

# INDIRECT TRANSLATION: MAIN TRENDS IN PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

*H. Pięta*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Lisbon  
Alameda da Universidade, Lisboa, 1600-214, Portugal  
Submitted on September 15, 2018  
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-2

*This article concerns indirect translation (ITr), understood broadly as translation of translation, and has the aim of facilitating systematic research on this long-standing, widespread yet underexplored phenomenon. The article thus provides an overview of some of the main patterns in ITr practice and research and explores suggestions for related future studies. The overview follows the 'Five W's and One H' approach. The what question concerns terminological and conceptual issues related to ITr and explores the relevance of systematic studies on ITr. The who question considers the profile of agents involved in ITr processes as well as the profile of ITr researchers. The where question relates to the spatial dimension of ITr as well as to the geographic spread of ITr research. The when question concerns the time coordinates of ITr practice as well as the diachronic evolution of ITr studies. The why questions look into the motivations for ITr and into the historical neglect in the Translation Studies discipline. Finally, the how question considers selected details of ITr processes as well as the methods used in identifying most probable mediating texts and languages. The article ends with a brief consideration of prospects for research on ITr training. The what question concerns terminological and conceptual issues related to ITr and explores the relevance of systematic studies on ITr. The who question considers the profile of agents involved in ITr processes as well as the profile of ITr researchers. The where question relates to the spatial dimension of ITr as well as to the geographic spread of ITr research. The when question concerns the time coordinates of ITr practice as well as the diachronic evolution of ITr studies. The why questions look into the motivations for ITr and into the historical neglect in the Translation Studies discipline. Finally, the how question considers selected details of ITr processes as well as the methods used in identifying most probable mediating texts and languages. The article ends with a brief consideration of prospects for research on ITr training.*

**Keywords:** *indirect translation, indirect translation research, pivot translation, relay translation, centre-periphery relations, binary approaches to translation, English as Lingua Franca.*

## 1. Introduction

This article focuses on indirect translation (ITr), with the underlying rationale that despite its long-standing history, widespread use in today's society and promising prospects for the future (as will be discussed in section 5) ITr has only recently become the subject of systematic research. Another reason behind foregrounding ITr is that it can breathe new life into ongoing debates in Translation Studies and beyond (as will be discussed in section 2). For this to happen, however, there is a need for a greater number of



studies focusing specifically on ITr. Therefore, in order to encourage the production of knowledge on ITr, this article provides an overview of some of the main trends in ITr practice and research and indicates possible areas of further enquiry.

With regard to the article's structure, it will follow the 'Five W's and One H' approach and will, therefore, look into the what, who, where, when, why and how of ITr practice and research. Each of these questions is subdivided into two specific follow-up queries. For the sake of clarity, it should be noted that ITr will be understood here in a broad sense, as translation of translation (Gambier 1994, 413; 2003, 57). This definition does not exclude relay interpreting but for methodological reasons and due to word-count limitations this practice will not be considered here. However, it is acknowledged that in-depth studies on relay interpreting, as well as those comparing relay interpreting with other variants of ITr practice, are clearly needed. ITr research will, in turn, be taken as research that addresses the topic of ITr as a primary issue (rather than one that is secondary, as has generally been the case in Translation Studies to date).

## 2. What?

The first what question is that of what ITr is understood to be. An answer is far from simple, mainly because (just like in the case of other translations) what is under scrutiny is not a simple phenomenon given once and for all but rather one that is complex and evolving in time and space, thus bound to generate different terms and meanings (Gambier 2018). The terminological variations arise from the fact that there is a messy metalanguage connected with the concept (Pym 2011, 80). Assis Rosa et al. (2017b, 117) identify a number of (mostly thematic, linguistic and chronological) patterns for ITr-related terminology used by translation scholars in English, nonetheless, there is a lack of understanding as to the way ITr is labelled (and defined) in the translation industry and in other languages.

As to the different meanings that can be attributed to the concept, the debate in English-language publications mostly concerns the number of languages involved (at least two languages versus at least three languages), type of mediating languages (whether a mediating language version or a target language version is resorted to) and the intended receiver of the mediating text (a target text-translator only versus a wider audience) (Assis Rosa et al. 2017b, 119–120). Drawing on radically inclusive definitions of ITr (e.g., Gambier 1994, 413; Gambier 2003, 57), Maia et al. (2018b) go as far as to suggest that there may be a degree of indirectness in all translation processes. For instance, even if a text (e.g., a Chinese novel) is translated directly (e.g., into Brazilian Portuguese), a third-language version (e.g. English) may have triggered the choice to translate directly (into Brazilian Portuguese) or a (Brazilian) reviser could have resorted to other language versions when preparing the text for publication. Such a claim about indirectness in all translation might lead to the questioning of the existence of direct translations. More importantly, it may provoke debate about the limits of ITr and therefore about the pertinence of ITr as an autonomous concept.



