rules for selection and is thus more in line with the so-called broader implementation. Unlike Even-Zohar's, Toury's translation policy doesn't refer to translators' strategies during the translation process.

Meaning so many things within so many models, it comes as no surprise that, all in all, the concept remained of secondary importance in the early years of Translation Studies. Without developing into a core term, it is more prominently present nowadays and covers both the restricted and the broad definition in a variety of subfields within the discipline.

2. Translation policy in official settings

As already mentioned, in its proper sense, a policy refers to the conduct of political and public affairs by a government or an administration. Regulating important aspects of people's lives among which their right to participatory citizenship, policies are not neutral but rather interventionist. Similarly, a translation policy is to be defined as a set of legal rules that regulate translation in the public domain: in education, in legal affairs, in political institutions, in administration, in the media. By means of its translation policy, a government thus regulates people's access to or exclusion from public life and services. Translation policies worldwide are in other words instrumental in furthering (or hindering in the case of non-translation) citizens' fundamental democratic right to communicate with the authorities. They are moreover an integral part of languages policies, i.e. the set of legal rules that regulate language use in the public domain. Any language policy presupposes a translation policy: determining the rules of institutional language use presupposes determining the right to translation within these same institutions in a democratic society. However, the key role of translation policies for the implementation of citizens' linguistic rights remains a blind spot in the literature on language rights and language policies. From a Translation Studies viewpoint, the links between language and translation policy have been explored from various viewpoints (see e.g. Schäffner 2008) but systematic accounts of translational justice are still lacking. To date, studies on community interpreting* are the exception

to the rule, exploring the links between interpreting policies on the one hand and interpreting services and interpreting rights as part of linguistic justice and minorities' integration on the other hand. Pöchhacker (2004: 30) shows e.g. how access to public services for immigrants was pioneered by countries with an explicit immigration policy, while comparative analyses of interpreting service provision and practice in court interpreting in Europe (Hertog 2003) have laid bare the implications for improving policy development and service provision. The topicality of these kinds of policy research is otherwise illustrated by the numerous brochures, leaflets and other documents published by public services and administrations (hospitals, nursing homes, refugee organizations, local administrations, etc.) on their respective 'translation and interpreting policy'. They testify to the important links between language and translation policies and integration policies but they also highlight the fragmented state of the landscape, with ad hoc policies being the order of the day due to a lack of large-scale research. One of the reasons for this is that the elaboration of a fair language and translation policy is part of "cross-portfolio policy making" (Ozolins 2010: 196) in which a variety of factors such as political and social attitudes to immigrants and minorities, models of citizenship, of public policy responsibility, of social well-fare, of equal access to education, administration, public health care, of integration etc. play a role that is yet to be determined. The issues to be investigated are thus inescapably social, political and ethical. Future research therefore needs to be more interdisciplinary, exploring the complex relations between various translation policies and linguistic justice, integration, equal opportunities. It places Translation Studies in front of its social, ethical and political responsibilities, responsibilities which are shared with political and social sciences, anthropology, sociolinguistics etc.

Of course, governments may also develop translation policies outside the strict domain of public and political affairs and implement legal rules for the importation and export of all sorts of cultural products. Among other things, these rules may impose quantitative restrictions on imported or exported materials, they may enforce specific procedures (dubbing* instead of subtitling* e.g.) or control the translation process through censorship*. Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Spain under Franco or former East-European communist regimes show typical examples of such policies, but they are certainly not restricted to so-called non democratic or contemporary regimes. As shown by Icíar & Payás 2008, public service and bilateral interpreting in several areas of public life were already used from the 13th to the 17th centuries by authorities in medieval Spain and in colonial America to communicate with their subjects. In Bagdad, scientific and philosophical translators were recruited by the caliphs during the Abbasid dynasty (750–1259). Medieval China's Tang dynasty (618–906) used official translators in central government whereas diplomatic interpreters were employed in Renaissance courts and in the Arab kingdoms of Northern Africa.

Besides governments, other types of institutional bodies (like the EU, the UN) implement translation policies in the strict sense. International institutions may resort to three different types of translation policy (Meylaerts 2010): non translation or the use of a lingua franca, multilateral translation (all languages translated into all other languages) and non translation within the institution combined with translation for communication between the institution and the outside. The first policy is that of most international scientific and technical organizations which are monolingual, mostly using English as a lingua franca (Pym 2006). The development of English as a lingua franca in science, technology and business is a typical example of a *non*-translation policy at institutional level, implying however the need for non-mother tongue English speakers to communicate and translate into a language that is not their own. Institutional non-translation presupposes individual translation. The second strategy would be that of the European Union: all pieces of legislation and policy documents of major public importance are translated in the 23 official languages which enjoy equal status. With the largest translation service in the world, the EU is the favorite object of translation policy analyses in international institutions. The third one is the "trend not only of international non-profit organisations (…) but also of most multinational marketing" (Pym 2006: 7). Both the first and third policies illustrate the so-called diversity paradox (Pym 2006): the fact that the increase of translation and the rise of an international lingua franca are not necessarily contradictory but go instead hand in hand.

