

ETHNOGRAPHY IN TRANSLATION STUDIES: AN OBJECT AND A RESEARCH METHODOLOGY*

H. Buzelin

Université de Montréal Département de linguistique et de traduction
Pavillon Lionel-Groulx C. P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec) H3C 3J7 Canada
Submitted on April 30, 2021
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2022-1-2

Based on a review of the literature on ethnography produced by translation scholars over the past twenty years, this contribution explores how translation studies [TS] has appropriated this concept, first as a way to solve translation problems (with Eugene Nida), then as an object (within the cultural turn) and more recently as a research methodology to document and analyze translation and interpreting events in context. The author shows how, in the early seventies, both cultural anthropology and TS saw a change in paradigm that brought the two disciplines closer at the surface level (as the metaphor of culture as a text gained grounds), but that draw them very much apart from an epistemological viewpoint. Indeed, while ethnography was undertaking an interpretive turn, TS chose to define itself as an empirical discipline based on systematic and objective observation; this positivistic bias in early TS could partly explain its late adoption of ethnography as a research methodology. This literary review finally reminds us of the many dichotomies out of which TS has grown and structured itself – text vs context; translation vs. interpretation; experiential vs. scientific knowledge, hermeneutics vs. empiricism, to name but a few – and suggest the need for an interpretive move within the discipline.

Keywords: translation, interpretation, interpretive ethnography, epistemology, research methodologies

Whereas some linguists elevated translation to the status of science in the mid-sixties (Nida, 1964), literary studies played a key role in its recognition as a proper discipline of research a few years later. James Holmes's 1972 paper *In the name and nature of translation studies* has been regarded by many scholars, at least in most of the European countries, as a milestone in that matter. Among its merits, this contribution put forward the interdisciplinary nature of the research field in becoming. From then, translation studies (TS) kept on expanding its horizon, exploring the multiple factors, not only linguistic but also cognitive, cultural, historical, social, institutional and material that come into play when transferring texts across languages and cultures and into other semiotic systems. In this process, the discipline kept on borrowing research designs from the social sciences. Hence, the conduct of interviews, surveys, focus groups as well as field observation became parts and parcels of the TS researcher toolkit. Gradually, several studies with an explicitly ethnographic orientation have seen the light (see, for example,



Wadensjö 1998; Davidson 2000; Buzelin 2006, 2015; Baraldi and Gavioli 2007; Koskinen 2008; Leblanc 2014). These developments led to the emergence of a discourse on ethnography as a valuable research methodology for exploring translators' communities, translating institutions and translation projects.

As a sequel to a discussion initiated in Buzelin (2007), the present contribution revisits the relations between ethnography and translation studies in light of this discourse produced over the past twenty years. A special focus is put on texts with a didactic or programmatic function, such as textbooks and handbooks (see Wolf 2002; Flynn 2010; Hubscher-Davidson 2011; Saldanha and O'Brien 2013; Biagini 2016). The goal is not to show the relevance of ethnography for translation studies, as this question has already been addressed before¹, but rather to reflect on why ethnography, although regarded as essential to translation since the earliest days of translation theory², was recognized as a potential methodology for studying translation only fifty years later. Exploring this question will lead us to uncover a few relevant features and boundaries in the development of the discipline: 1) a quest for scientificity in TS that encouraged a positivistic posture at a time where social research was, on the whole, moving in the opposite direction; 2) the very imperfect equivalence between *Translation Studies* and its usual French translation *traductologie*; 3) the lack of connections and dialogue between translation and interpreting studies, largely due to their separate development.

1. On the "Copernican revolution" in the human and social sciences

In the second half of the twentieth century, human and social sciences underwent a revolution as well as a vast expansion that led to a redefinition of disciplinary boundaries and research objects: some disciplines, such as anthropology, had to reinvent themselves (Hymes 1999) whereas others, such as translation studies, saw the light. In cultural anthropology, Clifford Geertz's essay *Interpretation of Cultures* (1973) is probably the text that best captures the change of paradigm, marking the advent of an interpretive turn within the discipline. As for the birth of translation studies, it has come to be associated with James Holmes's communication dated 1972. However, as we shall see, these two seminal texts, released several months apart, engaged their respective disciplines in very different directions.

¹ Among other things, this methodology based on fieldwork has been regarded from the start as a good way to reconcile textual and contextual approaches, to highlight the diversity of agents involved in translation processes, as well as to foster more reflexivity and dialogue among translation scholars and translation practitioners (see Buzelin 2006, Koskinen 2008, Hubscher-Davidson 2011).

² For example, in 1945, Eugene Nida argued that ethnology was the best way to solve the semantic problems of translation. Today, the missionary perspective underlying his theory of translation appears highly problematic and questionable. However, his contribution reminds us how much, as practices, *translation* and *ethnography* have always been intertwined, even before the birth of TS as a discipline.