The second what question is ‘what is ITr research good for?’, a question that invites us to explore the relevance of studying ITr. As pointed out in Maia et al. (2018), ITr research can be considered pertinent on at least three accounts. Firstly, it is relevant to Translation Studies in general. The traditional paradigms of this discipline are underpinned by binary approaches and ITr research can challenge these paradigms by stressing the tripartite nature of many translation processes (if not all processes, as suggested above). This can be done by suggesting that there is often (or perhaps even always) some kind of third-party mediation, operated by a language, a culture, a text, an agent, etc. Secondly, ITr research has the potential to yield insights useful to other fields. For instance:

- by generating new methods and knowledge about the probabilistic genealogy of texts, ITr research can contribute to Genetic Criticism;
- by generating new data on the complex role of intermediary centres in cross-cultural transfers, ITr research can contribute to disciplines that ask questions about intercultural relationships;
- by providing insights into the use of the so-called ‘mental translation’ into a third language in L2 learning, ITr research can contribute to disciplines that enquire after language learning processes.

Last but not least, ITr research may prove to be relevant to society at large, as it is likely to enrich discussions about some of the pressing issues and/or concerns of the world we live in (e. g., inaccessibility, inequality, language domination, low status of translation profession etc.). For instance, ITr research may be instrumental in:

- denouncing the breach of authorial rights in the case of translators whose translations are used as source texts,
- identifying the dangerous implications and challenges of using English as an exclusive pivot language, or
- yielding insights into the consequences of the need for migrant communities to adopt *linguae francae* in an increasingly globalized world.

### 3. Who?

The first who question regards the agents involved in ITr process. The focus can be on the translator producing the mediating text as well as on the translator producing the ultimate target text. For instance, it may be interesting to understand:

- whether translators tend to specialise in translating for further translation or translating from an already translated text, by respectively (a) producing translations of different texts, authors and from different languages that are then used for subsequent translations or (b) translating indirectly different texts by various authors and from various mediating and/or ultimate source texts;
- whether there are specific criteria for selecting the relay and the relay-taker, by analyzing common elements in the profile of those who tend to be acknowledged as having the ability to translate (a) for further translation or (b) from previous translations.



When pursuing these research avenues, it is important to keep in mind that, as with other translation types, ITr may be carried out and presented as the work of a single translator (although several contributors may be acknowledged even in this case), or they may result from a collective project and be presented as such, as in online crowdsourcing.

It is also pertinent to enquire into the variably influential role played by agents other than the translator(s) who may be involved in ITr, besides the translator(s). In this regard, the *who* question may focus on the client (thus inviting us to think about the translator's brief or commission), on additional addressees such as readers or viewers (with different needs, tastes, preferences and competences, the study of which may help us identify potential motivations for ITr), on project managers, editors, publishers, authors, critics, revisers, censors, etc., as all of these may contribute to rendering a translation (more or less) indirect. A reviser might resort to different language versions when working on a direct or an ITr; a different-language version may trigger an editor's or a project manager's choice to translate directly or indirectly; an ultimate source text the author might contribute to the revision of the ultimate target text, etc.

The second *who* question relates those doing research on ITr. Pięta's (2017, 200) bibliometric research covering scientific publications specifically dedicated to ITr shows that the overwhelming majority of authors are represented by just one publication. This, in turn, suggests that there are only a few researchers who give a certain degree of priority to ITr in their research agenda. Differently put, from the perspective of individual commitment to the topic, ITr is typically an incidental field of study, into which authors have brief forays, usually in the framework of their wider areas of expertise. Pięta (2017, 200) also shows that the overwhelming majority of publications has been authored by a single scholar, which may suggest that team efforts are extremely rare. Finally, MA and PhD theses on ITr seem to be becoming more common, thus supporting the characterisation of ITr as an emerging research trend: scholars seem to be increasingly embarking on projects of greater magnitude, and more early-stage researchers appear to have found an interest niche in this topic.

Further studies are of course called for to allow the evolving profile of ITr researchers to be fully understood. For example, it would be interesting to look into authors' academic affiliations in order to gain insights into the geographical spread of ITr research. A bibliometric study on keywords used in publications on ITr could also be useful in verifying which wider areas of expertise generate scholarly interest in the practice discussed here.

#### 4. Where?

The first *where* question – ‘where is ITr practised?’ – allows for the application of the criterion of space, which may be understood in geographic terms. Although ITr is a global phenomenon, in that it is not restricted to any specific geographic location, very little systematic knowledge has been produced about the directions and dynamics of indirect transfers of texts within the world system or within regional systems of translation (Heilbron 2010).



Moreover, the majority of previous studies seem to be limited to a handful of linguistic and geographic areas in Europe (mainly Nordic countries and the Iberian Peninsula), Asia (mainly China) and the Americas (mainly Brazil) (Pięta 2017, 200). So next to nothing is known about the way ITr has been practised and approached in other areas, such as Africa, Australia and – perhaps of particular interest to the target readers of this special issue – Russia or the former Eastern Block (but see in this respect, e.g., Gasparov 2011; Grigaravičiūtė and Gottlieb 1999; Witt 2013; Witt 2017; Vanechkova 1978; Zaborov 1963; Zaborov 2011).