3. Translation policy beyond official settings

As already said, relatively informal situations too have a policy dimension, albeit in a less structured and often far more complicated manner. Policy may refer here to prizes or scholarships which promote (or, in case of their absence, hinder) translation activities, it may refer more broadly to translation strategies, tactics, guiding principles or procedures and may thus be related to all possible choices involved in the translation process, to all possible actors (not only governments but also translators, interpreters, publishers, etc.) implementing these choices; these strategies may apply to all possible products (literature, media, science, law, etc.) and form a conceptual tool in whatever theory or model (Descriptive Translation Studies, Postcolonial approaches*, translator and interpreter training, etc.). This all-encompassing character is obviously the concept's Achilles heel, draining it of its specific meaning and thus of its added value compared to more successful alternatives like 'strategies' or 'norms'. Be that as it may, research on translation policies in today's official settings and beyond is much needed; they are a key to a less conflictual world (Hermans 2009).

References

Baker, Mona & Saldanha, Gabriela (eds). 2008. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. *Polysystem Studies*. Special issue of *Poetics Today* 11:1.

Hermans, Theo. 2009. "Translation, Ethics, Politics." In *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, Jeremy Munday (ed.), 93–105. London: Routledge.

Hertog, Erik (ed.). 2003. *Aequitas: equal access to justice across language and culture in the EU. Grotius project 2001/GRP/015*. Antwerpen: Lessius Hogeschool.

Holmes, J S. 1988. "The name and nature of Translation Studies". In *Translated! : papers on literary translation and Translation Studies*, J S Holmes (ed.), 67–80. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Icíar, Alonso & Gertrudis Payás. 2008. "Sobre alfaqueques y nahuatlatos: nuevas aportaciones a la historia de la interpretación." In *Investigación y práctica en traducción e interpretación en los servicios públicos : desafíos y alianzas*, Carmen Valero-Garcés, Carmen Pena, Raquel Lazaro Gutierrez (eds), 39–52. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá.

Levý, Jiří. 1967. "Translation as a decision process." In *To honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his seventienth birthday* v.2, 1171–1182. The Hague: Mouton.

Meylaerts, Reine. 2010. "Translation and Multilingualism." In *Handbook of Translation Studies Online*, Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (eds). http://www.benjamins.com/online/hts/ [Accessed 5 June 2011]

Munday, Jeremy (ed.). 2009. *The Routledge companion to Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Ozolins, Uldis. 2010. "Factors that determine the provision of Public Service Interpreting: comparative perspectives on government motivation and language service implementation." *Jostrans* 14 (July 2010): 194–215.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony. 2006. "Translation vs. language learning in international institutions: explaining the diversity paradox." *Cultus* 1 (1): 70–83.

Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring translation theories*. London/New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, Christina. 2008. "Behindert Übersetzung die Integration?" In *'Meine Sprache grenzt mich ab…'. Transkulturalität und kulturelle Übersetzung im Kontext von Migration*, Gisela Vorderobermeier & Michaela Wolf (eds), 169–188. Wien and Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence (ed.). 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London/New York: Routledge.

Translation problem○

Gideon Toury
Tel Aviv University

The notion of 'problem' has been looming large in discourse about translation, regardless of whether the discourse had theoretical (e.g. Holmes' category of 'Problem-Restricted [Partial] Theoretical Translation Studies'), descriptive-explanatory or applied aspirations. Whether the word 'problem' itself was used or not. The logical complement of 'problem', 'solution', is much rarer.

The word 'problem' was introduced into Translation Studies* from without, often with partial awareness of the inherent implications and complications. Recourse to this word has become such a matter of course that most authors haven't felt the slightest need to have it included in their indexes. Typically, an entry for 'translation problem' until now has been absent from dictionary-like publications as well. The present entry is basically a conceptual one, an attempt to highlight a kind of "grey zone" that has formed between the word 'problem' and its use as a term in Translation Studies.

The mere recurrence of a word across a range of texts does not guarantee sameness of designated concept, especially when the word has been taken over from another field. Concepts are always embedded in conceptual networks, so that each one of them can only be rendered intelligible, and hence be accounted for, within that network and in its own internal terms.

Unfortunately, this received logic has not been adhered to in most uses of 'problem' in expert discourse about translation. The word is certainly there but its terminological status is far from clear. Nor have translation scholars undertaken such clarification, except in some scattered, brief remarks. Thus, the word 'problem' has come to serve as a term-in-the-making in at least three (interconnected, but essentially different) contexts of discourse within Translation Studies, all involving expert-to-expert communication.[1]

○ This text is based on the new Chapter 2 of *Descriptive Translaton Studies – and Beyond* (Toury 2012, forthcoming). The issue was first dealt with in B. Lewandoska-Tomaszczyk & M. Thelen (eds): *Translation and Meaning*, part 6. Maastricht: Hogeschool Zuyd, 57–71.