1.1. 1973 – Clifford Geertz and the ethnographer as translator

As the core methodology of cultural anthropology, ethnography was directly impacted by the crisis of representation in the human and social sciences. The intertwining between the rise of cultural anthropology and that of colonial empires, the reflections on the relations between knowledge and power and the role of discourses and representations in power dynamics as well as the more global rejection of positivism were particularly noticeable in this discipline. The crisis led, among other things, to an interpretive and semiotic turn mostly embodied in the works by Clifford Geertz who suggested approaching culture as a text, i.e., a web of signs to be interpreted: "The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom they properly belong." (Geertz, 1973:452). In this line of thinking, the ethnographer would no longer seek causal or structural explanations but act rather as a translator, reading and interpreting a foreign manuscript: "Doing ethnography is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of') a manuscript—foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries, but written not in conventionalized graphs of sound, but in transient examples of shaped behaviour." (Geertz, 1973:10)

If ethnography, as a research methodology, originated in the field of anthropology, it was soon adopted by sociologists (most notably the Chicago School and its followers), by linguists (in the field of ethnolinguistics) and more recently by other disciplines such as communication studies, education, social psychology, human geography, criminology, etc. This increasing popularity could relate to a global trend in favour of qualitative methodologies in the human and social sciences (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007:2). As it expanded to other fields and as anthropologists returned back home, the definition and modalities of the ethnographic fieldwork also changed, the prolonged immersion within a foreign culture being only one of the many forms it could take. If contextualization remains a central component, the field is not so much defined as a geographical space, but rather as a *community of practices* that the researcher aims at better understanding through observation of and dialogue with those who belong to it. For a number of years now, ethnography textbooks have highlighted this multifaceted aspect. As early as 1983, Hammersley and Atkinson summed up the possibilities in the following terms:

[...] across the numerous fields in which ethnography, or something very like it, has come to be proposed, one finds considerable diversity in prescriptions and practice. There is disagreement as to whether ethnography's distinctive feature is the elicitation of culture knowledge (Spradley 1980), the detailed investigation of patterns of social interaction (Gumperz 1981), or holistic analysis of societies (Lutz 1981). Sometimes, ethnography is portrayed as essentially descrip-



tive, or perhaps as a form of storytelling (Walker 1981); occasionally, by contrast, great emphasis is laid on the development and testing of theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Denzin 1978). [...] For us ethnography (or participant observation, a cognate term) is simply one social research method, albeit a somewhat unusual one, drawing as it does on a wide range of sources of information. The ethnographer participates, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions; in fact, collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues with which he or she is concerned (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983:1–2).

For these authors, fieldwork is what defines best the ethnographic approach. In their view, it is essentially a method, the most eclectic and “the most basic”³ method of the social sciences (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983:2). For other commentators, ethnography is more of a *methodology*, that is, a research design characterized by particular concepts and values such as participation, immersion, reflexivity, thick description, understanding and a participatory ethics guided toward emancipation of the community under study (Gobo 2007). Still, others hold that it is not so much observation and description in themselves that define ethnography, but a certain gaze (*regard*) and a particular type of writing. This gaze is “neither casual nor uptight [...] but] give way to an attitude of drifting (obviously temporary), of availability and floating attention” (Laplantine 1996:16, *our translation*)⁴ and in the process of writing, “the researcher produces rather than s/he reproduces.” Criticizing the “lazy conception of observation and the indigent conception of language” that anthropology inherited, Laplantine affirms, in a spirit recalling that of Clifford Geertz:

There exist no such things as “ethnographic data” but always and everywhere a confrontation between a (given) ethnographer and a (given) socio-cultural group, an interaction between a researcher and those she/he studies. [...] This confrontation and this interaction (not half of it) are what constitutes the very object of the ethnographic experience and the ethnographic makeup. The latter will become truly anthropological when intertwined (in a way that Bakhtin would qualify as dialogical) in an intertextual network (Laplantine 1996:38, *our translation*).⁵

The very diverse definitions of ethnography confirm the polymorphic nature of this concept.

³ “basic” meant that the approach was as close as one can get to the type of knowledge acquired from common everyday practices. This mention appears in the first (1983) edition of the textbook but not in the third one.

⁴ “ni désinvolte ni crispé [...] mais] redonn[ant] toute sa place à une attitude de dérive (évidemment provisoire) de disponibilité et d’attention flottante.”

⁵ “Il n’existe donc pas, à proprement parler de “données ethnographiques”, mais d’emblée, toujours et partout, la confrontation d’un ethnologue (particulier) et d’un groupe social et culturel (particulier), l’interaction entre un chercheur et ceux qu’il étudie. [...] C’est cette confrontation et cette interaction (et non “la moitié”) qui constituent l’objet même de l’expérience ethnographique et de la construction ethnologique, lesquelles ne deviendront anthropologiques qu’en s’inscrivant (d’une manière que Bakhtine a qualifié de dialogique) dans un réseau d’intertextualité.”