The geographic dimension of ITr could be assumed to correlate with language diffusion and power relations between languages. In this respect, ITr is commonly assumed to be done from one (semi)peripheral language into another via a (hyper) central language (Heilbron 2010). However, this assumption has been debunked by recent research. An illustrative example has been provided by Assis Rosa et al. (2017b), who points out that in Portuguese universities, in practical modules on English-Portuguese translation, Chinese exchange students often use Chinese (i. e., a peripheral language, cf. Heilbron 1999) as mediating language in English-Portuguese translation tasks. Another common assumption is that ITr occurs between geographically / linguistically distant languages, yet past research has shown that in order for ITr to occur, languages do not need to be distant from each other. For example, Portuguese and Spanish are neither geographically nor linguistically distant yet, as demonstrated by Maia (2010), the literary transfer between these languages was mostly mediated via French until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The category of space could also be associated with different text-types and media. On this note, it should be stressed that although ITr research has focused almost exclusively on literary texts, the practice can also be observed in a plethora of further genres and media. Examples include sacred texts, philosophical, historical and social sciences texts; popular music and lyrics; operas and libretti; audiovisual texts; scientific, commercial, and technical texts; and even translation memories. Moreover, the various uses of ITr in language learning situations and such language mediating settings as the marketplace, international trains or museums also form an unexplored research area.

The second where query concerns the spaces where ITr research is produced. In general, ITr research remains fairly fragmented, although recently efforts have been made to overcome this fragmentation. Such efforts include the recent organization of dedicated scientific meetings (those held in Barcelona, Germersheim and Lisbon in 2013 or in Lisbon in 2017), the publication of collective volumes (Sala et al. 2014; Assis Rosa et al. 2017a), the establishment of a dedicated network of researchers (IndirecTrans network) or the launching of a website with resources for the study of indirectness (<http://www.indirecttrans.com/index.html>).

With respect to the geographic spread of ITr research, Ringmar (2012, 141) argues that the process of ITr is normally analysed in the ultimate target culture. As an illustration, Ringmar mentions the long-standing “Göt-



tingen Sonderforschungsbereich: Die literarische Übersetzung – 1985–1997” research project in Germany on early-modern translation into German via French and stresses the conspicuous lack of equivalent interest in Germany’s own mediating role in relation to eastern and northern Europe. On this note, one could also mention the surprising lack of systematic research on the mediating role of Middle Low German in the Hanseatic League, roughly from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In the same vein, there seem to be no systematic Anglo-American research on English as a main mediating language in today’s world. To my knowledge, neither is there a systematic research agenda emanating from Russian translation scholars and specifically focusing on the mediating role of Russian language in the transfer of texts between the former Soviet republics or between these republics and Western countries (although sporadic efforts are made in this area; see e.g., Witt 2017 or Tyulenev 2010).

As regards the distribution of knowledge on ITr via different publication formats and outlets, Pięta (2017, 200) suggests that journal articles prevail over other publication formats (monographs, collective volumes and chapters thereof) and that very few publications appear in mainstream Translation Studies or multidisciplinary journals/publishers (the vast majority is scattered among secondary journals/publishing houses).

## 5. When?

The first when question is that of when ITr takes place. It, therefore, concerns the temporal dimension of ITr practice. ITr is an age-old phenomenon (e.g. the Bible, I Ching, translations of Shakespeare or the activity of the so-called Toledo School). It is often mistakenly considered to be dead and buried, or at the very least, increasingly rare (see, e.g., Jianzhong 2003, 202). This is partly because the majority of earlier studies explore the use of ITr in the (more or less distant) past (the analysed time frame tends not to extend beyond the 1990s). The reality, however, is quite the reverse as ITr is alive and kicking in today’s society. For instance, Assis Rosa et al. (2017b) suggest that ITr of non-literary texts has become more frequent due to the increasing need to edit documents via the *linguae francae*, e.g. in international organizations. The same could be held true for ITr of literary texts: as shown in Pięta (2016), over 30 % of Portuguese translations of Polish literature published in the 21<sup>st</sup> century are indirect. What is more, while from the 1990s onwards the Portuguese ITrs of Polish literary texts have regressed proportionally, they have in fact increased in terms of absolute numbers. As for the prospects for the future, Ringmar (2012, 143) argues that “globalization will [...] produce phenomena like [...] a sudden worldwide interest in Icelandic crime fiction, without necessarily providing translators from Icelandic to match this demand. Furthermore, the increasing dominance of English in most, if not all, target cultures tends to marginalize translations (and translators) from other [source languages], adding to the appeal of English IT[r]s. [...] [T]he general literary taste may consequently be anglicized to the extent that English mediating will not only be tolerated but actually preferred”.



It thus seems that ITr is here to stay, at least for the foreseeable future.

Time is certainly a factor that deserves greater consideration in ITr research. For instance, little knowledge has been produced on the frequency, cycles, periodicity, chronology and rhythm of ITr. It would be particularly interesting to see if there are any discernable patterns in terms of the time elapsed between the production of the mediating text(s) and the ultimate target text, or in terms of the distance from the ultimate source text; and whether these patterns, where they exist, are general or gender/media/language-specific, etc.

The second when question considers the time coordinates of ITr research and concerns the historical spread of scholarship on ITr. Although the exact historical evolution needs to be explored in detailed, it seems safe to suggest that scholarly interest in ITr is recent and has grown significantly over the last two decades, especially since the mid-2010s. (Obviously, this is not to say that the phenomenon in question has been completely ignored by academics.) The situation is quite the reverse, and scholarly publications abound with passing references to ITr, as “it is almost impossible to examine literary exchange, especially historically, without coming across this phenomenon” (Ringmar 2007, 4). This growing popularity, which appears to be in line with the general expansion of Translation Studies discipline, is evident from the noticeable surge in the number of dedicated scientific publications (one issued in both the 1960s and the 1970s, eight in 1980s, 18 in 1990s, 32 in 2000s and 48 in 2010s, cf. Pięta 2017, 211 – 216). Time will tell if ITr will manage to assert itself as a research area in its own right.

