

## EDITOR'S NOTES

Translation Studies (TS) has undergone a rapid development in the last 50 years, and technology seems to speed up the changes. Digital innovation, data-centrism, mobility, globalisation are impacting the translation industry, and, by extension, the set of competences and status of the translator. Obviously, thinking about translation, intercultural communication cannot remain within the traditional ways of defining, conceptualizing them. Translation, as a professional work, a service, a business, a common resource, is not any longer perceived and structured within a simple linguistic framework. It is not the place here to draft the historiography of TS. Suffice it to say that in the 1950–1970s, scholars refer to or call for input from (formal, contrastive, applied) linguistics, semiotic aesthetics, poetics, philosophy, comparative literature, etc. Studies in translation (not yet TS then) immediately make up a “poly-discipline”. From the very beginnings, this poly-discipline explicitly was under the influence of various other disciplines, both methodologically and content-wise (see Gambier and van Doorslaer, 2016). In the 1970–1980s, some individuals here and there were concerned by the name, the scope and the definition of TS and also by the conceptualization of translation as a process, a product, a socio-cultural event, and later as a network of agents. In 1980–1990s, TS dominated in institutional names (departments or schools in universities, academic associations, research journals, book series, international conferences). Since the late 1980s, TS has been considered as a set of “turns” (cultural, empirical, pragmatic, post-colonial, sociological, ideological, technological, cognitive turns, to name a few) – “turn” being a new angle to study a complex object of investigation. So far, TS is broadening the boundaries of both the concept and the discipline, and several other disciplines do not hesitate to use “translation” as a metaphor to approach different types of changes and dissemination of knowledge.

Today, two paradigms are evolving, and they justify, to some degree, the current multiplication of labels created for “translation” (localisation, adaptation, transcreation, versioning, trans-editing, language mediation, etc.). On one hand, the more conventional conceptualization of translation that has endured for centuries through the paradigm of equivalence has evolved into one more oriented toward the targeted public or audience – that is, the paradigm of the cultural turn. It exists concurrently with another changing paradigm, one that reflects the platforms and mediums through which the activity of translation is now carried out. In this sense, the paradigm of the book (upon which the paradigm of equivalence was based) transforms into one of the digital and Web (where the text to translate becomes multimodal).

Within these rapid changes in translation – not any longer limited to literary texts – and in TS – beyond the linguistic perspective, this special issue of *Slovo.ru* offers some new views of the field in six different texts; in another issue of the journal, five authors will propose some other views.

For Andrew Chesterman, the development of TS is not only the result of the emergence of different kinds of translation practices, research questions



and new technologies but also of different epistemological and ontological assumptions about the object of study. Besides, there are two dominant methodological traditions in TS today: one based on empirical tradition, and the other on the liberal arts tradition. The differences between the two are manifested in the way the discipline is currently structured and might give the impression that TS is becoming more fragmented. Or is this diversity of approaches a sign of vitality?

Hanna Pięta tackles the issue, which has hardly been systematically researched: indirect translation. However, the translation of a translation is a rather widespread phenomenon and has a long-standing history. It is time to explore the patterns of this practice, used in different domains of knowledge and in literature.

Indirect or direct, translating is a complex process involving many agents and organizational factors. The relevance of ergonomics and the implications of putting the translators and their translation processes in focus are discussed by Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow.

In the next article, Yves Gambier reports on audio-visual translation, and how its multi-semiotic dimension can be received by different types of viewers: the research methods have multiplied recently, allowing different types of experiments, even though the number of parameters to take into consideration is always very high.

Lucile Davier deals with quite a new area of research: news translation. News translation, as audio-visual translation, can be studied as a product, a process or in a reception-oriented approach. Nevertheless, both fields open up new avenues in TS – questioning concepts such as text, source text, authorship, acceptability, relevance, accessibility, translation strategy.

One way to investigate translation style, news translation and many other text-genres is the use of electronic corpus. Mariachiara Russo introduces corpus-based studies but in conference interpreting. Several electronic interpreting corpora do exist today: they display different designs and demand different kinds of analysis. The review of the available corpora and some significant research results are provided in a clearly structured overview.

The domains described here (indirect translation, translation process, audio-visual translation, news translation, corpus and interpreting studies) are only a part of what is going on in TS. We do hope readers – advanced students, teachers, scholars, professionals in multilingual communication – will continue to be curious and concerned by the new orientations of TS.

*Yves Gambier*