1. A fourth context, that of translator training, where communication is typically a-symmetric, between experts and novices, seems to have always been eclectic.

This entry delineates the three types of discourse and some of their implications for the corresponding notions of 'problem': PROBLEM$_1$, PROBLEM$_2$ and PROBLEM$_3$, as they will henceforth be referred to.[2] No attempt will be made to distinguish between different levels of problem (e.g. problems of reception vs. problems of production), or different phases of the translation process where a problem may manifest itself, or any other aspect of translation problem, specific to certain genres, text-types, media (e.g. lip synch in dubbing) and even to individual texts (e.g. semantic instability or density of reference and allusion in *Finnegans Wake*/ J.Joyce)

1. PROBLEM$_1$

PROBLEM$_1$ has its place in discourse about source texts as a constraint on their envisaged translation; either translation in general, or translation into a particular target culture, language and textual tradition where the establishment of a translational SOLUTION$_1$ is set as a goal. PROBLEM$_1$ is thus a matter of potentials, not actual facts, i.e. translatability rather than translation.

In this first context of discourse, not just any potential replacement would be regarded as a SOLUTION$_1$; only those replacements that can be claimed appropriate. And the appropriateness of a replacement is not a fixed, unchanging condition, but rather a function of how 'translatability' and 'translation' are perceived in the culture in question. Thus, TRANSLATABILITY pertains exclusively to the first context of discourse; namely, as the initial potential of establishing optimal correspondence between a TL-text (or textual-linguistic phenomenon) and a corresponding SL-text (or phenomenon). This correspondence may be anywhere between 0 and 1, non-existent and absolute, without ever reaching any of the two extremes (this depends of course on how the scale of translatability is calibrated).

While the need to search for an appropriate solution is a major issue here, SOLUTION$_1$ itself as the realization of this requirement is all but present. That is to say, SOLUTION$_1$ has no physical reality. Nor is the notion of 'translation act' part of the first package: not only will no such act have taken place, but, so long as it is referred to within the first type of discourse, a translation act needn't be undertaken at all. Thus, it is quite normal to discuss the *solvability* of a PROBLEM$_1$, even alternative ways of going about solving it, without actually *performing* the act, most certainly without reaching any binding SOLUTION$_1$.

2. As soon as a word is offered as a term, SMALL CAPS will be used. The context of discourse to which the term pertains will be indicated by subscript numbers.

The nature of TRANSLATION ACT$_1$ can at best be speculated on, more often than not in ideal (or, better still, idealized) terms. In fact, even TRANSLATOR$_1$, the embodiment of the entity mediating between PROBLEM$_1$ and SOLUTION$_1$, is a mere theoretical construct: a persona rather than a person.

An important corollary of what has been said about the first context of expert discourse is that TRANSLATION ACTS$_1$ cannot be simulated, simulation being the representation of a certain act through the use of an act of another kind, in a more or less controlled environment. Simulating translation is thus tantamount to actually *performing the act itself*, albeit under specified (and extreme) conditions.

Bottom line, PROBLEM$_1$, by far the most common variety found in the literature, is a prospective notion and a utopian one. No PROBLEM SOLVING$_1$ can be contemplated unless PROBLEM$_1$, the one regarded as requiring a SOLUTION, were established correctly. Actually, the only issue associated with PROBLEM$_1$ is one of options; namely, the initial possibilities of cross-linguistic, cross-cultural replacement.

2. PROBLEM$_2$

PROBLEM$_2$ features in discourses which are retrospective and where the basic issue is one of factual replacement in concrete acts of translation. Consequently, PROBLEM$_2$ is not given in any way, neither in the source text as such nor in its confrontation with the initial capabilities of a particular receiving language/culture to solve it.

PROBLEM$_2$ bears no necessary relation to PROBLEM$_1$. Rather, it manifests itself individually in the case of each TRANSLATION ACT$_2$ performed by TRANSLATOR$_2$; not merely in *temporal* terms (i.e. during the performance of the act), but in *causal* terms. Unfortunately, ACT$_2$ then vanishes into thin air, along with PROBLEMS$_2$ which were tackled by TRANSLATOR$_2$, the ones s/he was trying to solve, leaving a single lasting imprint – the TL text assumed to be the translation. This end-product is precisely what should be probed by anyone interested in finding out what constituted PROBLEMS$_2$ in a particular case; and the way to do so is to approach translated texts as reservoirs of *realized* SOLUTIONS$_2$.

PROBLEMS$_2$ can thus be identified only when an existing text assumed to be a translation is mapped onto another text, in another language/culture, which is taken to have served as its source.