## 6. Why?

The first why concerns the reasons why ITrs are made. Probably the most commonly cited reason is probably the complete lack or temporary unavailability of translators who have the competences necessary to produce a direct translation. Other reasons include:

- unavailability of the ultimate source text, often resulting from censorial restrictions or geographical / temporal distance between the ultimate source and target cultures;
- cost-effectiveness: since translations from peripheral languages tend to be more costly than those from central languages, commissioning an ITr based on a central language often proves to be more affordable (Pięta 2012, Washbourne 2012);
- time-efficiency: in film subtitling, resorting to a preexisting template in a mediating language may save time and efforts with regard to time cueing and dialogue segmentation (Gambier 2003, 55);
- mitigating the risks: contracting a translator who lacks knowledge of the ultimate source language but who has previous experience and proven reliability may help in ensuring the high quality and timely delivery of translated texts;
- censorial, authorial or copyright control over the contents of the ultimate target text: censors, authors, literary agents and publishers are known to use ITr as an instrument of control over the contents of the ultimate target



text (see, e.g., Frank 2004, 806; Gambier 2003, 59; Marin-Lacarta 2008 and 2017; Tyulenev 2010, 79; Witt 2017; Zaborov 2011, 2071). A translation policy implemented in the USSR is a good case in point: the Soviets introduced a tacit rule that a book written in a language other than Russian had to be translated into Russian before it could be translated into other languages (Kuhiwczak 2008, 14);

– the prestige of the meditating cultures and their cultural models (see, e.g., Boulogne 2009, 14; Schultze 2014, 513). In these cases, ITr may actually be preferred to direct translation.

The second Why question explores reasons why ITr has never been a buzzword in translation research. Perhaps the most frequently cited explanation for this is that ITr is heavily loaded with negative connotations, in that it reportedly replicates the stigma attached to translation itself (if one assumes that a translation is a poor copy of the original, then an ITr is inevitably a poor copy of this poor copy). While definitely important, this reason cannot have been absolutely determining. After all, a practice does not need to trigger positive connotations to be systematically researched (e.g., a translation has low symbolic capital vis-à-vis an original text, but this has not prevented translation from becoming the object of research in what is now a successful scientific discipline, cf. Maia et al 2015, 320). Another, perhaps more decisive reason, has to do with the fact that research in Translation Studies has been marked by reductionist, if not imperialistic approaches (to use the designation employed by Cronin (forthcoming)). It predominantly concerns translations from, into or between the so-called (hyper)central (Heilbron 1999) languages, whereas (as already mentioned in section 4) ITr is typically assumed to occur in communication between peripheral languages (Heilbron 1999); that is, a much less commonly studied linguistic combination.

## 7. How?

The first how question is ‘how are ITrs made?’ The answer is far from simple, as there is a vast spectrum of ITr situations. As pointed out by Frank (2004, 806), at one end, there is [...] ITr pure and simple, with a translator using only a translation into a third language as the source text for a translation [...]. The other extreme is marked by the use of such an intermediate [...] translation merely as a control. Between these two poles, there is room for various combinations, which may include the alternate or simultaneous use of several mediating texts (often in different mediating languages, including the ultimate target language), and does not preclude the recourse to (the various versions of) the ultimate source text. Since ITr has been typically approached as a product rather than a process (cf. Assis Rosa et al. 2017b), at present this how question appears to yield more follow-up questions than research-informed hypotheses or definitive answers. The question can, of course, be addressed from a variety of angles. The following is just a sample of more specific (mostly cognitive, sociological and technological) queries that this general ‘how’ question provokes:



– Do translators producing mediating texts know that they are translating for further translation? If so, how does this knowledge affect the way they translate? Are they more explicit (to minimise the number of possible deviations provoked by ambiguities in the subsequent interpretation of their translation)? Do they resort to foreignizing strategies (Venuti 1995) (in an effort to allow later translators an insight into the actual appearance of the ultimate source text / language), etc.?

– Do translators translating indirectly (un)consciously take more liberties with the mediating text than they would with the ultimate source text? (The rationale is that the status of an already translated text is lower than that of an original text, and so the translator may be less inclined to preserve features in a mediating text that deviate from target culture norms (cf. Ringmar 2007; Dollerup 2000, 23).)

– Where are more changes introduced: during the transition from the ultimate source text to the mediating text? Or in the passage from the mediating text to the ultimate target text? Recent research (Pięta forthcoming, Špirk 2014) indicates that, as far as literary texts are concerned, more changes tend to be introduced in the first part of the ITr chain, often leading to a situation in which the ultimate target text is a rather faithful rendering of the mediating text, but the mediating text is a rather unfaithful version of the ultimate source text, possibly due to uneven power relations between the languages involved. It remains to be seen, however, whether this pattern is verifiable in other text types, genres and media.

– What is the role of technology in ITr processes? What human-computer interactions are in place when one translates indirectly? What exactly does the computer screen of a translator resorting to different mediating texts look like? How have recent technological innovations affected the way in which mediating texts are used in ITr process?