1.2. 1972 – *The rise of translation studies*

The fame of James Holmes's text is to a large part due to Gideon Toury's strategic role in reediting this paper and commenting its key ideas in the introductory chapter of his own book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995). It is worth reminding Holmes's and Toury's (1980, 1985, and 1995) main propositions to better grasp what unites and what distinguishes them. For Holmes, *Translation Studies* (a denomination he favoured over *translation science* for its inclusivity) defined itself as an "empirical discipline." Quoting Hempel, he further explained that empirical disciplines generally share two goals: "(1) to describe particular phenomena in the world of our experience and (2) to establish general principles by means of which they can be explained and predicted" (Hempel quoted in Holmes, 1972 [1988]: 71). Holmes divided the discipline in two branches: a pure one and an applied one, the former consisting of a theoretical part and a descriptive one. Description was further split in three categories corresponding to distinct viewpoints on translation: namely the *products* (of translation), i. e., translations as texts, the *processes* and the *functions*. The applied branch had four ramifications: translator training, translation aids, translation policies and translation criticism. In conclusion, Holmes insisted on the interdependence and complementarity of the theoretical, descriptive and applied branches, each contributing to the development of the discipline.

While commenting Holmes's ideas, Toury gave them a particular inflection. For instance, whereas Holmes had rejected the term *science*, Toury (1985) made an almost systematic use of it – the term occurring three times on the first page of the book. Along the same line, Toury saw the *descriptive branch* – hence the *pure* one as well – as the cornerstone of the discipline. He also ranked the three possible objects of TS, stating that *functions* determined the *products* which, in turn, governed *processes*. Whereas Holmes insisted on interdisciplinarity, Toury asserted the need to distance TS from comparative linguistics. Last but not least, he relegated applied research to the margin of the discipline, as a mere "extension" (1995:17). All these adjustments had a purpose: "to make a case for the discipline's controlled evolution" (Toury 1995:10). So, a year before the release of Geertz's seminal essay inaugurating an interpretive turn in anthropology, Holmes wrote what would come to be regarded as the act of birth of Translation Studies, laying out a research program that, as interpreted by Gideon Toury, would position the discipline in a rather positivist frame.

Holmes and Toury are not the only scholars who have tried to circumscribe the new discipline. Antoine Berman's essay *The Experience of the Foreign* (1992), originally published in French in 1984, included a manifesto engaging *traductologie* in a very different path, closer to history, philosophy and hermeneutics⁶. Whereas Toury considered that translation scholars should

⁶ "La traductologie ne se constituera qu'en coopération avec la linguistique et la poétique; elle a beaucoup à apprendre de la socio- et de l'ethnolinguistique, ainsi que de la psychanalyse et de la philosophie [Traductology will only be constituted in collaboration with linguistics and poetics; it has much to learn from socio- and ethno-linguistics, as well as from psychoanalysis and philosophy]." (Berman 1984: 304, Berman 190 1992 for the English translation)



approach their object from an objective and distanced perspective, Berman defined *traductologie* as “a study of translation based on the experience of translating” (Berman 1989:675). In the nineties, many translation scholars criticized this dissociation, encouraged by Toury, between translators and translation scholars (see in particular Simeoni 1995, Pym 1998, Hermans 1999, Crisafulli 2002). At the time, sociological approaches in TS had gained ground and Pierre Bourdieu’s ideas, most notably his sociology of science as well as his concepts of “habitus” and “participant objectivation”⁷ helped to reconcile the practical and the scholarly viewpoints on translation and to move from a definition of TS solely based on its object to a definition incorporating the subjectivity (and agency) involved both in performing and in studying translation. Finally, the reflections on the ethics of translation stemming, partly, from cultural and post-colonial approaches, also showed the limits of a strictly descriptive approach along with the ideal of an objective researcher distanced from its object.

As Hermans noted (1999: 31–45), Toury’s quest for translation universals was not followed by many and his vision of the discipline was not unanimously shared either. But his legacy remains an important one. It can be traced, for example, in the writings of Chesterman (2000) in favour of causal and linear models of analysis aiming at explaining and eventually predicting translation phenomena; in the rapid and durable popularity of corpus studies; in the long-lasting emphasis placed on the study of translation norms; and more generally in the predominance of functionalist and empirical approaches in TS. It is no coincidence that a textbook as rich and comprehensive as *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies* (Saldanha and O’Brein 2013) leaves no room to historical and hermeneutic approaches. Writing a methodology textbook for an interdisciplinary research field is a challenge and choices inevitably have to be made. So one cannot blame the authors for restraining themselves to empirical methodologies or for referring the reader to Pym (1998) for methods in translation history⁸. But as legitimate as they are, these choices also suggest Toury’s long-lasting influence in the evolution of the discipline in the English-speaking world. One may wonder if this quest for scientificity that marked the birth of TS and that is still present today, though to a lesser extent, is not partly responsible for the delayed adoption of the least formalized and most subjective research methodologies of the social sciences: ethnography.

2. Ethnography as a research methodology in TIS

At the turn of the twenty-first century, three books on research methodologies in TS saw the light. The first two are collections of essays edited by Maeve Olohan (2000) and Theo Hermans (2002). The year 2002 also saw the

⁷ For a detailed presentation of these concepts, see Grenfell ed. (2013), chapter three (*Habitus*) by Karl Maton and chapter twelve (*reflexivity*) by Cécile Deer.