As reconstructed entities, PROBLEMS$_2$ can only be established backwards, so to speak; that is, from the replaced members of coupled pairs of replacing + replaced segments established ad hoc during the comparative analysis of the two texts in question and for its sake, where the replacing members of each pair are simultaneously taken to represent the corresponding SOLUTIONS$_2$. What remains a true stumbling-bloc is the concealed TRANSLATION ACT$_2$: Even though, unlike ACT$_1$, it has once been put into effect

and thus can be claimed to have had a real existence, accessing it in retrospect is a hard task. Consequently, *speculation* still forms part of the way PROBLEM$_2$ and SOLUTION$_2$ are established, presumably connected by a concrete(ized) ACT$_2$ that has evaporated.

Thus, even though we certainly know better, from both introspection and studies carried out in various methods, most retrospective analyses of translation have been, and will probably go on being performed on the simplistic assumption that ACT$_2$, the act that is reconstructed as having yielded the assumed translation is linear, unidirectional and non-interrupted.

Any wish to search for clues to actual processes of translational decision-making (see Translation process*), and introducing them into the discussion, gives immediate rise to a *third* kind of discourse, with a third notion of 'problem'.

3. PROBLEM$_3$

PROBLEM$_3$ is no less factual than PROBLEM$_2$. Like the latter, it is associated with the performance of a single TRANSLATION ACT$_3$, always situated in a particular point in time and space. However, its factuality is less straightforward, and its establishment cannot be regarded as purely retrospective: Here observation will not be undertaken from the point of the ACT's termination backwards, towards that point which marks its commencement. The only way PROBLEMS$_3$ can manifest themselves is step by step, alongside the gradual unfolding of ACT$_3$. Rather than being punctual, they may therefore be regarded as processual.

This kind of observation can be attempted only in as much as ACT$_3$ has left more traces than just the end-product, as was the case with ACT$_2$; most notably, temporary, interim replacements, on the one hand, and reflections on the other; on both PROBLEMS$_3$, their SOLUTIONS$_3$ (final or interim) – as well as on ACT$_3$ itself.

Unlike the two previous notions of 'problem', PROBLEM$_3$ is thus a dynamic notion, which may, moreover, assume various forms. It may even change its primary disposition in the course of ACT$_3$ (or rather – from the researcher's point of view – in the course of its unfolding/reconstruction). This changeability is inherent to TRANSLATION ACT$_3$: The ultimate SOLUTION$_3$ is not necessarily the only SOLUTION$_3$ entertained, or even realized in the course of the act. Rather, any number of INTERIM SOLUTIONS$_3$ may be, and often are explored along the way. The multiplicity of SOLUTIONS$_3$ can be unearthed in several ways, in retrospect (for instance, by studying manuscripts which have undergone revision) as well as in real time, as it were (for instance, by making use of Think-aloud Protocols*or special computer programs such as Translog, which save every single key-stroke made by the translator). The notion of INTERIM SOLUTION has its place in the *third* context only.

Once a concretized translation act has become a real factor (TRANSLATION ACT$_{2\text{-or-}3}$, that is), and to the extent that it is still regarded as an act of problem-solving, the notion

of SOLUTION$_{2\text{-or-}3}$ becomes highly technical: It is anything that is there whenever the act is discontinued; whether it has reached its end (= SOLUTION$_2$ or FINAL SOLUTION$_3$), or just temporarily suspended (= INTERIM SOLUTION$_3$). This technical sense of SOLUTION$_{2/3}$ is thus devoid of value judgments.

While some INTERIM SOLUTIONS$_3$ may represent alternative ways of solving one and the same PROBLEM$_3$, others may involve a *change* of PROBLEM$_3$ actually being addressed by TRANSLATOR$_3$, or even of the textual-linguistic segment where the "problem" is taken to reside. This lends a variational character not only to SOLUTION$_3$, but to PROBLEM$_3$ as well, in striking contrast to both the initial (idealized) PROBLEM$_1$ and the single (reconstructed) PROBLEM$_2$.

Table 1. The main attributes of the three notions of 'Translation Problem'

Notion			Attributes		Complementary notion
PROBLEM$_1$	source-oriented	prospective, posited	initial possibilities of tr. replacement	utopian, abstract, potential	SOLVABILITY$_1$, way to go about SOLVING
PROBLEM$_2$	target-oriented	retrospective, punctual, reconstructed	factual tr. replacement	concrete, realized	SOLUTION$_2$
PROBLEMS$_3$	process-oriented	processual, reconstructed	factual tr. replacement, variational	concrete, realized, at least momentarily	SOLUTIONS$_3$ (final or interim)

References

Holmes, J. 1988 [1972]. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In *Translated!,* J. Holmes (ed.), 65–80. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Toury, G. 2012, forthcoming [1995]. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Revised edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Further reading

Hönig H.G. & Kussmaul P. 1982. *Strategie der Übersetzung.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Krings, H.P. 1986. *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lörscher, W. 1991. *Translation Performance, Translation Process, and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Nord, C. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

PACTE group, 2011. "Results of the Validation of the PACTE Translation Competence Model." In *Methods and Strategies of Process Research*, C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vandepitte S. & Hardsuiker R.J. 2011. "Metonymic language use as a student translation problem." In *Methods and Strategies of Process Research*, C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Translation universals

Andrew Chesterman
University of Helsinki

Research on translation universals emerges from a convergence of influences. The first is the old idea that translations are recognizably different from other texts. There is a long tradition of comments about translations sounding unnatural, which has led to the notion of "translationese". Similarly, it has long been recognized that some aspects of the source text and its meaning or style are typically "lost in translation" (see Stylistics and translation**). Underlying both these traditions is the assumption that any translation shares characteristics with other translations, since otherwise no generalization about typical weaknesses could be made in the first place.