– What interactions exist between translators in the ITrproduction chain? What interaction do these translators have with other translation agents (e.g. those mentioned in section 3)? How do organisational factors such as workflow, communication processes, project management and translator status influence the process of indirect translating?

Since addressing these questions involves looking into the minds and desk of translators, when pursuing these research avenues it may be particularly productive to use insights from process-oriented cognitive studies and studies on the ergonomics of translation.

The second how question, dealing with one of the main challenges of ITr research, is that of how to identify the mediating language / text. The challenge derives mainly from the fact that the indirect nature of translations is often hidden or camouflaged and so the paratextual (Genette 1997) information on the mediating language(s) and text(s) is typically unavailable or unreliable (see Ivaska 2016 for some of the most recent examples).

There is a plethora of ITr situations (as emphasized above). For these reasons, in many cases tracing the genealogy of an ITr is only probabilistic. Toury (1995), Ringmar (2007, 7–9), Pięta (2012, 315–317), Assis Rosa et al. (2017b, 122–126) and Marin-Lacarta (2017) have offered some methodological guidelines for identifying intervening languages / texts, but these rec-



ommendations are presented as applicable only to translation of literature. It remains to be seen to what extent they can be extrapolated and adjusted to translations of other text types.

All the authors mentioned above stress the importance of triangulating the results of:

- peritextual analysis (looking at blurb, introduction, preface, annotations, etc.),

- epitextual analysis (consulting archival documents, bibliographies, catalogues, reference literature, interviews with translators or publishers, relevant correspondence and literary criticism in search of data relating to translators, translations and relevant contexts),

- comparative (ultimate source text – mediating text – ultimate target text) analysis (involving the analysis of such elements as transliteration of names, loanwords, cultural phenomena, additions, omissions, substitutions and misunderstandings).

The third type of analysis has recently yielded particularly intriguing lines of enquiry such as the recourse to research methods used in Genetic Criticism (e.g., putting an ITr through computational source language detection, cf. Ivaska 2018) and Forensic Linguistics (e.g., applying models used for plagiarism detection, cf. Marin-Lacarta 2017).

## 8. In lieu of conclusion

The above discussion has been focused on ITr practice and research. However, the importance of incorporating ITr into translator training should also be emphasised if the idea is to teach translators real-life skills (Pięta and Maia 2015). It, therefore, seems equally urgent to look into the what, who, where, when, why and how of teaching ITr practice. For instance, as proposed in Maia et al. (2018a):

- the what questions could cover what students should know about ITr and what specific competences and skills they should acquire to better translate from an already translated text or to translate for further translation;

- the who question could prompt us to consider who should receive training in ITr;

- the where query could look into where in the (already packed) translation curricula space for ITr exists;

- the when question could relate to when ITr could be introduced into translator training, thereby focusing on student prerequisites for studying ITr;

- the why questions could focus on the possible reasons for which ITr is left out of translation curricula and on why it is so important that translation trainees be familiarized with this practice;

- finally, the how question could explore the pros and cons of various possible approaches to teaching ITr in translation classroom (e.g., implicit versus explicit teaching; case-study approaches versus distinct module approaches).



Clearly, the list of questions asked throughout this article is far from exhaustive (as is the list of suggested angles from which these questions can be addressed) and is only meant to serve as a springboard for new ideas. However, it is evident that ITr-related questions abound. Hopefully, future research will provide some answers.

### Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal) under Grant SFRH/BPD/100800/2014. Susanna Witt's and Yves Gambier's feedback is also gratefully acknowledged.

### References

- Assis Rosa, A., Pięta, H. and Maia, R. B. (eds.), 2017a. Indirect Translation: Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues. *Special Issue of Translation Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 113–132.
- Assis Rosa, A., Pięta, H. and Maia, R. B., 2017b. Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview. *Translation Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 113–132.
- Boulogne, P., 2009. The French Influence in the Early Dutch Reception of F. M. Dostoevsky's *Brat'ja Karamazovy*: A Case Study. *Babel*, 55 (3), pp. 264–284.
- Cronin, M. (in press). Interview by Rita Bueno Maia. *Cadernos de Tradução*.
- Dollerup, C., 2000. Relay and Support Translations. In: A. Chesterman, N. Galardo and Y. Gambier (eds.). *Translation in Context: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 17–26.
- Frank, A. P., 2004. Translation Research from a Literary and Cultural Perspective: Objectives, Concepts and Scope. In: H. Kittel et al. (eds.). *Übersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein international Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An international encyclopedia of translation studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 790–851.
- Gambier, Y., 1994. La retraduction, retour et détour. *Meta*, 39 (3), pp. 413–417.
- Gambier, Y., 2003. Working with Relay: An Old Story and a New Challenge. In: L. Pérez González (ed.). *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users*. Valencia: Universitat de Valencia, pp. 47–66.
- Gambier, Y. and van Doorslaer, L., 2004. Translation Studies Bibliography. *TSB*, available at: <http://benjamins.com/online/tsb/> (accessed 10 October 2018).
- Gambier, Y., 2018. Concepts of translation. In: L. D'hulst and Y. Gambier (eds.). *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, concepts, effects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 19–38.
- Gasparov, M., 2001. The interlinear and the measure of accuracy. In: M. Gasparov. *O russkoi poezii. Analizy. Interpretatsii. Kharakteristiki* [On Russian Poetry: Analyses, Interpretations, Characteristics]. Moscow: Azbuka, pp. 363–372.
- Genette, G., 1997. Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation. Transl. by J. Lewin. Cambridge UP.
- Grigaravičiūtė, I. and Gottlieb, H., 1999. Danish Voices, Lithuanian Voice-over. The Mechanics of Non-Synchronous Translation. *Perspectives. Studies in translatology*, 7 (1), pp. 41–80.
- Heilbron, J., 1999. Towards a sociology of translation. Book translations as a cultural world-system. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2 (4), pp. 429–444.
- Ivaska, L., 2016. Uncovering the Many Source Texts of Indirect Translations: Indirect Translations of Modern Greek Prose Literature into Finnish 1952–2004. In: *8<sup>th</sup> European Society for Translation Studies Congress*. Aarhus, Denmark, 15–17 September 2016.
- Ivaska, L., 2018. Three Methods to Uncover the de facto source language(s) of translations." In: *"Culture and Technology" – The European Summer University in Digital Humanities*. Leipzig, Germany, 17–27 July 2018.