⁸ More surprising though is the absence of reference to Berman’s last essay, *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne* published posthumously in 1995, even if this seminal methodological enquiry into translation criticism was available in English since 2009.



release of *The Map* by Jenny Williams and Andrew Chesterman, a short introductory guide to doing research on translation. Ethnography is not mentioned in the book, but the authors do say a word on *workplace studies* that aim at analyzing the working conditions of professional translators mainly by way of observation. To the readers interested in such studies, the authors give the following advice: “The observer tries not to interfere with the process (as far as possible), but simply observes it and notes certain features of it. [...] The very fact of your being an observer may, of course, have some influence on the behaviour of the person you are watching but you just have to try to keep this to a minimum.” (2002: 62). In this formulation, *workplace studies* seem to belong to (or derive from) a naturalistic tradition, the positivistic version of ethnography.

Michaela Wolf’s chapter entitled “Culture as Translation—and Beyond. Ethnographic Models or representations in Translation Studies” (in Hermans ed. 2002) is one of the first mentions of ethnography in a TS methodology book. This chapter explores how the crisis of representation in the human sciences led to new ways of defining culture and cultural transfers that ought to be taken into account by translators and translation scholars. The author shows how these new conceptions—such as Homi K. Bhabha (1994)’s concepts of “third space” and “hybridity” or Geertz’s depiction of the ethnographer as an author—remind us of the partial and incomplete nature of any translation as well as the power relationships and negotiations underlying the process. She highlights some common grounds and differences between ethnography, cultural translation and interlingual translation as various ways of writing and representing alterity. The chapter is an invitation to reflexivity for translators and translation scholars. However, as the discussion remains on a theoretical ground, the methodological challenges and conditions for conducting ethnographies of translation are not addressed. The same remark holds for Peter Flynn’s article on “ethnographic approaches” (2010): the author mixes two bodies of literature: 1) contributions that conceive ethnography as a type of translation and, therefore, as a potential *object* of research for TS (see for example Kate Sturge’s contribution on translation strategies used in ethnographic descriptions); 2) and contributions that approach ethnography as a *research methodology* mainly based on fieldwork. Adopting Geertz’s philosophy, the author insists that an ethnography of translation consists in analyzing translation or interpretation practises *in context* from the viewpoint of those who perform them. Such an approach adds Flynn, requires reflexivity on the part of the researcher.

In the same vein, Séverine Hubscher-Davidson’s article on the relevance of ethnographic methods for translation process research (2011) opens on a literary review of TS contributions dealing with ethnography as an object of study, as a discourse on translation and as a research methodology. Follows a long discussion on how ethnography can be useful to translation process research. The author recalls some of the strengths of this approach: reflexivity, flexibility, induction, dialogism, ethical involvement with participants. In conclusion, she argues that “injecting a dose of ethnography to empirical studies in particular could perhaps contribute to providing translation re-



searchers and participants with what Tirkkonen-Condit terms ‘empowering experiences’ (2009) that will open their eyes” (Hubscher-Davidson 2011:14). This article leaves an ambiguity over the role and nature of ethnography. Is it merely a tool for collecting new types of data, i. e., a “method” (as suggested by the recurring use of this term throughout the article)? Is it a “methodology” (as suggested by values such as reflexivity and dialogism mentioned in the article)? Or is it simply a valuable “supplement” that one just has to take, in small doses, to overpass the limits of traditional approaches? The article does not offer many examples of existing studies combining ethnography with the methods commonly used in process studies such as think-aloud protocols, eye-tracking systems, keystroke logging or video recording. It does not question either to what extent this inductive approach is compatible with the experimental research protocols also commonly used in psychology. Ethnography is not completely foreign to psychology, but according to Sal Watt (2010), a socio-psychologist performing ethnography, introducing this approach in the most formal discipline of the social sciences was not self-evident and its use remains marginal. If Hubscher-Davidson’s article is very rich, one can regret that the author does not push the discussion further to explore maybe not so much the relevance of ethnography for process studies (something that had been partly done before), but rather to what extent, under what conditions and what type(s) of ethnography is (are) most appropriate to this area of research.

Unlike *The Map*, Saldanha and O’Brein’s textbook (2013) discusses ethnographic research in TS at length, in relation to case studies, in a chapter dedicated to sociological and cultural models. The presentation draws extensively from Kaisa Koskinen’s *Translating Institutions* (2008), an ethnographic study of the Finnish division of the translation services of the European Commission. For these authors, ethnography is a “methodological approach” based on a wide range of data collection methods. It is holistic by nature, contextualized and requires “a high degree of personal involvement from the researchers” (2013:209). Quoting Koskinen, the authors conclude that the distinctive features of ethnography are “[...] engagement with the object of study – going into the field – and a willingness to learn from those who inhabit the culture” (Koskinen 2008: 37) as well as a focus on the researcher’s personal involvement with the data” (Saldanha et O’Brein 2013: 209). Hence, beyond observation, what comes out of this overview is the subjective and participatory nature of ethnography⁹.