A second influence comes from linguistics**. In the late 20th century some linguists began searching for language universals. These were understood to be highly abstract features of language which are common to all languages, deriving from universal characteristics of human cognition. The goal was to formulate these linguistic universals as a universal grammar, an idea promoted particularly by the American linguist Noam Chomsky.

A third source of influence has been a methodological development: the expanding use of computers in language research opened up the potential of large corpora of machine-readable texts (see Corpora*). These corpora could be analysed automatically, yielding detailed quantitative data on the frequencies and distributions of linguistic features. Corpus studies rapidly became a major branch of linguistics, and soon after, in the 1990s, came to flourish also in Translation Studies* (see e.g. Laviosa 2002).

A fourth tendency can be seen in the theoretical development of Translation Studies. During the 1980s and 1990s, with the move towards a descriptive approach, empirical generalizations began to be made about possible shared features of translations (see Descriptive Translation Studies*). Building on the work of Itamar Even-Zohar, Gideon Toury (e.g. 1995) proposed two general "laws" about translation: that translations were inevitably influenced by the form of the source text (i.e. they showed interference), and that they tended to be stylistically more standardized than their source texts. Perhaps the most influential early observation was that of Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1986), who noted that translations tended to contain more cohesion markers than their originals, and suggested an "explicitation hypothesis" to account for this.

1. The rise of translation universals

It was a seminal paper by Mona Baker (1993) that first brought these tendencies together into a research programme for Translation Studies. She called for research on what she called (following some earlier scholars) the "universal features of translation, that is features which typically occur in translated texts rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific language systems" (1993: 243). To this end, she set up an electronic corpus of translated English texts at Manchester (see http://www.monabaker.com/tsresources/TranslationalEnglishCorpus.htm). The corpus did not include the source texts, but could be used in conjunction with any standard corpus of non-translated English, such as the Bank of English Corpus, to make comparisons between translations and non-translations. Other similar corpora were set up for other languages.

These potentially universal features fall into two categories, depending on the point of comparison (see e.g. Chesterman 2004). An S-universal (S from "source") formulates a generalization about a difference between translations and source texts, and a T-universal (T from "target") claims something about typical differences between translations and non-translations in the target language. All such generalizations are strictly speaking hypotheses, which may or may not be supported by further empirical tests. Here are some examples (for further references, see the papers in Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004):

1.1 Potential S-universals

- Lengthening: translations tend to be longer than their source texts. The hypothesis has not met with much support, and is presumably heavily dependent on the linguistic features of the languages concerned.
- Interference. This is one of Toury's "laws", and is widely assumed to be a valid general claim. But there is also wide variation in the conditions under which it occurs to different degrees, and under which it is accepted.
- Standardization. This is Toury's other "law". The evidence in favour of this general tendency is fairly clear, although here too there is variation under different conditions. The term has a wide range of interpretations, including what some scholars call "conventionalization" or "normalization" (including dialect normalization).
- Explicitation. This is one of the most widely studied and debated potential universals. The idea that translations tend to be more explicit than their originals goes back at least to Blum-Kulka (1986), and has since been taken up in many studies (e.g. Klaudy 1996). However, the concept itself has proved problematic; it has been interpreted in many conflicting ways.

– The retranslation* hypothesis. This claims that later translations of a given (literary) work into a given target language tend to get closer to the source text. The idea goes back to Goethe, but has been much debated. Some evidence supports the claim, but much evidence does not. It is certainly not a genuine "universal", but may apply under certain conditions. As with explicitation, there are many conceptual disagreements that have not yet been resolved (see e.g. Paloposki & Koskinen 2010).
– Reduction of repetition. This has been noted by several scholars.

1.2 Potential T-universals

– Simplification. This was one of the main conclusions drawn by Laviosa (see e.g. 2002) in the first major study using the Manchester comparable corpus of translated English. She used a number of measures of simplification, such as lexical variety (translations showed less variety); lexical density (translations had a higher proportion of functional words to lexical words, i.e. they were less dense); and use of high-frequency items (translations had a higher proportion of high-frequency items). These measures suggest that translations tend to be simpler than comparable non-translated texts.
– Untypical lexical patterning. If this really is a universal tendency, it seems that translations exhibit two contrary tendencies: to over-use the most typical words and structures of the target language (cf. simplification), but also to show signs of untypical usage.
– Under-representation of target-language-specific items. This is the "unique items hypothesis" proposed by Tirkkonen-Condit (e.g. 2004). The idea is that target-language items that are formally very different from a given source language (and in this sense "unique") will tend not to be used so often in translations, as they will presumably not occur so readily to the translator's mind, on the assumption that mental processing is based primarily on the source-language form.