- Jianzhong, X., 2003. Retranslation: necessary or unnecessary. *Babel*, 49 (3), pp. 193–202.
- Kuhiwczak, P., 2008. How postcolonial is post-communist translation? *University of Warwick*, available at: <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/121/> (accessed 22 September 2017).
- Maia, R.B., 2010. Of how Lázaro de Tormes and the Devil upon two sticks entered Portugal and the way the presented themselves. In: X.M. Dasilva (ed.). *Perfiles de la traducción hispano-portuguesa III*. Vigo: Editorial Academia del Hispanismo, pp. 99–114.
- Maia, R.B., Pięta, H. and Torres-Simón, E., 2018a. Bringing indirect translation into translator training. In: “*Translation and cultural sustainability*” Conference. Salamanca, Spain, 28–30 November 2018.
- Maia, R.B., Pięta, H. and Assis, A., 2018b. Unleashing the potential of indirect translation. In: “*Publishing in Translation Studies*” Conference. Antwerp, Belgium, 7–8 September 2018.
- Maia, R.B., Pacheco Pinto, M. and Ramos Pinto, S., 2015. Translation Studies in Portugal and Interview with João Ferreira Duarte. In: R.B. Maia, M. Pacheco Pinto and S. Ramos Pinto (eds.). *How Peripheral Is the Periphery? Translating Portugal Back and Forth: Essays in Honour of João Ferreira Duarte*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 319–331.
- Marin-Lacarta, M., 2008. Indirect translation of contemporary Chinese fiction into Spanish: syndrome or disease? *1611: A Journal of Translation History*, 2 (2), available at: <http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/marin.htm> (accessed 10 September 2017).
- Marin-Lacarta, M., 2017. Indirectness in literary translation: Methodological possibilities. *Translation Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 133–149.
- Pięta, H., 2012. Patterns in (In)directness: An Exploratory Case Study in the External History of Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature (1855–2010). *Target*, 24 (2), pp. 310–337.
- Pięta, H., 2016. On Translation between (Semi)peripheral Languages: External History of Polish Literature Translated into European Portuguese as a Case in Point. *Translator*, 22 (3), pp. 354–377.
- Pięta, H., 2017. Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues in Researching Indirect Translation: A Critical Annotated Bibliography. *Translation Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 198–216.
- Pięta, H. (in press). On the role of indirect literary translation in the construction of the conflicting images of communist Poland in para-fascist Portugal. *Target*.
- Pięta, H. and Maia, R.B., 2015. Integrating Indirect Translation into the Academic Education of Future Generations of Translators across Europe: A Lisbon Model. In: *Translating Europe Forum*. Brussels, Belgium, 29–30 October 2015.
- Pym, A., 2011. Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute. In: A. Pym (ed.). *Translation Research Projects 3*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, pp. 75–100.
- Ringmar, M., 2007. Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations. In: F. Mus (ed.). *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*. Leuven: CETRA, pp. 1–17.
- Ringmar, M., 2012. Relay Translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 141–144.
- Sala, I.G., Sanz Roig, D. and Zaboklicka, B. (eds.), 2014. *Traducció indirecta en la literatura catalana* [Indirect translation in Catalan literature]. Lleida: Punctum.
- Schultze, B., 2014. Historical and Systematical Aspects of Indirect Translation in the de Gruyter Handbuch *Übersetzung* – HSK.26.1-3: Insight and Impulse to Further Research. *Zeitschrift für Slavistic*, 59 (4), pp. 507–518.



Špirk, J., 2014. *Censorship, Indirect Translation and Non-Translation: The (Fateful) Adventures of Czech Literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Portugal*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Toury, G., 1995. A Lesson from Indirect Translation. In: *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 161–178.

Tyulenev, S., 2010. Through the Eye of the Needle of the Most Proletarian Language. *mTm*, 2, pp. 70–89.

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

Vanechkova, G., 1978. The interlinear: intermediate between author and translator. *Československá rusistika*, 23 (1), pp. 10–14.

Washbourne, K., 2013. Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation. *Meta*, 58 (3), p. 607. 10.7202/1025054ar.

Witt, S., 2013. The Shorthand of Empire: 'Podstrochnik' Practices and the Making of Soviet Literature. *Ab Imperio*, 3, pp. 155–190.