Both Hubscher-Davidson’s and Saldanha and O’Brein’s contributions present ethnography as a rather new approach in TS – i. e., new at the time these publications were released, i. e., the early 2010s – without mentioning that it had been used for about two decades in interpreting studies. Among the pioneers, Marta Biagini (2016) quotes the works of Susan Berk-Seligson (1990) and Cecilia Wadensjö (1998) on court interpreters, Melanie Metzger on sign languages as well as the contributions of Claudia Angelelli, Brad

⁹ On the previous page, the authors mention that contemporary ethnographies are not necessarily based on observation and can rely on the study of written documents or on interviews. (Saldanha and O’Brien 2013: 208)



Davidson, Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli on medical interpreting (Biagini 2016:66–70). These studies revealed, among other things, the gap between the ideal of neutrality (the interpreter as a conduit) put forward in theory and the active role interpreters play in the conversational dynamics between patients and health care providers.

If interlingual transfers are everywhere in society, some forms lend themselves more easily to observation and analysis than others (Poupaud et al. 2009). This diversity could be visualized as a continuum with, on one end, published literary translations that are reviewed and prized (very easy to find) and, on the other end, community interpreting practices. By virtue of being oral (hence more ephemeral, leaving no record more often than not) and quite sensitive (due to the asymmetric power relationship they engage) the latter are probably the most difficult to document and, to some extent, can only be documented by way of fieldwork. As Biagini rightly notes, this type of fieldwork raises methodological and technical challenges: one needs to get authorization from the institution; transcripts of the source-language texts are not always available and there are limits to what can be observed. But the study of community interpreting practices also raises epistemological and ethical challenges. If, as mentioned above, those studies have shown that community interpreters (whether in hospital, in courts or in immigration services) seldom act as neutral conduits, we could argue that the same holds (to a lesser extent as the implication is more indirect) for translation scholars studying those practices. Will the researcher also act as a judge or as an advocate? And in either case, will his/her criticism be directed toward interpreters or toward the institution that they serve? Between a highly involved, activist posture (like, for instance, that of Barksy and Jacquemet) and a more distanced one (like that of Davidson and Baraldi) the possibilities are numerous.

3. For an Interpretive move in Translation Studies

To sum up, at the turn of the nineteen nineties, as cultural studies made its way in the discipline, ethnographic narratives became objects of study for translation scholars. Around the same time, as a sociological eye developed in TS calling for translation/interpretation practises to be studied in their context, ethnography gradually appeared as a valuable research methodology. The literature produced for the past fifteen years over this question is extremely rich, but it leaves some ambiguities and grey areas. To begin with, if they recall key notions related to ethnography, all the contributions discussed above (with the exception of Wolf, 2002) tend to omit the fact that ethnography is a highly polysemous concept (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007:2). So, instead of adopting a particular definition (as Peter Flynn does for example) or refusing to do so (as the case with Hubscher-Davidson where ethnography is called a method but described as a methodology), one could start by acknowledging this diversity of definitions and question which one(s) would be most relevant to translation studies. This is the kind of discussion that Wolf's chapter announces, without going as far as engaging with methodological questions. In that respect, among all the definitions mentioned



above, the one proposed by Laplantine (1996) seems particularly interesting. Indeed, less inclusive than Hammersley and Atkinson's definition, Laplantine's conception of ethnography, inherited from Geertz, has the merit of putting high demands on the researcher. Emphasizing the unique character of both the ethnographic gaze and ethnographic descriptions (rather than just focusing on observation and fieldwork as core features), this definition reminds us that ethnography is an *interpretive* practice as well as a particular type of (dialogical) writing.

TS literature rarely mentions these two sides of the coin: *observation* and *writing*. Indeed, scholars who study ethnographic texts (e.g.: Sturge 1997, Wolf 2002) tend to emphasize this interpretive dimension without looking at the methodological challenges involved in doing fieldwork¹⁰. Conversely, the literature on ethnography as a research approach in TS (e.g. Hubscher-Davidson 2011, Saldanha et O'Brein 2013, Leblanc 2014, Biagini 2016) tends to focus on fieldwork and do not say much about the interpretive and writing challenges facing TS researchers. Sturge (1997) rightly highlights how much ethnographers have often used translation in a loose metaphorical way, without properly questioning their interlingual translation practices. But if we look the other way round, one must admit that the pioneers of TS, mainly concerned with interlingual transfers, have hardly questioned their own interpretive practices, i.e., the way they read, understand and represent their object and their own relationships to that object, because in an epistemological frame infused with positivism, the only possible ethnographic posture is that of the naturalistic researcher, as suggested by Williams and Chesterman (2002).

So, one of the current challenges of the discussions on ethnography in TS lies maybe in our ability to relate, without mixing them, two types of TS discourses on ethnography: 1) ethnography as a practice of fieldwork based on observation and dialogue; 2) ethnography as a mode of interpretation and writing. This would encourage a dialogue between two distinct orientations suggested in the early days of the discipline: an empirical approach (inherited from Toury and Holmes) and a more hermeneutic one embodied, among other things, in Antoine Berman's 1984's manifesto; a manifesto that, at least within the anglophone tradition (which largely dominates the field) did not have as much resonance as Holmes's proclamation of independence.