Research into potential translation universals is not only a question of establishing whether they exist or not, and if so, under what conditions. If they do exist, they need explaining; possible explanations have been sought at different levels.

Most obviously, there must be some kind of cognitive cause, something in the mind of translators that affects the way they process texts simultaneously in two languages. Another kind of explanation would be to appeal to the way translators are trained to be good communicators, to take cultural distance into account, to think of the reader, and so on. They are taught about the norms they will be expected to meet: this might explain why they tend to explicate, to clarify, and so on. Yet another suggestion has been to appeal to translators' desire to avoid risks: "playing safe" could easily

involve translating literally or sticking to the most frequent vocabulary and grammar. Tight deadlines might increase such a tendency.

2. Problems

Research on universals has not gone without criticism. One problem is terminological: the term "universal" was perhaps an unfortunate choice in the first place, as this meant giving a term borrowed from linguistics a weaker meaning (potential translation universals are often formulated as "tendencies"). Tymoczko (1998) and others have pointed out a related problem. When a corpus of translations is set up in order to generate or test hypotheses about universals, it is by no means obvious what should count as a translation in the first place and thus qualify for inclusion in the corpus; whether a corpus should also include for instance "bad" translations, non-native ones, very free ones, or even deliberately marked ones such as those that are strongly foreignized or based on feminist principles. Furthermore, the way universal claims are formulated and tested is sometimes far from explicit, which makes replication impossible.

A different critical point is made by those who see research into universals as basically pointless: it merely highlights features of translations that are already quite well known – as features of poor translations. And some have argued that many of the phenomena so far discussed could be just as well explained as being pragmatic universals of language use in general (e.g. House 2008). A further criticism is that so far, potential universals have only been tested on translations between a rather limited range of languages, mostly European ones.

3. Benefits

Research on translation universals has brought methodological benefits, helping to strengthen the field as an empirical discipline. The search for universals has encouraged the use of clear research designs, either starting with a specific hypothesis to be tested, or moving from corpus analysis to proposals about possible new hypotheses. If scholars abandon the term "universal", it makes good sense to look for generalizations and tendencies of all kinds, including those that are not perhaps universal in the strict sense but conditioned in some way, concerning translations of a given type (such as subtitling*, for instance), done by a given kind of translator, and so on.

Some research is moving in the opposite direction, exploring potential characteristics of mediated discourse in general (such as edited or transcribed texts: see e.g. Ulrych 2009), not just translations. A further step would be to compare generalizations about translations with language produced by non-native speakers such as

language learners, or by bilinguals. Some of the potential universals might turn out not to be specific to translation after all, but have a wider scope.

It may also be the case that if translator trainees are explicitly taught about possible universals, they may seek to avoid those that they see as undesirable. Paradoxically, of course, this would eventually falsify any claim of the universality of such features.

References

Baker, M. 1993. "Corpus linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and applications." In *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, M. Baker . (eds), 233–250. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. "Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation." In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies,* J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds), 17–35. Tübingen: Narr.

Chesterman, A. 2004. "Beyond the particular." In Mauranen and Kujamäki (eds), 33–49.

Laviosa, S. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Mauranen. A. & Kujamäki, P. (eds). 2004. *Translation Universals. Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Mauranen, O. & Koskinen, K. 2010. "Reprocessing texts. The fine line between retranslating and revising." *Across Languages and Cultures* 11 (1): 29–49.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. 2004. "Unique items – Over- or under-represented in translated language?" In Mauranen & Kujamäki (eds), 177–184.

Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Tymoczko, Maria 1998. "Computerized corpora and the future of Translation Studies." *Meta* 43 (4): 653–659.

Further reading

Chesterman, A. 2007. "What is a unique item?" In *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies,* Y. Gambier . (eds), 3–13. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Halverson, S. 2003. "The cognitive basis of translation universals." *Target* 15 (2): 197–241.

House, J. 2008. "Beyond Intervention. Universals in translation?" *trans-kom* 1 (1): 6–19.

Klaudy, K. 1996. "Back-translation as a tool for detecting explicitation strategies in translation." In *Translation Studies in Hungary,* K. Klaudy (eds), 99–114. Budapest: Scholastica.

Pym, Anthony 2008. "On Toury's laws of how translators translate." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies,* A. Pym . (eds), 311–328. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Ulrych, M. 2009. "Translating and editing as mediated discourse: focus on the recipient." In *Translators and Their Readers. In Homage to Eugene* A. Nida, R. Dimitriu & M. Shlesinger (eds), 219–234. Brussels: Editions du Hasard.