Witt, S., 2017. Institutionalized intermediates: Conceptualizing Soviet practices of indirect literary translation. *Translation Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 166–182.

Zaborov, P., 1963. "The mediating literature" in the history of Russian-Western literary relations. In: M. P. Alekseev (ed.). *Mezhdunarodnye svyazi russkoi literatury* [International relations of Russian literature]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, pp. 64–85.

Zaborov, P., 2011. Die Zwischenübersetzung in der Geschichte der russischen Literatur. In: H. Kittel et al. (eds.). *Übersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein international Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 2066–2073.

### The author

Prof. Hanna Pięta, postdoctoral researcher, University of Lisbon, Portugal.

E-mail: hannapieta@campus.ul.pt

### To cite this article:

Pięta, H. 2019, Indirect translation: Main trends in practice and research, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 21–36. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-2.

## НЕПРЯМОЙ ПЕРЕВОД: ОСНОВНЫЕ НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ В НАУКЕ И НА ПРАКТИКЕ

Х. Пиета<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Университет Лиссабона  
1600-214, Португалия, Лиссабон, Аламеда да Универсидаде  
Поступила в редакцию 15.09.2018 г.  
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-2

Статья посвящена проблеме непрямого перевода (НП), понимаемого в широком смысле как перевод перевода. Ставится цель систематизировать корпус исследований, посвященных этому давно и широко практикуемому, но явно недостаточно изученному виду перевода. Описываются основные модели практического применения НП, а также существующие и перспективные направления его исследования. Статья построена в форме ответов на шесть вопросов: «что?», «кто?», «где?», «когда?», «по-



чему?» и «как?». Вопрос «что?» касается терминологических и концептуальных аспектов НП, а также актуальности его системного изучения. Вопрос «кто?» характеризует участников данного вида перевода и его исследователей. Вопрос «где?» ставится в отношении ареала распространения НП и географии посвященных ему научных работ. Вопрос «когда?» затрагивает временные координаты НП и эволюцию его исследований в диахронии. Вопрос «почему?» наводит на размышления о мотивации использования НП и недостаточном внимании к его изучению в переводоведении. Наконец, вопрос «как?» концентрируется на отдельных элементах НП, а также методах, которые используются для определения наиболее вероятных посреднических текстов и языков для НП. В заключении кратко намечаются перспективы исследований в области подготовки специалистов по НП.

**Ключевые слова:** косвенный (непрямой) перевод, исследование непрямого перевода, промежуточный перевод, релейный перевод, отношения между центром и периферией, бинарные подходы к переводу, английский как *Lingua Franca*.

### Список литературы

Ванечкова Г. Подстрочник – посредник между автором и переводчиком // *Československá rusistika*. 1978. Vol. 23 (1). S. 10–14.

Гаспаров М. Подстрочник и мера точности // Гаспаров М. О русской поэзии. Анализ. Интерпретация. Характеристики. М.: Азбука, 2001. С. 363–372.

Заборов П. «Литература-посредник» в истории русско-западных литературных связей XVII–XIX вв. // *Международные связи русской литературы* / ред. М.П. Алексеев. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1963. С. 64–85.

Assis Rosa A., Pięta H., Maia R.B. (eds.). *Indirect Translation: Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues*. Special Issue of *Translation Studies*. 2017a. Vol. 10 (2).

Assis Rosa A., Pięta H., Maia R.B. *Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview* // *Translation Studies*. 2017b. Vol. 10 (2). P. 113–132.

Boulogne P. The French Influence in the Early Dutch Reception of F. M. Dostoevsky's *Brat'ja Karamazovy*: A Case Study // *Babel*. 2009. Vol. 55 (3). P. 264–284.

Cronin M. Interview by Rita Bueno Maia // *Cadernos de Tradução* (в печати).

Dollerup C. Relay and Support Translations // *Translation in Context: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress* / ed. by A. Chesterman, N. Gallardo and Y. Gambier (eds.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2000. P. 17–26.

Frank A.P. *Translation Research from a Literary and Cultural Perspective: Objectives, Concepts and Scope* // *Übersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction* / ed. by H. Kittel et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014. P. 790–851.

Gambier Y. La retraduction, retour et détour // *Meta*. 1994. Vol. 39 (3). P. 413–417.

Gambier Y. Working with Relay: An Old Story and a New Challenge // *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users* / ed. by L. Pérez González. València: Universitat de València, 2003. P. 47–66.

Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van. *Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB)*. 2004. URL: <http://benjamins.com/online/tsb/> (дата обращения: 10.11.2018).

Gambier Y. Concepts of translation // *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, concepts, effects* / ed. by L. D'hulst, Y. Gambier. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2018. P. 19–38.

Genette G. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* / transl. into English by J. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.



*Grigaravičiūtė I., Gottlieb H.* Danish Voices, Lithuanian Voice Over: The Mechanics of Non-Synchronous Translation // Perspectives. 1999. Vol. 7 (1). P. 41 – 80.

*Heilbron J.* Towards a sociology of translation. Book translations as a cultural world-system // European Journal of Social Theory. 1999. Vol. 2 (4). P. 429 – 444.

*Ivaska L.* Uncovering the Many Source Texts of Indirect Translations: Indirect Translations of Modern Greek Prose Literature into Finnish 1952–2004. Poster presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> European Society for Translation Studies Congress, Aarhus, Denmark, 15–17 September 2016.