Conclusion

To sum up, reviewing TS literature on ethnography reminds us of the many dichotomies out of which the discipline has developed and structured itself – text vs. context, prescription vs. description, applied research vs. pure research, experiential vs. scientific discourse, subjectivism vs. positiv-

¹⁰ The challenges are quite different from those traditionally faced by the ethnographer. Whereas the later used to define its object by its otherness (until this very concept of "otherness" was questioned), translation scholars traditionally had a very close relationship to their object, as illustrated by the rich of "experiential discourses" on translation.



ism, hermeneutics vs. empiricism —, where the second term of each pair refers to the discipline as Toury and Holmes envisioned it. It also reminds us that even in an academic field concerned with translation, the circulation of ideas across national and linguistic boundaries is far from obvious. Toury and Berman, who do not encapsulate the whole discipline but who certainly had a major influence on its development, envisioned two very different research fields. In other words, *Translation studies* and *traductologie*, far from being perfect equivalents, tend to express quite distinct ideas of what it means to study translation, each having its strengths and blind spots. Other languages and nations may also have their own views and probably different ones. Lastly, this overview highlights another structural division: that between translation and interpreting studies. Mainly concerned with literary transfers, the fathers of TS focused on the analysis of written texts. Hence, translation and interpretation studies have developed largely in parallel, independently from one another. Initiatives such as Benjamin's TS bibliography (Doorslaer 2007) or, more recently, the textbook titled *Quantitative research methods in translation and interpreting studies* (Mellinger and Hanson 2017) suggest the desire and possibility for a dialogue. In that vein, one could hope for a similar type of textbook that would be dedicated to qualitative research methodologies in Translation and Interpreting Studies. Such a contribution would give an accurate picture of the role and place of ethnography in TIS, show the common (epistemological, ethical, methodological and interpretive) challenges faced by researchers and the variety of forms that ethnographies of "translation" (in the broad sense) can take, depending on whether they relate to institutions, communities or particular translation projects, as many contexts to which the translation scholar also belongs, though in a slightly different way.

References

- Angelelli, C., 2004. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L., 2007. Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: an analysis in healthcare multicultural settings. In: M. Grein and E. Weigand, eds. *Dialogue and Culture*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, pp. 155–176.
- Bhabha, H. K., 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Barsky, R., 1994. *Constructing a Productive Other: Discourse Theory and the Convention Refugee Hearing*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Berman, A., 1984. *L'Épreuve de l'étranger*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berman, A., 1989. La traduction et ses discours. *Meta*, 34 (4), pp. 672–679.
- Berman, A., 1992. *The experience of the foreign*. Translated by S. Heyvaert. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Berman, A., 1995. *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berman, A., 2009. *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne*. Translated by Mas-sardier-Kenney. Kent (Ohio): Kent State University Press.
- Biagini, M., 2016. Revisiting Ethnography for Dialogue Interpreting Research. In: Bendazzoli C. and C. Monacelli, eds. *Addressing Methodological Challenges in Interpreting Studies Research*. Cambridge Scholars, pp. 61–84.
- Buzelin, H., 2006. Independent Publisher in the Networks of Translation. *TTR*, 19 (1), pp. 135–173.



Buzelin, H., 2007. Translation Studies, ethnography and the production of knowledge. In: P. St-Pierre and P.C. Kar, eds. *In Translation – Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, pp. 39–56.

Buzelin, H., 2015. Traduire pour le Centre national du livre. *COnTEXTES. Revue de sociologie de la littérature*, pp. 1–19. doi: 10.4000/contextes.6095.

Chesterman, A., 2000. A Causal Model for Translation Studies. In: M. Olohan, ed. *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 15–28.

Mellinger, C.D. and Hanson, T.A., 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies*. London; New York: Routledge.

Crisafulli, E., 2002. The Quest for an Eclectic Methodology of Translation Description. In: T. Hermans, ed. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 26–43.

Davidson, B., 2000. The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4 (3), pp. 379–405.

van Doorslaer, L., 2007. Risking conceptual maps. *Target*, 19 (2), pp. 217–233.

Flynn, P., 2010. Ethnographic Approaches. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, pp. 116–119.

Geertz, C., 1973. *The Interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gobo, G., 2007. *Doing Ethnography*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Grenfell, M., ed., 2013. *Pierre Bourdieu. Key concepts*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P., 1983. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London; New York: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P., 2007. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. 3d ed. London; New York: Routledge.

Hermans, T., 1999. *Translation in systems*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Hermans, T., ed., 2002. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St Jerome.

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

Hubscher-Davidson, S., 2011. A Discussion of Ethnographic Research Methods and their Relevance for Translation Process Research. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 12 (1), pp. 1–18.

Hymes, D., ed., 1999. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Jaquemet, M., 2005. The Registration Interview. Restricting Refugees' Narrative Performances. In: M. Baynham and A. de Fina, eds. *Dislocations/Relocations. Narratives of displacement*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 197–220.

Koskinen, K., 2008. *Translating Institutions*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Laplantine, F., 1996. *La description ethnographique*. Paris: Nathan.

Leblanc, M., 2014. Traduction, bilinguisme et langue de travail: une étude de cas au sein de la fonction publique fédérale canadienne. *Meta*, 59 (3), pp. 537–556.

Nida, E., 1945. Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems. *Word*, 2, pp. 194–208.

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

Olohan, M., ed., 2000. *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Poupaud, S., Pym, A. and Torres-Simón, E., 2009. Finding Translations. On the Use of Bibliographical Databases in Translation History. *Meta*, 54 (2), pp. 264–278.

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

Saldanha, G. and O'Brien, S., 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. London; New York: Routledge.

Scott Jones, J. and Watt, S., eds., 2010. *Ethnography in social science practice*. London; New York: Routledge.



- Simeoni, D., 1995. Translating and Studying Translation: The View from the Agent. *Meta*, 40 (3), pp. 445 – 460.
- Sturge, K., 1997. Translation Strategies in Ethnography. *Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication*, 3 (1), pp. 21 – 38.
- Toury, G., 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, G., 1985. A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies. In: T. Hermans, ed. *The Manipulation of Literature*. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 16 – 41.
- Toury, G., 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Revised edition: 2012. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tymoczko, M., 2002. Connecting the Two Infinite Orders. *Research Methods in Translation Studies*. In: T. Hermans, ed. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 9 – 25.
- Wadensjö, C., 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London: Longman.
- Watt, S., 2010. "But It's Got No Tables or Graphs in It..." A Legacy of Scientific Dominance in Psychology. In: J. Scott-Jones and S. Watt, eds. *Ethnography in social science practice*. London; New York: Routledge, pp. 42 – 56.
- Williams, J. and Chesterman, A., 2002. *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Wolf, M., 2002. Culture as Translation – and Beyond. *Ethnographic Models or representations in Translation Studies*. In: T. Hermans, ed. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 180 – 192.

The author

Dr H el ene Buzelin, professor, the Department of Linguistics and Translation, University of Montr eal, Canada.

E-mail: helene.buzelin@umontreal.ca

To cite this article:

Buzelin, H. 2022. Ethnography in Translation Studies: an object and a research methodology, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 13, no. 1, p. 32 – 47. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2022-1-2.



SUBMITTED FOR POSSIBLE OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATION UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION (CC BY) LICENSE ([HTTP://CREATIVECOMMONS.ORG/LICENSES/BY/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/))

ЭТНОГРАФИЯ В ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИИ: ОБЪЕКТ И МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ*

Э. Бюзлен

Монреальский университет, факультет лингвистики и перевода
Канада, Квебек НЗС 3J7, Монреаль, Лионель-Груль, С. Р. 6128, филиал в Сэнтр-Вилье

Поступила в редакцию 30.04.2021 г.

doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2022-1-2

На основе обзора литературы по этнографии, созданного переводоведами за последние двадцать лет, в статье демонстрируется, как переводоведение использует наработки этнографии сначала как способ решения проблем перевода (вслед за Юджином Нидой), затем как объект исследования (в рамках культурного поворота), а в последнее время как исследовательскую методологию для документирования и анализа



письменного и устного перевода, осуществляемого в определенном контексте. Автор показывает, как в начале 1970-х годов в культурной антропологии и науке о переводе произошла смена парадигмы, которая не только сблизила эти две дисциплины на поверхностном уровне (поскольку метафорическая трактовка культуры как текста к этому моменту обрела свои научные обоснования), но и очень сильно отделила их друг от друга с эпистемологической точки зрения. Действительно, пока в этнографии происходил интерпретативный поворот, переводоведение предпочитало определять себя как эмпирическую дисциплину, основанную на систематическом и объективном наблюдении. Этот позитивистский уклон раннего переводоведения отчасти может объяснить запоздалое принятие этнографии в качестве методологии исследования. Представленный обзор литературы заставляет еще раз задуматься о многочисленных дихотомиях, из которых выросла и структурировалась наука о переводе, – текст *vs* контекст, перевод *vs* интерпретация, опытное *vs* научное знание, герменевтика *vs* эмпиризм и т.д., а также сделать вывод о необходимости развития интерпретативного направления в этой дисциплине.

Ключевые слова: перевод, интерпретация, интерпретативная этнография, эпистемология, исследовательские методологии

Список литературы

- Angelelli C. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Baraldi C., Gavioli L. Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: an analysis in healthcare multicultural settings // *Dialogue and Culture* / ed. by M. Grein and E. Weigand. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 2007. P. 155–176.
- Bhabha H. K. *The Location of Culture*. L. : Routledge, 1994.
- Barsky R. *Constructing a Productive Other: Discourse Theory and the Convention Refugee Hearing*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 1994.
- Berman A. *L'Épreuve de l'étranger*. P. : Gallimard, 1984.
- Berman A. *La traduction et ses discours* // *Meta*. 1989. Vol. 34, №4. P. 672–679.
- Berman A. *The experience of the foreign* / transl. by S. Heyvaert. Albany : State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Berman A. *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*. P. : Gallimard, 1995.
- Berman A. *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne* / transl. by Massardier-Kenney. Kent (Ohio) : Kent State University Press, 2009.
- Biagini M. Revisiting Ethnography for Dialogue Interpreting Research // *Addressing Methodological Challenges in Interpreting Studies Research* / ed. by C. Bendazoli and C. Monacelli. Newcastle upon Tyne : Cambridge Scholars, 2016. P. 61–84.
- Buzelin H. *Independent Publisher in the Networks of Translation* // *TTR*. 2006. Vol. 19, №1. P. 135–173.
- Buzelin H. *Translation Studies, ethnography and the production of knowledge* // *Translation – Reflections, Refractions, Transformations* / ed. by P. St-Pierre and P. C. Kar. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 2007. P. 39–56.
- Buzelin H. *Traduire pour le Centre national du livre* // *CONTEXTES. Revue de sociologie de la littérature*. 2015. P. 1–19. doi: 10.4000/contextes.6095.
- Chesterman A. *A Causal Model for Translation Studies* // *Intercultural Fault-lines. Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects* / ed. M. Olohan. Manchester : St Jerome, 2000. P. 15–28.
- Mellinger C. D., Hanson T. A. *Qualitative Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies*. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2017.
- Crisafulli E. *The Quest for an Eclectic Methodology of Translation Description* // *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues* / ed. by T. Hermans. Manchester : St Jerome, 2002. P. 26–43.



- Davidson B. The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse // *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 2000. Vol. 4, №3. P. 379–405.
- Doorslaer L. van. Risking conceptual maps // *Target*. 2007. Vol. 19, №2. P. 217–233.
- Flynn P. *Ethnographic Approaches* // *Handbook of Translation Studies* / ed. by Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 116–119.
- Geertz C. *The Interpretation of cultures*. N. Y. : Basic Books, 1973.
- Gobo G. *Doing Ethnography*. Los Angeles : Sage Publications, 2007.
- Grenfell M. (ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu. Key concepts*. 2nd ed. L. : Routledge, 2013.
- Hammersley M., Atkinson P. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 1983.
- Hammersley M., Atkinson P. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. 3rd ed. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2007.
- Hermans T. *Translation in systems*. Manchester : St Jerome, 1999.
- Hermans T. (ed.). *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2002.
- Holmes J. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam : Rodopi, 1988.
- Hubscher-Davidson S. *A Discussion of Ethnographic Research Methods and their Relevance for Translation Process Research* // *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2011. Vol. 12, №1. P. 1–18.
- Hymes D. (ed.). *Reinventing Anthropology*. N. Y. : Pantheon Books, 1999.
- Jaquemet M. *The Registration Interview. Restricting Refugees' Narrative Performances* // *Dislocations/Relocations. Narratives of displacement* / ed. by M. Baynham and A. de Fina. Manchester : St Jerome, 2005. P. 197–220.
- Koskinen K. *Translating Institutions*. Manchester : St Jerome, 2008.
- Laplantine F. *La description ethnographique*. P. : Nathan, 1996.
- Leblanc M. *Traduction, bilinguisme et langue de travail: une étude de cas au sein de la fonction publique fédérale Canadienne* // *Meta*. 2014. Vol. 59, №3. P. 537–556.
- Nida E. *Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems* // *Word*. 1945. №2. P. 194–208.
- Nida E. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden : Brill, 1964.
- Olohan M. (ed.). *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester : St Jerome, 2000.
- Poupaud S., Pym A., Torres-Simón E. *Finding Translations. On the Use of Bibliographical Databases in Translation History* // *Meta*. 2009. Vol. 54, №2. P. 264–278.
- Pym A. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester : St Jerome, 1998.
- Saldanha G., O'Brien S. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2013.
- Scott Jones J., Watt S. (eds.). *Ethnography in social science practice*. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2010.
- Simeoni D. *Translating and Studying Translation: The View from the Agent* // *Meta*. 1995. Vol. 40, №3. P. 445–460.
- Sturge K. *Translation Strategies in Ethnography* // *Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication*. 1997. Vol. 3, №1. P. 21–38.
- Toury G. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv : The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1980.
- Toury G. *A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies* // *The Manipulation of Literature* / ed. by T. Hermans. N. Y. : St. Martin's Press, 1985. P. 16–41.
- Toury G. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Revised edition: 2012. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1995.



Tymoczko M. Connecting the Two Infinite Orders. *Research Methods in Translation Studies // Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues* / ed. by T. Hermans. Manchester : St Jerome, 2002. P. 9–25.

Wadensjö C. *Interpreting as Interaction*. L. : Longman, 1998.

Watt S. "But It's Got No Tables or Graphs in It..." A Legacy of Scientific Dominance in Psychology // *Ethnography in social science practice* / ed. by J. Scott-Jones and S. Watt. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2010. P. 42–56.

Williams J., Chesterman A. *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester : St Jerome, 2002.

Wolf M. Culture as Translation – and Beyond. *Ethnographic Models or representations in Translation Studies // Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues* / ed. by T. Hermans. Manchester : St Jerome, 2002. P. 180–192.

Об авторе

Д-р Элен Бюзлен, профессор, кафедра лингвистики и перевода, Монреальский университет, Монреаль (Квебек), Канада.

E-mail: helene.buzelin@umontreal.ca

Для цитирования:

Бюзлен Э. Этнография в переводоведении: объект и методология исследования // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2022. Т. 13, №1. С. 32–47. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2022-1-2.