Wordplay in translation

Jeroen Vandaele
University of Oslo

1. Wordplay and humor

Dirk Delabastita's definition of wordplay is dense but comprehensive:

> Wordplay is the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings. (Delabastita 1996: 128)

Semantically, several meanings are activated by identical or similar forms in a text. Formally, the definition includes *homonymy* (same sound and writing), *homophony* (same sound), *homography* (same writing) and *paronymy* (similar form). Textually, the author adds, a pun can be "horizontal" or "vertical" (Haussmann, explained by Delabastita 1996: 128). Harvard professor of economic history Neal Ferguson offers an example of a vertical pun: the title of a book chapter about America, "Chimerica". As a chapter title, "Chimerica" is a vertical pun because various meanings are activated by one form (*token*) on the communicative axis. In one go, the token *chimerica* refers to China's enormous stake in America's economy and to the word *chimera*. In horizontal puns, *several* identical or similar tokens appear in the chain of communication in order to activate various meanings: "How the US put US to shame" is Delabastita's homographic example (129).

Ferguson's *Chimerica* pun shows, on the one hand, that wordplay is not a subcategory of humor* (see also Henry 2003: 36): Ferguson's pun is meant quite seriously. On the other hand, wordplay – perhaps even Ferguson's pun – does often create some amusement, a smile or even laughter. If we accept that humor takes root in incongruity and superiority, then we understand why wordplay is often perceived to be humorous. Indeed, insofar as our naïve linguistic intuition suggests that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between words and things, wordplay may be (naïvely) perceived as a linguistic incongruity (Delabastita 2004: 601); and pragmatically (discursively) we usually strive for unambiguous use of language (discourse) so that the practice of wordplay can be felt as a pragmatic incongruity (ibid.). Also, some forms of wordplay activate superiority mechanisms: they require us to activate relevant background knowledge and invite us to find interpretive "solutions" to the incongruous

communication (Vandaele 2001: 38) and they may be "demonstrations of virtuosity" (Henry 2003: 154).

2. Wordplay and translation

Whether serious or comical, wordplay creates linguistic problems of translatability because different languages have different meaning-form distributions (Delabastita 2004: 601; see also Henry 2003: 69–110 for a lengthy discussion of translatability).

Delabastita notes that a structural and typological dissimilarity of source and target language increases the linguistic untranslatability of puns. Yet he also insists that puns are textual phenomena requiring a textual solution. A textual, rather than an isolated, approach to puns increases translatability. For instance, a vertical pun based on polysemy (the Spanish *¡ay!* meaning both an admiring 'wow' and a painful 'ouch') may be translated into Dutch by a horizontal one based on paronymy (the Dutch *wauw!* and *auw!*) (Vandaele 2010). Moreover, argues Delabastita, if translators reflect about the various textual functions that puns may perform in a text, they will find ways or techniques to translate them: translation can go from one pun type to another (as in the *¡ay!* example), from pun to non-pun, from pun to a rhetorically related device such as repetition, alliteration or rhyme (1996: 134), from comical pun to comical non-pun, etc. For an analysis in this sense, see e.g. Marco (2010) on Catalan translations of works by Oscar Wilde and Graham Swift. Marco notes for his corpus that "the translators tend to use techniques resulting in a negative punning balance, i.e. techniques which imply loss in terms of punning activity with regard to the S[ource] T[ext]" (2010: 276). In a similar vein Klitgård (2005) insists, with reference to James Joyce's *Ulysses*, that puns are not just items with textual functions but patterned elements with contextual, ideological meanings: "Joyce's puns are not just verbal fun and games […] but form large unfamiliar and foreign patterns of strong political, ideological or ethical messages" (88). In other words, the specific metalinguistic import of a pun is only one factor to be taken into consideration and its weight depends on textual and contextual factors. For instance, if it is true that wordplay often carries socially transgressive content, the nontranslation of a pun may have moral grounds rather than linguistic ones: what should we make of the Francoist translation *Con faldas y a lo loco* ('Wearing skirts and foolishly') of Billy Wilder's film comedy *Some Like It Hot* (1959)?

Delabastita (1996) introduces a collection of excellent theoretical studies. Gottlieb (1997) points out that puns in comic strips and TV comedy are often activated by "polysemiotic" means. Further references to wordplay translation can be found in Heibert (1993), Tęcza (1997) and Henry (2003). The theoretical considerations in Delabastita (2004) may help translation students to find well-argued practical solutions to seemingly impossible source-text wordplay.