*Ivaska L.* Three Methods to Uncover the de facto source language(s) of translations. Poster presented at the “Culture and Technology” – The European Summer University in Digital Humanities, Leipzig, Germany, 17–27 July 2018.

*Jianzhong X.* Retranslation: necessary or unnecessary // Babel. 2003. Vol. 49 (3). P. 193 – 202.

*Kuhiewicz P.* How postcolonial is post-communist translation? 2008. URL: <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/121/> (дата обращения: 22.09.2017).

*Maia R. B.* De como o Lázaro de Tormes e o Diabo Coxo entraram em Portugal e de como se apresentaram // Perfiles de la traducción hispano-portuguesa III / ed. by X. M. Dasilva. Vigo : Editorial Academia del Hispanismo, 2010. P. 99 – 114.

*Maia R. B., Pięta H., Torres-Simón E.* Bringing indirect translation into translator training // Paper presented at the “Translation and cultural sustainability” Conference. Salamanca, Spain, 28–30 November 2018a.

*Maia R. B., Pięta H., Assis A.* Unleashing the potential of indirect translation. Poster presented at the “Publishing in Translation Studies” conference. Antwerp, Belgium, 7–8 September 2018b.

*Maia R. B., Pacheco Pinto M., Ramos Pinto S.* Translation Studies in Portugal and Interview with João Ferreira Duarte // How Peripheral Is the Periphery? Translating Portugal Back and Forth : Essays in Honour of João Ferreira Duarte / ed. by R. B. Maia, M. P. Pinto, S. R. Pinto. Newcastle upon Tyne : Cambridge Scholars, 2015. P. 319 – 331.

*Marin-Lacarta M.* La traducción indirecta de la narrativa china contemporánea al castellano: ¿síndrome o enfermedad? // 1611: A Journal of Translation History. 2008. Vol. 2 (2). URL: <http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/marin.htm> (дата обращения: 10.09.2017).

*Marin-Lacarta M.* Indirectness in literary translation: Methodological possibilities // Translation Studies. 2017. Vol. 10 (2). P. 133 – 149.

*Pięta H.* Patterns in (In)directness: An Exploratory Case Study in the External History of Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature (1855–2010) // Target. 2012. Vol. 24 (2). P. 310 – 337.

*Pięta H.* On Translation between (Semi)peripheral Languages: External History of Polish Literature Translated into European Portuguese as a Case in Point // Translator. 2016. Vol. 22 (3). P. 354 – 377.

*Pięta H.* Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues in Researching Indirect Translation: A Critical Annotated Bibliography // Translation Studies. 2017. Vol. 10 (2). P. 198 – 216.

*Pięta H.* On the role of indirect literary translation in the construction of the conflicting images of communist Poland in para-fascist Portugal // Target (в печати).

*Pięta H., Maia R. B.* Integrating Indirect Translation into the Academic Education of Future Generations of Translators across Europe: A Lisbon Model. Poster presented at the “Translating Europe Forum”. Brussels, Belgium. 29–30 October 2015.

*Pym A.* Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute // Translation Research Projects 3 / ed. by A. Pym. Tarragona : Intercultural Studies Group, 2011. P. 75 – 100.

*Ringmar M.* Round about Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations // Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006 / ed. by F. Mus. Leuven : CETRA, 2007. P. 1 – 17.



Ringmar M. Relay Translation // Handbook of Translation Studies / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2012. P. 141 – 144.

Sala I.G., Sanz Roig B., Zaboklicka B. (eds.). Traducció indirecta en la literatura catalana. Lleida : Punctum, 2014.

Schultze B. Historical and Systematical Aspects of Indirect Translation in the de Gruyter Handbuch *Übersetzung* – HSK.26.1-3: Insight and Impulse to Further Research // Zeitschrift für Slavistic. 2014. Vol. 59 (4). S. 507 – 518.

Špírk J. Censorship, Indirect Translation and Non-Translation: The (Fateful) Adventures of Czech Literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Portugal. Newcastle upon Tyne : Cambridge Scholars, 2014.

Toury G. A Lesson from Indirect Translation // Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1995. P. 161 – 178.

Tyulenev S. Through the Eye of the Needle of the Most Proletarian Language // mTm. 2010. Vol. 2. P. 70 – 89.

Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. L. : Routledge, 1995.

Washbourne K. Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation // Meta. 2013. Vol. 58, №3. P. 607. doi: 10.7202/1025054ar.

Witt S. The Shorthand of Empire: 'Podstrochnik' Practices and the Making of the Soviet Literature // Ab Imperio. 2013. №3. С. 155 – 190.

Witt S. Institutionalized intermediates: Conceptualizing Soviet practices of indirect literary translation // Translation Studies. 2017. Vol. 10 (2). P. 166 – 182.

Zaborov P. Die Zwischenübersetzung in der Geschichte der russischen Literatur // Übersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction / ed. by H. Kittel et al. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 2011. S. 2066 – 2073.

### Об авторе

Ханна Пиета, исследователь (пост-докторант), Университет Лиссабона, Португалия.

E-mail: hannapieta@campus.ul.pt

### Для цитирования:

Pięta H. Indirect translation: Main trends in practice and research // Слово.ру: Балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 21 – 36. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-2.