3. Linguistic humor but not wordplay?

Despite Delabastita's and others' insistence that even wordplay is *not* untranslatable, it is obvious that verbally expressed humor stretches over a continuum from easily translatable humor to very resistant, "metalinguistic" humor (if we leave cultural aspects aside). It is worth asking if play with words that is not play *on* words (i.e. that is not wordplay *sensu stricto*) (Henry 2003: 41) may also to some extent be resistant to translation. To that effect Attardo (1994: 223) suggests that intralinguistic paraphrasability – and interlinguistic translatability – is a good test to see if verbally expressed humor is rather "referential" (when its translation is easy) or "(meta)linguistic" (when the source text is resistant). Yet Attardo also deflates the importance of this test by claiming that most jokes are translatable or paraphrasable, hence not (meta-) linguistic.

Antonopoulou (2002) argues by contrast that the language dependency of humor is pervasive, stretching far beyond the socio- and metalinguistic. For cognitive linguists such as Antonopoulou and Nikiforidou (Antonopoulou & Nikiforidou 2009), idiomaticity is omnipresent in languages, and much humor is linguistic in the sense that it hinges on specific linguistic constructions. A cognitive linguistic perspective on humor translation (see Cognitive approaches*) pretends to offer "fine-grained, cognitively based analyses which emphasize the importance of *idiomaticity* […], as Construction Grammar does" (Antonopoulou 2002: 199). About Raymond Chandler's opening sentence of *Trouble is my Business* ("Anna Halsey was about two hundred and forty pounds of […] woman"), Antonopoulou writes that the narrator uses a linguistic construction to create humor (2002: 204). The humor depends on the mass-noun construction *x pounds of y* as combined with the count noun *woman*. For translators it is important to realize that, besides metalinguistic humor, much humor is linguistic in the sense that it exploits cognitive rules attached to linguistic constructions. Such analyses explain why "Anna Halsey was a woman of about two hundred and forty pounds" is not a humorous paraphrase; and "Anna Halsey era una mujer de ciento diez kilos" not a funny Spanish translation.

There is however a *relatively* easy and adequate Spanish translation ("Anna Halsey era ciento diez kilos de mujer") that is funny for the same reason as the source text (at least for those who can live with its derogatory meaning); and this fact shows that the 'linguistic' translation problem here is not caused by a linguistic unavailability of structures (i.e. of form-meaning pairs in the Spanish *langue*) but by Chandler's unusual use (*parole*) of perfectly available structures. For Spanish translators, then, Chandler's narrator's joke is clearly not metalinguistic (*langue*-bound) yet neither is it entirely "referential" (that is, entirely funny because of *what* it represents, no matter *how* it represents it): though not English-bound, the representation's how certainly matters – and that's a matter of play *with* words (though not *on* words).

References

Antonopoulou, Eleni. 2002. "A cognitive approach to literary humour devices: translating Raymond Chandler." In *Translating humour*, Jeroen Vandaele (ed.), 195–220. Special issue of *The Translator* 8 (2).

Antonopoulou, Eleni & Nikiforidou, Kiki 2009. "Deconstructing Verbal Humour with Construction Grammar." In *Cognitive Poetics*, G. Brône & J. Vandaele (eds), 289–314. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Attardo, Salvatore. 1994. *Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Delabastita, Dirk. 1996. "Introduction." In *Wordplay and Translation: Essays on Punning and Translation,* Dirk Delabastita (ed.), 1–22. Special issue of *The Translator* 2 (2).

Delabastita, Dirk. 2004. "Wordplay as a translation problem: a linguistic perspective." In *Übersetzung, translation, traduction*, Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert, Fritz Paul (eds.), 600–606. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gottlieb, Henrik. 1997. "You got the picture? On the polysemiotics of subtitling wordplay." In *Traductio: essays on punning and translation*, Dirk Delabastita (ed.), 207–232. Manchester / Namur: St. Jerome and Presses Universitaires de Namur.

Henry, Jacqueline. 2003. *La traduction des jeux de mots*. Paris : Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Klitgård, Ida. 2005. "Taking the pun by the horns: the translation of wordplay in James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Target* 17 (1): 71–92.

Marco, Josep. 2010. "The translation of wordplay in literary texts. Typology, techniques and factors in a corpus of English-Catalan source text and target text segments." *Target* 22 (2): 264–297.

Vandaele, Jeroen. 2001. "Si sérieux s'abstenir: le discours sur l'humour traduit." *Target* 13 (1): 29–44.

Vandaele, Jeroen. 2010. "Spaanse humor vertalen." *Idioma. Revue de linguistique et de traductologie* 20: 189–200.

Further reading

Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with special reference to* Hamlet. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Heibert, Frank. 1993. *Das Wortspiel als Stilmittel und seine Übersetzung am Beispiel von sieben Übersetzungen des 'Ulysses' von James Joyce*. Tübingen: Narr.

Tęcza, Zygmunt. 1997. *Das Wortspiel in der Übersetzung. Stanislaw Lems Spiele mit dem Wort als Gegenstand interlingualen Transfers*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Subject index

Entries which lead directly to an article (either in HTS vol. 1 or vol. 2) appear in bold, and are followed by the author's name.

The *Handbook of Translation Studies* 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.

ISBN 978 90 272 0332 8

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY