ISSN 2225-5346

БФУ
им. И. Канта

СЛОВО.РУ: БАЛТИЙСКИЙ АКЦЕНТ

2019

Том 10

№ 1

Темы и проблемы современного переводоведения

Специальный выпуск

Часть 1

Издательство
Балтийского федерального университета имени Иммануила Канта
2019

СЛОВО.РУ:
БАЛТИЙСКИЙ
АКЦЕНТ
2019
Том 10
№ 1

Калининград :
Изд-во БФУ
им. И. Канта, 2019.
103 с.

Точка зрения авторов
может не совпадать
с мнением учредителя

Издание
зарегистрировано
в Федеральной службе
по надзору
в сфере связи,
информационных
технологий и массовых
коммуникаций.
Свидетельство
о регистрации
СМИ ПИ
№ ФС77-46308
от 26 августа 2011 г.

Редакционная коллегия

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

CONTENTS

ОТ РЕДАКЦИИ

Проблема перевода — одна из приоритетных тем для журнала. Ей был посвящен специальный тематический выпуск «Трансферы в языке и культуре» в двух частях, подготовленный сотрудниками Института языкознания РАН Наталией Азаровой, Светланой Бочавер и Владимиром Фещенко (Слово.ру: балтийский акцент, 2017, т. 8, №3, 4). Интересно сопоставить взгляды российских ученых с точкой зрения их европейских коллег, хотя, разумеется, речь скорее должна идти о взаимодополнении, поскольку поставленные цели достаточно различны. В этом номере представлен спектр проблем, в первую очередь обусловленных новыми вызовами современной коммуникации. Проблематика номера изложена в предисловии его составителя и редактора, профессора Ива Гамбье, поэтому отсылаем читателя непосредственно к нему. Однако считаем необходимым вкратце представить самого редактора — хотя для специалистов в области переводоведения он в представлении не нуждается.

Профессор Ив Гамбье — автор более двухсот научных работ, посвященных разнообразным аспектам перевода, от теоретических до образовательных. Подготовленные им сборники и монографии стали настольными книгами как для теоретиков, так и для практиков перевода. Ранее, в 1998—2004 годах, он дважды избирался президентом Европейского переводоведческого общества (European Society for Translation Studies — EST). Ив Гамбье входит в состав редколлегий практически всех значимых переводоведческих журналов и издательских серий: *Babel, Hermeneus, MonTI, Target, Terminology, Sendebar, Synergies, TTR (Traduction, Terminology, Redaction), Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB), Handbook of Translation Studies (HTS)*, а также занимает пост главного редактора серии международных академических изданий по переводу и переводоведению (Benjamins Translation Library) одного из наиболее престижных академических издательств мира — John Benjamins Publishing Company. Большая честь для нашей редколлегии — участие в ее составе Ива Гамбье, который, как явствует из предлагаемого вниманию читателя номера, является одним из наиболее активных ее членов.

В настоящее время Ив Гамбье — почетный профессор (Professor Emeritus) Университета Турку и профессор Института гуманитарных наук Балтийского федерального университета им. И. Канта, где он руководит переводоведческим семинаром «Когниция, коммуникация, культура и перевод», по праву считаясь одним из выдающихся ученых нашего вуза.

Заметим, что многообразие проблем и аспектов современного переводоведения не позволяет ограничиться одним номером, и как редакция, так и профессор Ив Гамбье предполагают еще раз вернуться к этой актуальной проблематике и в течение 2019 года подготовить и издать вторую часть тематического номера.

Учитывая состав авторов и международную аудиторию журнала, принято решение оба выпуска сделать англоязычными.

Сурен Золян,
главный редактор

FROM THE EDITITORIAL BOARD

The problems of translation have been one of the priorities for *Slovo.ru*. An earlier issue of the journal, *Slovo.ru: Baltic accent*, 2017, Vol. 8, No. 3—4, was devoted to transfers in language and culture. The issue was compiled and edited by Natalia Azarova, Svetlana Bochaver and Vladimir Feshchenko from the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The *Slovo.ru* stirred interest in the academic community since translation continues to challenge researchers. Hence, we thought it would be interesting to compare the views of Russian and European experts in translation on a rich array of themes relevant for the field.

The articles included in this issue explore new challenges of modern communication. The overview of this *Slovo.ru* written by Professor Yves Gambier, the invited editor and the compiler of this issue, gives the reader a good idea of the many approaches to Translation and Interpreting Studies developed by the contributors. Although Yves Gambier does not need any formal presentation as he is very well-known to everybody in the field and beyond, we would like to briefly introduce the editor.

Professor Yves Gambier is the author of more than two hundred books and articles on various aspects of translation ranging from the theory and practice of translation to the methodology thereof. His books and monographs became reference books for both researchers and translation practitioners. Yves Gambier was elected president of the European Society for Translation Studies (EST) for two consecutive terms (1998—2004). He is a member of the editorial boards of almost all highly-ranked Translation Studies journals and academic series (*Babel, Hermeneus, MonTI, Target, Terminology, Sendebar, Synergies, TTR, Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB)*, and *Handbook of Translation Studies (HTS))*. He is the editor-in-chief of John Benjamins Translation Library, one of the most prestigious academic publications in the world.

It is a great honour for the editorial board of the *Slovo.ru* to work with Professor Yves Gambier, a most active member of the editorial board of the journal.

Yves Gambier is Professor Emeritus at the University of Turku (Finland) and a professor at the Institute of the Humanities of the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, where he is Director of the Research Seminar "Cognition, Culture, Communication, Translation (C3T)". Yves Gambier is one of the high caliber researchers who have joined the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University lately.

The variety of aspects and problems of modern Translation Studies cannot be reduced to a single issue only. Hence, both the editorial board and Yves Gambier are preparing a subsequent issue of the *Slovo.ru* to be published this year.

Suren Zolyan,
editor-in-chief

EDITOR'S NOTES

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

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

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

For Andrew Chesterman, the development of TS is not only the result of the emergence of different kinds of translation practices, research questions and new technologies but also of different epistemological and ontological assumptions about the object of study. Besides, there are two dominant methodological traditions in TS today: one based on empirical tradition, and the other on the liberal arts tradition. The differences between the two are manifested in the way the discipline is currently structured and might give the impression that TS is becoming more fragmented. Or is this diversity of approaches a sign of vitality?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yves Gambier

CONSILIENCE OR FRAGMENTATION IN TRANSLATION STUDIES TODAY?

A. Chesterman[1]

[1] University of Helsinki
33 Fabianinkatu Str., Helsinki, 00014, Finland
Submitted on September 15, 2018
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-1

Translation Studies has branched out into a heterogeneous interdiscipline during the past few decades. This development is not only the result of the emergence of different kinds of translation practices, research questions and new technologies, but also of different epistemological and ontological assumptions about the object of study. Four major areas are outlined: linguistic, cultural, cognitive and sociological. Connections between them are briefly discussed, but the main tendency has been one of fragmentation. Perhaps this does not matter?

Keywords: *interdiscipline, consilience, fragmentation, explanation.*

During the past three or four decades, Translation Studies has gradually become an interdiscipline. This development was explicitly acknowledged at the Translation Studies Congress held in Vienna in 1992, from which selected papers were published under the title *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (Snell-Hornby et al. 1994). Since then, there have been discussions on whether we are an interdiscipline, a multidiscipline (or pluridiscipline) or a transdiscipline and on the extent to which Translation Studies lends to or borrows from other disciplines (e. g. Kaindl 2004), but there is a broad consensus our field is becoming increasingly heterogeneous, both within itself and in its relationship to neighbouring fields. From its original roots in linguistics and literary studies, research has branched out in all directions, sometimes conceptualized as "Turns", for instance, the "Cultural Turn" (for a survey, see Snell-Hornby 2006). Some of this expansion has been stimulated by advances in technology and machine translation, and by the emergence of new translation practices such as the varieties of multimodal translation and non-professional translation.

This development carries both a risk and a challenge. The risk is that the field will become so fragmented that it will break up into smaller, more specialized fields that no longer communicate with each other, hold joint conferences or publish in the same journals, or seek to relate their research to a shared general theory. Such a fragmentation would, of course, reflect the way science has progressed through the centuries: in the broadest terms, the mother-discipline of philosophy can be seen to have given birth to the separate fields of astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology and so on. The challenge is to find ways of strengthening those features that still connect the different fragments. And one key concept here is that of consilience.

"Consilience" is defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "the linking together of principles from different disciplines especially when forming a comprehensive theory". It denotes the idea of the unity of all knowledge, an idea that was particularly important in the European Enlightenment, a period of humanist and scientific optimism. The concept has been given a new lease of life by the biologist Edward O. Wilson, whose book *Consilience*, appeared in 1998. Wilson was first known as a specialist on ants, but later became the founding figure of the field of sociobiology, which aims to use concepts and hypotheses derived from biology to examine and explain the social behaviour of human beings. Significantly, and ironically, sociobiology is thus itself an interdiscipline. Wilson has thus succeeded in fragmenting the field of science one step further, by adding an extra fragment, at the same time as he has endeavoured to link the fragments together, at least conceptually. Can Translation Studies follow suit? (Chesterman 2005).

Let us first examine some of the roots of the fragmentation in Translation Studies, before looking at some of its manifestations.

In 2000, Rosemary Arrojo and I opened a Forum debate in *Target* about the possibility of establishing "shared ground" in Translation Studies (see *Target* 12,1 and the following issues, concluding with 14,1). Each of us came to the discipline from a different background: Rosemary came more from literary and cultural studies and deconstruction, and I came from applied and contrastive linguistics. We originally framed our different views in terms of different assumptions about of meaning (essentialist vs non-essentialist), but there were broader philosophical issues on which we also differed. Those who responded to our opening essay also represented different views, and some criticized the way we had framed the main contrasts between us (see especially Malmkjær 2000). At the end, the conclusion seemed to be (in my view at least) that there was actually very little shared ground to be seen. There were many differences of opinion concerning the kind of theory we should be trying to construct (and even whether any kind of general theory could be constructed at all); about the kinds of research questions that were most significant, about methodology, and about research aims. Another conceptual distinction that overlaps with the epistemological divide indicated above is that between nomothetic and idiographic approaches to knowledge; the distinction itself comes from Kant, but not these terms. A nomothetic approach seeks generalizations (as empirical research does), whereas an idiographic approach seeks specific, context-bound knowledge (cf. the hermeneutic view traditionally central to the humanities).

One central issue concerns how we see the object of our study: translation itself. This is thus an ontological issue. We are still arguing about what translation "is", or what it can be, and what kind of concept it is. It is obviously fuzzy, shading off into adaptation, rewriting, versions, and other similar neighbouring categories. Some have seen translation as a prototype category (e.g. Halverson 1998), others as a cluster category (e.g. Tymoczko 2004); still others are beginning to doubt that any kind of universal definition is possible at all since there is so much temporal and cultural variation. Perhaps it is not a natural category at all, but a purely cultural one? One aspect of this ontological issue is the difficulty of conceptualizing "translation" as distinct from "good" translation. How bad can a translation be and still merit the label "translation"? Who decides?

There are also terminological disagreements. Some scholars are happy to extend the term "translation" (and its "equivalents" in other languages) to include metaphorical usage, such as when Salman Rushdie refers to himself as a translated man (1992). Others have preferred to restrict the term to its original textual use. Still others, especially those working in, or researching on, the translation industry, have tended to reduce the scope of the term, by opposing it to some other category. For the localization industry, for instance, translation is seen as just a small part of what they do, subordinate to the wider term of "localization". In marketing and advertising, "translation" is becoming distinguished from "transcreation", on the grounds that the latter is more demanding since it involves more creative imagination and adaptation to a new readership (see e. g. Gambier and Munday 2014, and other papers in that special issue of *Cultus*). Such a solution seems to assume that "normal" translation is not particularly creative and does not take account of different readers; many translators and scholars would disagree! And then, of course, there is the question of whether terms referring to "translation" in other languages, cultures and periods are really referring to "the same thing."

Apart from ontological disagreements, we also have epistemological ones. The main issue here has been stated with elegant clarity by Dirk Delabastita (2003). He labels main opposition as empirical vs postmodern. Both these positions acknowledge that absolutely objective, value-free knowledge is not possible. Empiricists nevertheless strive towards this ideal with what Delabastita calls a "utopian" ambition. Empirical scholars look for norms, regularities, generalizations etc., on the basis of which predictions can be made, and systematically tested. Postmodernists also accept the impossibility of achieving totally objective knowledge but adopt a relativist position which allows considerable scope for self-reflexive exploration. They are more interested in what makes each translation unique than in claims about regularities, let alone laws. Their approach is individualistic and even playful, rather than systematic. Rather than hypothesis-testing, postmodernists are more interested in emancipating the translator and working for a fairer world in general.

These two positions are roughly represented in the two dominant methodological traditions that are current in Translation Studies (see e. g. Gile 2005). One is based on the empirical science tradition, and the other on the liberal arts tradition. The scholarly norms of these differ to some extent, and so do their respective traditions of academic writing.

We can now outline how these differences are manifested in the way the discipline is currently structured. This will be described here in terms of four major areas. These are not totally separate boxes but rather reflect differences of primary focus, and overlaps are normal.

At the traditional centre of Translation Studies we find linguistic research based on texts (written or oral). This addresses such issues as the relation between translations and their source texts; the conceptualization of equivalence and its various types;ways of achieving equivalence, for instance via the use of translation strategies or shifts or solution types (see e. g. Pym 2016); the relation between translations and non-translations in the target language (often called parallel texts); and the search for "universals" or general tendencies that are hypothesized to characterize translations regardless of language pairs (Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004). This latter research has come to the fore with the increasing availability of large computer corpora and has borrowed many analytical methods and tools from corpus linguistics. The linguistic tradition also continues to contribute to, and draw on, contrastive analysis and contrastive rhetoric, as a way of specifying the range of possible options than a translator can choose between. More recent developments in linguistics, such as cognitive linguistics, have also influenced linguistically-oriented translation research (see Rojo Lopez et al. 2013). Linguistic research into translation was originally prescriptive and critical, concerned with translation quality; but outside the classroom or literary translation reviews, research now tends to be descriptive or explanatory. In terms of the epistemological dichotomy outlined above, linguistic textual research has been mainly carried out within the empirical paradigm.

The second major focus is cultural research. Translations are always embedded in cultures, or in an "intercultural" space (Bassnett and Lefevere 1996). The long tradition of Bible translation can be seen as an influential part of this focus. In culturally oriented research on translation, textual material is interpreted in terms of its cultural origin and history, and in terms of its effects and influences. Central themes include power, ideology, the spread of knowledge and ideas, translation history, the relation between centres and peripheries, cultural capital, cultural identity, the perception of "Otherness", and translation ethics. One of the aims of this kind of research has been emancipatory: to give more visibility and autonomy to the translators themselves. The texts studied have mainly been literary, sacred or scientific. The epistemological background has been partly empirical, but it has become increasingly postmodern, borrowing from post-colonial studies, gender studies, and deconstruction.

The third focus is research on the translator's (and interpreter's) cognition. These days, this sometimes merges with the cognitive linguistic approach mentioned above. The central issue is simple: what goes on in the translator's head? (Krings 1986) How are decisions made? We cannot study this process directly, so inferences have to be made from what we can observe. One early method was the use of Think-Aloud Protocols (TAPs), where a translator is required to think aloud as he/she translates. Inferences are then made from what is said, often about problems that have occurred, and from the positioning and lengths of pauses, for instance. Further inferences may be drawn from what is known about the translator's emotional state, self-image, personality, personal history, value priorities, and so on (Jääskeläinen 2002). Later, key-logging and eye-tracking technologies have been taken into use, and even EEG and PET scans of the translator's brain (see e. g. Muñoz Martín 2014). Most recently, it has been suggested that a move should be made towards incorporating the methods and theories of neuroscience (e. g. García et al. 2016). Another recent development is the growing interest in the approach known as embedded or embodied cognition, which sees the mind not as a self-contained black box, separate from the body, but rather as embedded in and part of its physical context, including the human body itself and its immediate environment (e. g. Risku 2014). In general, the cognitive focus is obviously based on the empirical paradigm.

The fourth general focus is a sociological one. This looks at translation as a social activity, from many points of view. Many translators work in a team, for instance, and this means that there are social relationships between team members such as project managers, revisers, colleagues, clients and so on. Network models of workplace procedures are proposed, to study the communication between the agents involved. Issues concerning the translator's agency are studied, such as autonomy, power and visibility (see Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010). Translators' treatment and working conditions are studied as factors affecting the assessment of translation quality: if working conditions are appalling, can the translator be blamed for a producing a poor translation? Translation quality is thus given an ethical aspect as well as a textual one (Abdallah 2012, Ehrensberger-Dow and O'Brien 2015). Sociological research has also looked at the international translation market, the economics of translation, the professionalization of translators and interpreters, accreditation systems, social status, and payment rates. Another important topic is non-professional translation, such as the use of children to interpret for their immigrant parents, or the amateur fan-translation of films or comics (see Brian Harris's blog). Yet another significant area is translation policy and its relation to language policy. In sociological research on translation, theoretical concepts have obviously been borrowed from sociology (theories such as norm theory, Bourdieu's work, and Agent Network Theory), and so have data collection and elicitation methods (e. g. questionnaires, interviews). The general philosophical background has been empirical: the activity of translation is studied as a human science (see e. g. Wolf and Fukari 2007).

The four focus areas sketched above are obviously interrelated. One connecting feature is the increasing use of technology. In terms of the textual focus, the relevance of technology is evident in the growing field of multimedia translation, encompassing subtitling, dubbing, audio description, and the like. Machine translation (MT) is nowadays a field of its own, developed by computer scientists and/or computer linguists, but its influence on Translation Studies has been important, particularly in terms of the various technical aids that have emerged as offshoots of the MT project: electronic term banks, translation memory programs, translator's workbench systems, computer-aided translation, and so on.

From a cultural history perspective, doubts have been raised about the risk of dehumanizing of translation (Pym 2003). From the sociological perspective, there is concern about the detrimental ergonomic effects that the contemporary computer-dominated working environment may have, both on translation quality and on translators' sense of professional identity. Cognitive research, as noted above, is making increasing use of sophisticated technology. What happens to the human mind, at the interface of humanity and technology?

Another trend that connects cultural, cognitive and sociological focuses is that these are all primarily concerned with people rather than texts. To reflect this shared interest in the human agents involved in translation, the label "Translator Studies" has been proposed (Chesterman 2009). Perhaps this trend will promote interconnections across these sections of the discipline.

Connections across all four approaches can also be made via different kinds of explanation. If we take a textual feature of a translation or a set of translations, say the feature X, we can first describe it, but then we can ask why X has occurred. The initial (proximate) explanation is, of course, that it has occurred because the translator so decided. I.e. the reason is to be found somewhere in the translator's cognition or emotional state. But if we continue to ask why, we may look for causal conditions outside the translator's head, for instance in the sociological situation, including the resources available, the revision process, the nature of the source text, and so on. And beyond that, there may be cultural conditions such as ideology, censorship, and power relations. The notion of causality implied in the appeal to these conditions is of course much looser than the sense of causality that is used in the natural sciences, where higher levels of predictability are at issue, compared with the more variable nature of human behaviour. But causal factors of many kinds can still be hypothesized, and to some extent tested, across our four areas of focus. Furthermore, translations are not just effects of complex causal influences; they also act as causes themselves, and have their own effects, on readers' responses, sociological behaviour and perhaps even wider cultural trends. So we can also investigate chains of causal influence by investigating retrospectively from a given effect which we suspect may be due to a translation. For instance, the failure of a play to win popularity in another culture, despite being a hit in its source culture, can be plausibly explained by certain stylistic features of the translation that the target-culture production was based on (see Leppihalme 2000).

Other kinds of explanation may also serve to link different research areas. Contextualizing a puzzling feature of text or behaviour may also help us to make sense of it, even without appealing overtly to causal factors (Chesterman 2008). This is a well-known analytical procedure in history, for instance, or in sociology, or indeed culture studies. Placing a significant translation in the context of colonial or post-colonial history can contribute to an understanding of how it came to take the form that it did. (For an example that illustrates both causal and contextual explanation, see Fenton and Moon 2002.) Indeed, if we wish to go beyond linguistic description, in the direction of explanation, we have no alternative but to venture into one or all of the other fields we are dealing with here.

Attempts have also been made to unite the whole of Translation Studies under a broader umbrella theory. One suggestion has been to conceptualize translation within memetics, the study of memes (culturally transmitted ideas, metaphorically parallel to biological genes: see Chesterman 1997). Another view situates translation within semiotics (Gorlée 1994). One of the most developed proposals so far has been to apply Relevance Theory to translation, as just one kind of communication among others (Gutt 1991).

A more modest way of exploring links between different segments of Translation Studies is to exploit concepts that in some way bridge the gaps between the segments: we could call these "bridge concepts" (Chesterman 2005). Here are three examples. (a) Norm theory is a sociological theory, but the concept of the norm itself is both social and cultural. Norms vary between cultures; they embody cultural values but they exercise prescriptive influence over social behaviour. Consider the norms of personal proximity, for instance: in some cultures, two people engaged in a conversation naturally stand more closely to each other than in other cultures, depending on how the notion of personal space is interpreted. In translation, evidence of norms can be found in textual regularities when these are supported by extratextual evidence in the form of norm statements or the like (see e. g. Bartsch 1987, Toury 1995). (b) The translation brief, i. e. the instructions given by the client, is another kind of bridge, between the social sphere and the cognitive sphere: the brief affects how the translator will think about the task at hand, what kind of overall strategy will be most appropriate, how to adapt the text to the intended readership, and so on. In skopos theory, the brief is given particular significance (Reiß and Vermeer 1984). And (c) the concept of the translation strategy itself links the translator's cognition with the textual product which this cognition gives rise to. Strategies have been defined as problem-solving plans, either at the general level of the text as a whole (e. g. choosing the kind of equivalence that should be given priority in a given case) or locally (e. g. choosing a solution for the translation of a given culture-bound concept). The terminology of strategies and their taxonomies has varied hugely: some approaches are more textually oriented (e. g. shift analysis), others more cognitive. (For a recent proposal, which also offers a comprehensive critical survey of the history of the concept, see Pym 2016.)

More pragmatically, we are seeing an increasing number of research projects involving cooperation between specialists in different sub-fields or disciplines, projects that involve dialogue as well as conceptual and methodological borrowings and lendings. A recent book (Gambier and van Doorslaer 2016) offers dialogues between translation scholars and representatives of the following fields: history, military history, information science, communication studies, sociology, neuroscience, biosemiotics, adaptation studies, computer science, computational linguistics, business and marketing studies, multilingualism, comparative literature, game localization, language pedagogy, and gender studies. This gives a good idea of the complex relations that our interdiscipline engages in.

However, so far it seems that there is more evidence of fragmentation than of consilience. Translation scholars continue to use many different kinds of data, different methods and different theoretical frameworks, and they do not all hold the same epistemological and ontological assumptions. They may share the very general goal of a better understanding of translation in all its forms, and of the translation process. But there is no agreement on what a coherent "General Theory of All Translation" might look like, nor even that such a theory would be desirable or useful, or indeed possible.

Perhaps this does not matter, as long as heterogeneous views can be openly discussed, as Rosemary Arrojo notes in her closing comment on the Target Forum debate (2002, 142).

References

Abdallah, K., 2012. *Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on agency, quality and ethics.* Joensuu: Publications of the University of Eastern Finland.

Arrojo, R., 2002. Lessons learned from Babel. *Target*, 14 (1), pp. 137—143.

Bartsch, R., 1987. *Norms of Language*. London: Longman.

Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A., 1996. *Constructing Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chesterman, A., 1997. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Chesterman, A., 2005. Consilience in Translation Studies. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 51, pp. 19—32.

Chesterman, A., 2008. On explanation. In: A. Pym et al. (eds.). *Beyond Descriptive Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 363—379.

Chesterman, A., 2009. The Name and Nature of Translator Studies. *Hermes*, 42, pp. 13—22.

Chesterman, A. and Arrojo, R., 2000. Shared ground in Translation Studies. *Target*, 12 (1), pp. 151—160.

Delabastita, D., 2003. Translation Studies for the 21st century. Trends and perspectives. *Génesis. Revista cientifica do ISAI,* 3, pp. 7—24, available at: http://www.academia.edu/4222581/Translation_Studies_for_the_21st_century_Trends_and_perspectives (accessed 8 August 2018).

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and O'Brien, S., 2015. Ergonomics of the Translation Workplace: Potential for Cognitive Friction. *Translation Spaces*, 4 (1), pp. 98—118.

Fenton, S. and Moon, P., 2002. The translation of the Treaty of Waitangi: a case of disempowerment. In: M. Tymoczko and E. Gentzler (eds.). *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 25—44.

Gambier, Y. and Munday, J., 2014. A conversation between Yves Gambier and Jeremy Munday about transcreation and the future of the professions. *Cultus: the Intercultural Journal of Mediation and Communication*, 7, pp. 20—36.

Gambier, Y. and van Doorslaer, L. (eds.), 2016. *Border Crossings. Translation Studies and Other Disciplines*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

García, A.M., Mikulan E., Ibáñez, A., 2016. *A neuroscientific toolkit for translation studies*. In: R.M. Martín (ed.). *Reembedding Translation Processing Research*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 21—46.

Gile, D., 2005. Liberal arts and empirical science. *European Society for Translation Studies*, available at: http://www.est-translationstudies.org/resources/research_issues_index.html (accessed 22 June 2018).

Gorlée, D.L., 1994. *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gutt, E.-A., 1991. *Translation and Relevance. Cognition and context*. London: Routledge.

Halverson, S., 1998. *Concepts and Categories in Translation Studies*. Bergen: University of Bergen.

Harris, B., n.d. *Blog on Unprofessional Translation*, available at: http://unprofessionaltranslation.blogspot.fi (accessed 23 June 2018).

Jääskeläinen, R., 2002. Think-aloud protocol studies into translation. An annotated bibliography. *Target*, 14 (1), pp. 107—136.

Kaindl, K., 2004. *Übersetzungswissenschaft im interdisziplinären Dialog*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Kinnunen, T. Koskinen, K. (eds.), 2010. *Translators' Agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, available at: http://urn.fiurn:isbn:978-951-44-8082-9 (accessed 23 June 2018).

Krings, H.P., 1986. *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht: eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern*. Tübingen: Narr.

Leppihalme, R., 2000. Foreignizing strategies in drama translation. The case of the Finnish Oleanna. In: A. Chesterman, N. Gallardo San Salvador and Y. Gambier (eds.). *Translation in Context.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 153—162.

Malmkjær, K., 2000. Relative stability and stable relativity. *Target*, 12 (2), pp. 341—345.

Mauranen, A. and Kujamäki, P. (eds.), 2004. *Translation Universals. Do they Exist?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Muñoz, M.R., 2014. A blurred snapshot of advances in translation process research. *MonTI*, Special Iss. 1: Minding Translation, pp. 49—84, available at: https://dti.ua.es/es/documentos/monti/monti-especial-1-portada-indice.pdf (accessed 23 June 2018).

Pym, A., 2003. Localization and the humanization of technical discourse. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 4 (2), pp. 205—216.

Pym, A., 2016. *Translation Solution Types for Many Languages – Histories of a Flawed Dream*. London: Bloomsbury.

Reiß, K. and Hans, J.V., 1984. *Grundlegung einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Risku, H., 2014. Translation process research as interaction research: From mental to socio-cognitive processes. *MonTI*, Special Iss. 1: Minding Translation, pp. 331—353.

Rojo Lopez, A.M. and Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (eds.), 2013. *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rushdie, S., 1992. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991*. London: Granta.

Snell-Hornby, M., Pöchhacker, F. and Kaindl, K. (eds.), 1994. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, M., 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Tymoczko, M., 2004. Difference in similarity. In: S. Arduini and R. Hodgson (eds.), *Similarity and Difference in Translation*. Rimini: Guaraldi, pp. 27—43.

Wilson, E.O., 1998. *Consilience. The Unity of Knowledge.* London: Little, Brown and Company.

Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds.), 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

The author

Prof. Andrew Chesterman, Professor Emeritus of Multilingual Communication, University of Helsinki, Finland.

E-mail andrew.chesterman@helsinki.fi

To cite this article:

Chesterman, A. 2019, Consilience or fragmentation in Translation Studies today? *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 9—20. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-1.

СОВРЕМЕННОЕ ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИЕ: ЦЕЛОСТНОСТЬ ИЛИ ФРАГМЕНТАРНОСТЬ?

Э. Честерман[1]

[1] Хельсинкский университет
00014, Финляндия, Хельсински, ул. Фабианинкату, 33

Поступила в редакцию 15.09.2018 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-1

В течение последних десятилетий переводоведение постепенно стало разнородным и междисциплинарным. Это связано не только с появлением различных переводческих практик, новых проблем исследования и новых технологий, но и с наличием различающихся эпистемологических и онтологических взглядов на объект науки о переводе. В рамках переводоведения можно выделить четыре основных направления — лингвистическое, культурологическое, когнитивное и социологическое. В статье кратко рассматриваются их взаимосвязи, однако отмечается, что превалирует тенденция к фрагментации направлений. Автор ставит вопрос, имеет ли это значение для переводоведения.

Ключевые слова: *междисциплинарность, целостность, фрагментарность, объяснение.*

Список литературы

Abdallah K. Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on agency, quality and ethics. Joensuu : Publications of the University of Eastern Finland, 2012.

Arrojo R. Lessons learned from Babel // Target. 2002. Vol. 14, №1. P. 137—143.

Bartsch R. Norms of Language. L. : Longman, 1987.

Bassnett S., Lefevere A. Constructing Cultures. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 1996.

Chesterman A. Memes of Translation. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1997.

Chesterman A. Consilience in Translation Studies // Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses. 2005. №51. P. 19—32.

Chesterman A. On explanation // Beyond Descriptive Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury / ed. by A. Pym et al. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2008. P. 363—379.

Chesterman A. The Name and Nature of Translator Studies // Hermes. 2009. №42. P. 13—22.

Chesterman A., Arrojo R. Shared ground in Translation Studies // Target. 2000. Vol. 12, №1. P. 151—160.

Delabastita D. Translation Studies for the 21st century. Trends and perspectives // Génesis. Revista cientifica do ISAI. 2003. Vol. 3. P. 7—24. URL: http://www.academia.edu/4222581/Translation_Studies_for_the_21st_century_Trends_and_perspectives (дата обращения: 08.08.2018).

Ehrensberger-Dow M., O'Brien Sh. Ergonomics of the Translation Workplace: Potential for Cognitive Friction // Translation Spaces. 2015. Vol. 4, №1. P. 98—118.

Fenton S., Moon P. The translation of the Treaty of Waitangi: a case of disempowerment // Translation and Power / ed. by M. Tymoczko, E. Gentzler. Amherst : University of Massachusetts Press, 2002. P. 25—44.

Gambier Y., Munday J. A conversation between Yves Gambier and Jeremy Munday about transcreation and the future of the professions // Cultus: the Intercultural Journal of Mediation and Communication. 2014. №7. P. 20—36.

Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Border Crossings. Translation Studies and Other Disciplines. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2016.

García A. M., Mikulan E., Ibáñez A. A neuroscientific toolkit for translation studies // Reembedding Translation Processing Research / ed. by R. Muñoz Martín. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2016. 21—46.

Gile D. Liberal arts and empirical science [2005]. URL: http://www.est-translationstudies.org/resources/research_issues_index.html (дата обращения: 22.07.2018).

Gorlée D.L. Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles S. Peirce. Amsterdam : Rodopi, 1994.

Gutt E.-A. Translation and Relevance. Cognition and context. Oxford : Blackwell, 1991.

Halverson S. Concepts and Categories in Translation Studies. Bergen : University of Bergen, 1998.

Harris B. Blog on Unprofessional Translation. URL: http://unprofessionaltranslation.blogspot.fi (дата обращения: 23.06.2018).

Jääskeläinen R. Think-aloud protocol studies into translation. An annotated bibliography // Target. 2002. Vol. 14, №1. P. 107—136.

Kaindl K. Übersetzungswissenschaft im interdisziplinären Dialog. Tübingen : Stauffenburg, 2004.

Kinnunen T., Koskinen K. (eds.). Translators' Agency. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2010. URL: http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:978-951-44-8082-9 (дата обращения: 23.06.2018).

Krings H.P. Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht: eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern. Tübingen : Narr, 1986.

Leppihalme R. Foreignizing strategies in drama translation. The case of the Finnish Oleanna // Translation in Context / ed. by A. Chesterman, N. Gallardo San Salvador, Y. Gambier. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2000. P. 153—162.

Malmkjær K. Relative stability and stable relativity // Target. 2000. Vol. 12, №2. P. 341—345.

Mauranen A., Kujamäki P. (eds.). Translation Universals. Do they Exist? Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2004

Muñoz M.R. A blurred snapshot of advances in translation process research // MonTI. 2014. Special iss. 1: Minding Translation. P. 49—84. URL: https://dti.ua.es/es/documentos/monti/monti-especial-1-portada-indice.pdf (дата обращения: 23.06.2018).

Pym A. Localization and the humanization of technical discourse // Across Languages and Cultures. 2003. Vol. 4, №2. P. 205—216.

Pym A. Translation Solution Types for Many Languages — Histories of a Flawed Dream. L. : Bloomsbury, 2016.

Reiß K., Vermeer H.J. Grundlegung einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie. Tübingen : Niemeyer, 1984.

Risku H. Translation process research as interaction research: From mental to socio-cognitive processes // MonTI. 2014. Special iss. 1: Minding Translation. P. 331—353.

Rojo Lopez A.M., Ibarretxe-Antuñano I. (eds.). Cognitive Linguistics and Translation. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2013.

Rushdie S. Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981—1991. L. : Granta, 1992.

Snell-Hornby M., Pöchhacker F., Kaindl K. (eds.). Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1994.

Snell-Hornby M. The Turns of Translation Studies. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2006.

Toury G. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995.

Tymoczko M. Difference in similarity // Similarity and Difference in Translation / ed. by S. Arduini, R. Hodgson. Rimini : Guaraldi, 2014. P. 27—43.

Wilson E. O. Consilience. The Unity of Knowledge. L. : Little, Brown and Company, 1998.

Wolf M., Fukari A. (eds.). Constructing a Sociology of Translation. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2007.

Об авторе

Эндрю Честерман, почетный профессор, кафедра многоязычной коммуникации, Хельсинкский университет, Финляндия.

E-mail: andrew.chesterman@helsinki.fi

Для цитирования:

Chesterman A. Consilience or fragmentation in Translation Studies today? // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 9—20. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-1.

INDIRECT TRANSLATION: MAIN TRENDS IN PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

H. Pięta[1]

[1] 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 processesas 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 looks 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 looks 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 relayer 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 rending 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; Grigaravičiūte 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 19th 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.indirectrans.com/index.html).

With respect to the geographic spread of ITr research, Ringmar (2012, 141) argues that the process of ITr is normally analysed is in the ultimate target culture. As an illustration, Ringmar mentions the long-standing "Göttingen 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 14th to the 17th 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 21st 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 ina 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 as 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 recommendations 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 recourseto 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. Gallardo 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.). *Ubersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein internationals Handbuchzur Übersetzungforschung. 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*. València: Universitat de València, 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: Analyzes, Interpretations, Characteristics]. Moscow: Azbuka, pp. 363—372.

Genette, G., 1997. Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation. Transl. by J. Lewin. Cambridge UP.

Grigaravičiūte, 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: *8th 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 20th-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 sviazi 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 internationals Handbuch zur Übersetzungforschung. 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[1]

[1] Университет Лиссабона
1600-214, Португалия, Лиссабон, Аламеда да Университидаде
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. Анализы. Интерпретации. 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 internationals Handbuch zur Übersetzungforschung. 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.

Grigaravičiūte 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 8th 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.

Kuhiwczak 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 comoaí 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 traducciónindirecta 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.

Špirk J. Censorship, Indirect Translation and Non-Translation: The (Fateful) Adventures of Czech Literature in 20th-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. C. 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 internationals Handbuch zur Übersetzungforschung. 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.

ERGONOMICS AND THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

M. Ehrensberger-Dow[1]

[1] Zurich University of Applied Sciences
15c, Theaterstr., Winterthur, CH-8401, Switzerland
Submitted on September 15, 2018
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-3

The translation process can be regarded as a complex system involving many agents, organizational factors such as workflow, communication processes, project management, job security, and translator status. Environmental factors in the physical sense (e.g. lighting, temperature, air quality, space) as well in the broader sense of the role of translation and translators in the economy and society as a whole can also influence the process. Viewing translation from an ergonomic perspective can provide an appropriate framework to understand the impact of such factors on the demanding bilingual activity that translators engage in. Because their work requires close attention and concentration, translators have to exert energy and ultimately cognitive resources to compensate for the distraction of any physical discomfort, delays in computer responsiveness, or frustration with organizational problems. In this article, the relevance of ergonomics and the implications of putting the translator and their translation processes in focus are discussed in light of recent research.

Keywords: *translation process, ergonomics, professional translators, translation workplace.*

1. Relevance of ergonomics to translation

As professional communicators, translators are expected to create high-quality texts that meet the needs of their clients and readers while at the same time being subject to physical, temporal, economic, organizational, and cultural constraints. They perform the demanding cognitive act of producing reader-appropriate texts in a target language while simultaneously processing information from source and parallel texts and juggling client and employer expectations of both the process (i. e. efficiency) and the product (i. e. quality). At the modern translation workplace, the increasingly heavy reliance on language technology has added to the complexity of this dynamic system and made it increasingly important to understand the effect of various factors on translator efficiency and the translation process.

Although definitions of ergonomics vary somewhat, the one published on the website of the International Ergonomics Association (IEA) captures current thinking on the topic:

> Ergonomics (or human factors) is the scientific discipline concerned with the understanding of interactions among humans and other elements of a system, and the profession that applies theory, principles, data and methods to design in order to optimize human well-being and overall system performance (IEA).

The first documented use of the term 'ergonomics' was by W. Jastrzebowski (2006) in 1857 in a philosophical treatise. According to a meta-analysis (Licht, Polzella and Boff 1989), definitions of the word started appearing in the literature in the 1960s. Before that, the terms 'human factors engineering' and 'human factors' were used to mean much the same thing. These terms share the aim of describing how non-human elements in a system should be adapted to fit the needs of humans in order to enhance the latter's comfort and performance. In other words, systems should serve their users and not the converse. It can be argued that ergonomics is essentially the human side of usability (ISO 9241; Norros and Savioja 2007), with its focus on the user rather than on machines or tools. Enhancing comfort can contribute positively to people's well-being and possibly lower the risks of injury, whereas enhancing performance can be related to decreasing the time needed to perform a task and reducing the number and/or severity of errors.

According to the IEA, this can be done using "a holistic approach in which considerations of physical, cognitive, social, organizational, environmental and other relevant factors are taken into account." The IEA explains that there are three main domains of specialization within ergonomics: physical, cognitive, and organizational. The physical domain, defined rather technically by the IEA as "human anatomical, anthropometric, physiological and biomechanical characteristics as they relate to physical activity" is the one that is probably most often associated with ergonomics. It relates to workplace equipment, layout, repetitive movements, safety, and health. A large body of research into physical ergonomics in the 1990s culminated in good practice recommendations for computer workstations and office ergonomics (e. g. CCOHS 2011; Ijmker et al. 2007; Salvendy 2012).

Since professional translators spend much of their day thinking and working at a computer, physical ergonomics is very important for them. The multi-activity task of translation can easily cause cognitive overload and stress since professional translators have to read the source text in one language, do research in one or more languages, and write and revise in the target language while thinking, retrieving, and evaluating information from internal and external resources under tight temporal constraints. Just as models have been proposed to explain the effort or cognitive load of interpreting (e. g. Gile 2009), the construct of the mental load has been used to explain how various factors can affect translation performance (cf. Muñoz 2012, 177).

Moreover, many translators work in offices that have sub-optimal conditions for intensive text work, such as other people talking, making phone calls or moving around, other ambient noise, inadequate lighting, and uncomfortable temperatures. Physical factors, such as the design of desks, office chairs, computer keyboards, and other input devices like trackpads and mice can all influence the performance of the people working at computers. They can also represent risk factors for health problems. Keyboarding and using input devices are activities that involve more than just the hands or lower arms; constant repetition of movement can also cause an overload of muscles of the upper extremities and back and lead to hand and wrist tendonitis (cf. Lavault-Olléon 2011a; Lavault-Olléon 2011b).

The second major domain defined by IEA is cognitive ergonomics, which is "concerned with mental processes, such as perception, memory, reasoning, and motor response, as they affect interactions among humans and other elements of a system." It is usually associated with features of human-computer interaction such as the design, organization, and operation of user interfaces, but also includes mental load, decision-making, and stress related to work. The assumption behind optimizing the ergonomics of user interfaces is that if they are in alignment with natural cognitive processes then they will be easier to use and lead to more efficient performance, fewer errors, and less stress (e. g. Beale and Peter 2008).

Cognitive factors involved in translation work include the subject matter and quality of source texts as well as their terminological, conceptual and linguistic complexity. Human-computer interactions, information sources, and language technology are also all factors related to the cognitive ergonomics of a translator's workplace. In light of machine solutions being a part of virtually all translation tasks at modern workplaces (see O'Brien 2012), improving cognitive ergonomic conditions has become increasingly important. In her discussion of translation as a form of human-computer interaction, O'Brien points out that, in addition to its three most commonly cited advantages (speed, quality, and cost), translation technology can relieve translators of tedious tasks and the effort of trying to recall or retrieve previous translation solutions.

The third main domain referred to by the IEA is organizational ergonomics, which "is concerned with the optimization of sociotechnical systems, including their organizational structures, policies and processes." This recognizes that people work within a system that includes not only tools, equipment, and computer interfaces but also other people. Topics relevant to organizational ergonomics include teamwork, collaboration, communication, and teleworking (see Vink and Kantola 2011) as well as feedback and quality management (e. g. Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey 2017).

Recent developments in technologies, communication speed, and the availability of information sources have had a huge impact on the translation profession. The entrenchment of language technology in the industry has forced language service providers to develop and integrate processes and organizational structures in order to remain competitive while maintaining quality standards for their clients (see, for example, ISO 17100). Increased use of computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools has resulted in impressive productivity gains, but it has also substantially changed the activity of translation itself (e. g. O'Brien 2012; Pym 2011; Pym 2013). One consequence of this is the increased influence of technological and organizational factors that can constrain translators' agency and affect their decision-making.

Translation scholars (e. g. Grass 2011; Olohan 2011) have argued that, by largely failing to address human and organizational aspects in the design and workflow deployment of CAT and project management technologies, software developers and Language Service Providers (LSPs) have been increasingly disempowering and alienating translators. This may diminish translators' commitment and sense of personal responsibility, with a negative impact on their professional identity and self-concept. Potential organizational issues at the translation workplace also include structures, processes and policies related to equipment and software procurement, teamwork, communication, feedback, and quality management. There is a large potential for poor ergonomics to have detrimental effects on the people in the centre of the translation process, as explained below.

2. Translators in the centre of the translation process

An ergonomic perspective on the translation process is congruent with Chesterman's (2009, 20) proposal to broaden the classic 'map' of translation studies to include a branch devoted to a study of translators. Putting the human in the centre this way, as the discipline of ergonomics does, allows us to explore what makes the products and processes of human translation different from machine translation (MT) solutions. The added-value of human translation includes novel solutions, stylistic choice, and culture-appropriate lexis and references, which are related to uniquely human traits such as creativity, discourse awareness, and reader empathy. These constructs are consistent with an appreciation of human cognition that extends beyond the boundaries of mental processes and rational decision-making to include notions of situatedness and embeddedness (cf. Englund Dimitrova and Ehrensberger-Dow 2016; Muñoz 2016a).

Translation can thus best be viewed as an activity situated in a particular time, place, society, and discourse, all of which can influence the decisions that translators make as they choose the best way to express the meaning and message of a source text to meet the informational needs of their target audience and the requirements of their clients. It is a complex bilingual cognitive activity that takes place within a dynamic system involving multiple agents and human-computer interactions in settings that can range from a kitchen table in a freelancer's house to a desk in an open-plan office of a busy commercial language service provider. At the highly-technologized computer workplaces that have become a standard feature of most freelance work and LSPs, translating has become a highly screen-intensive line of work that demands computer and information literacy in addition to familiarity with language technology and CAT tools. Ideally, the tools that translators use lighten their mental load (cf. Muñoz 2012), help them optimize their performance, and relieve them of tedious tasks such as translating the same sentence several times or ensuring consistent terminology. In reality, certain features in newly-designed or upgraded language technology systems can seem rather counter-intuitive to their intended users, thus having to be consciously remembered and adding an unnecessary load to cognitive resources.

In the past couple of decades, translation process researchers have made substantial contributions to our understanding of competences needed as well as problem-solving, resource use, and decision making during the act of translating. During this time, there has been a growing realization that simple models are essentially too limited in scope to adequately explain an activity that is situated in a temporal, spatial, and discursive context (cf. Chesterman 2013; Muñoz 2010; Muñoz 2016b). For this reason, the theoretical framework of situated cognition (e. g. Robbins and Aydede 2008) has started to have an impact on translation studies (e. g. Risku 2002). In essence, situated cognition assumes an extension of human cognition from the mind to the physical and social situation in which individuals find themselves (e. g. Clark and Chalmers 2010; Menary 2013). As such, it can help explain, and in some cases predict, how humans and machines interact.

Pym (2011) reasonably maintains that the technologization of the translation profession has led to the extension and externalization of human memory. For example, CAT tools and editing software can free up valuable cognitive resources for decision-making and higher-order problem solving by decreasing the load on working and long-term memory, and intuitive interfaces and functionalities make it easier for translators to bring their expertise to bear. The centrality of technology to the modern translation workplace is amply demonstrated by a recent European language industry report (ELIA 2018). A survey of 1285 LSPs from 55 countries shows almost all of the companies and approximately 87 % of individual professionals using CAT tools, and 76 % of the companies having a translation management system. Despite the undisputed importance of technology and workflow management to the translation profession, a number of translation scholars have expressed concern that the industry has yet to properly address technological and organizational aspects of the socio-technical systems in which translators are employed. They claim that failing to do so can disempower and alienate such professionals, potentially undermining their commitment, their concept of agency, and their sense of responsibility for the decisions they make (e. g. Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010).

3. Recent research into the ergonomics of translation

There is no single picture of the ergonomics of professional translation: a large-scale survey completed by translators from almost 50 countries revealed that profiles differ depending on employment condition, age group, number of hours worked per week as well as many other factors (see Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016 for more details). Nevertheless, the topic of ergonomics is gaining attention from the translation studies community. The call for empirical research to inform theory-building, training, and practice is being answered using various methods ranging from workplace observations to experiments in lab settings. This research is grouped below roughly into the categories used by the IEA, although their tripartite classification is inadequate to capture the situated activity of translation, in which physical and organization conditions are intrinsically linked to the cognitive process.

3.1. The physical ergonomics of translation

Professional translation is not usually thought of as a physical activity, but analyses of recordings of translation processes done in the lab by professionals showed that on average they typed approximately 1,000 characters and spaces and made over 80 mouse clicks within 15 minutes (Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey 2014, 72). These observations were confirmed by the translators' responses to certain questions in interviews after they commented on their translation processes. Although they basically seemed satisfied with their usual workplaces, all of them spontaneously mentioned issues related to ergonomics, such as the impossibility of working standing up in their offices and the (inadequate) size of their computer screens. The latter complaint was related to the limited space available for inputting target text because of the number of menus and optional functions in the CAT tools. Some of the translators also expressed their concerns about contextual factors such as ambient noise, furniture, and floor plans in light of an office move due to take place shortly after the interviews were done.

Since translation is generally a seated activity done indoors, physical factors such as the design of desks, chairs, office layout as well as ambient noise, lighting, and temperature can influence translators' performance, just as they do for other office workers (see Salvendy, 2012 for a general overview). In a recently completed interdisciplinary study (Meidert et al. 2016), occupational therapy and translation studies researchers visited professional translators at their workplaces to perform ergonomic assessments and observe their activities as they worked. The workplaces that were assessed in companies and institutions evinced a high ergonomic standard overall, whereas the ergonomics of most of the freelancers' workplaces was suboptimal. However, even at the dedicated workplaces with ergonomic furniture and equipment, most of the settings had not been adjusted correctly for the individual translators.

This is consistent with the findings from an exploratory survey study of freelancers and commercial translators in two countries (Ehrensberger-Dow and O'Brien 2015) and confirmed in a much larger international survey of over 1,800 professional translators (Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016). Proportionately fewer freelancers have a dedicated workplace, a large enough desk, or their elbows at the right position when keyboarding. Far more of them use laptops with small screens, which can increase the risk of eyestrain. These issues would be relatively easy to remedy since information on ergonomic posture and workplace set-up is freely available on the internet from reliable sources. However, freelance translators working from home might actually be compensating for certain non-ergonomic physical features by having much more control over the room temperature, amount of fresh air, airflow, and lighting than institutional and commercial translators working in shared offices do. All of those factors can affect concentration, which illustrates the overlap of physical and cognitive ergonomics.

3.2. Cognitive ergonomics of translation

The notion of cognitive ergonomics is often associated with engineering, where it usually refers to the design, organization, and operation of user interfaces. This is an area that is highly relevant to translation, of course, with its increasing reliance on computer-aided translation (CAT) tools ranging from spelling and grammar checkers to complete solutions that include translation memory (TM), terminology tools, concordancers, workflow organization, and links to MT. As early as the 1980s, some concern was expressed about the ergonomics of MT (e. g. Bevan 1982) yet relatively little research on translator-computer interaction has been done in the meantime, leading O'Brien (2012, 116) to suggest that "cognitive-ergonomic studies of translation tools and the translation process itself" would be beneficial. It is important to understand the reality of professional translation as translators cope with the transition of their work becoming increasingly machine-driven.

Translators interact with the tools they use, adapting them to suit their needs if possible or perhaps, more worrying from an ergonomic perspective, adjusting their cognitive processes to fit the machine. This has been discussed with respect to TM (e. g. O'Brien, O'Hagan and Flanagan, 2010), post-editing MT (Mesa-Lao 2014), integration of MT in TM (Teixeira 2014), and the usability of tools in general (Taravella and Villeneuve 2013; Teixeira and O'Brien 2017). In the international survey mentioned above (Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016), about three-quarters of the respondents reported that they used CAT tools and that they found them helpful at least some of the time, but most of them kept the default settings instead of customizing them to suit their needs. However, over half of those respondents said that they found certain things about their CAT tools problematic. A qualitative analysis of their responses indicated that the complexity of the user interface, segmentation, formatting issues, visual presentation, and bugs caused irritation (O'Brien et al. 2017). Since being irritated can affect negatively performance, improvements in the cognitive ergonomics of translator tools could contribute to better decision-making, creativity, and efficiency.

Cognitive ergonomics at the translation workplace encompasses much more than the interfaces and functionalities of CAT tools, however. Working conditions, time management, and stress can all be associated with disturbances to the translation process (cf. Hansen 2006) and/or cognitive flow (cf. Ehrensberger-Dow and O'Brien 2015). The suggestion has been made that some of the typing mistakes that translators make might indicate stress and cognitive effort (Muñoz 2009). Such mistakes also present an additional cognitive load: backspacing to correct them interrupts writing flow, ignoring them transfers quality control to a later stage of the process, and auto-correct features of editing software can introduce new errors that need to be remedied.

If the ergonomic conditions are not optimal, it might be very difficult for translators to perform their screen-intensive tasks at the quality that is expected of them. As outlined in the previous section, working conditions can be related to the physical ergonomics of the office, furniture and equipment they are using, but translators are also part of a complex network (cf. Risku 2014). Unwanted distractions from others, whether within or outside their network, can detrimentally affect concentration and thus are also related to cognitive ergonomics (cf. Baethge and Rigotti 2010). More of the commercial and institutional translators in the international survey reported in Ehrensberger-Dow et al. (2016) reported being disturbed by colleagues moving around and ambient noise than freelancers did, who tended to work alone, but a large majority of all three groups reported being disturbed by emails, chats, and phone calls. Reducing or eliminating such distractions would improve the cognitive ergonomics for the translators concerned by optimizing the organizational ergonomics of their workflow.

3.3. The organizational ergonomics of translation

The recent rapid developments in CAT tools and increasingly usable MT output have led to higher organizational expectations with regard to productivity and consequently additional time pressure. Advances such as neural machine translation (NMT) being integrated into TM systems are blurring the boundaries between human translation and post-editing of MT output. In most of the systems currently deployed, the origin of the suggested segment is marked as MT or TM, which may help the translators in their decision-making as to whether to accept the suggestion or not but also contributes to cognitive load. The quality of the MT suggestions is highly dependent on the programming effort that has gone into the development and tuning of the system, which is an organizational matter that is usually beyond individual translators' control. In a focus group study carried out at the European Commission's Directorate-General for Translation, reasons given for not using MT included fear of its influence on translators' performance as well as general discomfort with the technology (Cadwell et al. 2016). Policies and training with respect to working optimally with TM and MT as well as meeting clients' demands regarding quality, pricing, and deadlines need to be reviewed regularly and aligned with teams' expectations, expertise, software, and equipment.

As discussed above, the situated activity of translation involves not only physical and cognitive aspects of the workplace but also organizational factors. The freelancers who responded to the international survey seem more isolated than the commercial and institutional translators with respect to additional resources and style guides provided by the client (Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2016). The trade-off of relative isolation is that freelancers have autonomy with respect to where, when, and how often they work; which jobs they do and in which order; and when they take their breaks. Commercial and institutional translators enjoy less self-determination over their workload and workflow, but they have more opportunities to discuss translation problems with colleagues, receive feedback, and have better support for their infrastructure and workflow. They may feel under pressure by the presence or expectations of others in their organizations, though, since they take significantly fewer breaks than freelancers do. Being under self-imposed or organizational pressure to spend extended periods engaged in very similar activities can be taxing, as translators struggle to maintain a high enough level of concentration to ensure quality.

4. Implications of an ergonomic perspective for translation

By adopting an ergonomic perspective on translation as an activity embedded in a variety of technological and organizational environments, we can shed more light on the interplay between the cognitive and situational aspects of the work done by translators. From an ergonomic perspective, it is the humans in the translation process as well as their interactions with each other and other elements in the system that are of interest (e. g. O'Brien 2012; Olohan 2011; Risku 2014) rather than their tools in isolation or the products of their processes. Translators operate within a network of mutually interdependent 'actors and factors' that can range from the micro level of irritating or missing features in the language tools that they have to use to the macro level of the societal status of machine versus human translation. Poor physical and cognitive ergonomics in translation may be compounded by organizational issues such as time pressure, inadequate feedback, and client-imposed tools (cf. Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey 2017). Although still relatively under-researched, the physical, cognitive, and organizational aspects of the translation workplace have come into focus for theoretical and practical reasons (see also Ehrensberger-Dow and Jääskeläinen 2019). Among other things, good ergonomic conditions should allow translators to make the cognitive effort required to evaluate risks and take appropriate decisions (cf. Canfora and Ottmann 2015; Pym 2015). A better understanding of how ergonomic conditions interact should also allow a better appreciation of the socio-technical issues that can impinge on professional practice.

References

Baethge, A. and Rigotti, T., 2010. *Arbeitsunterbrechungen und Multitasking: Ein umfassender Überblick zu Theorien und Empirie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Altersdifferenzen*. Dortmund: Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin.

Beale, R. and Peter, C. (eds.), 2008. *Affect and Emotion in HCI.* Berlin: Springer.

Bevan, N., 1982. Psychological and ergonomic factors in machine translation. In: V. Lawson (ed.). *Practical Experience of Machine Translation*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, pp. 75—78.

Cadwell, P., Castilho, S., O'Brien, S. and Mitchell, L., 2016. Human factors in machine translation and post-editing among institutional translators. *Translation Spaces,* 5 (2), pp. 222—243.

Canfora, C. and Ottmann, A., 2015. Risikomanagement für Übersetzungen. *Trans-kom,* 8 (2), pp. 314—346.

CCOHS, 2011. *Office Ergonomics Safety Guide.* 6th ed. Hamilton, ON: CCOHS.

Chesterman, A., 2009. The name and nature of translator studies. *Hermes — Journal of Language and Communication Studies,* 42, pp. 13—22.

Chesterman, A., 2013. Models of what processes? *Translation and Interpreting Studies,* 8 (2), pp. 155—168.

Clark, A. and Chalmers, D. J., 2010. The extended mind. Reprinted. In: R. Menary (ed.). *The Extended Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 27—41.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M., Hunziker Heeb, A., Massey, G., Meidert, U., Neumann, S. and Becker, H., 2016. An international survey of the ergonomics of professional translation. *ILCEA,* 27, available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/4004 (accessed 22 September 2018).

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Jääskeläinen, R., 2019 (in press). Forthcoming. Ergonomics of translation: methodological, practical and educational implications. In: H.V. Dam, M.N. Brøgger and K.K. Zethsen (eds.). *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Massey, G., 2014. Cognitive ergonomic issues in professional translation. In: J.W. Schwieter and A. Ferreira (eds.). *The Development of Translation Competence: Theories and Methodologies from Psycholinguistics and Cognitive Science*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 58—86.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Massey, G., 2017. Socio-technical issues in professional translation practice. *Translation Spaces,* 6 (1), pp. 104—121.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and O'Brien, S., 2015. Ergonomics of the translation workplace: Potential for cognitive friction. *Translation Spaces,* 4 (1), pp. 98—118.

ELIA, 2018. *Language Industry Survey — Expectations and Concerns of the European Language Industry 2018.* Brussels: European Language Industry Association, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/2017_language_industry_survey_report_en.pdf (accessed 22 September 2018).

Englund Dimitrova, B. and Ehrensberger-Dow, M., 2016. Cognitive space: Exploring the situational interface. *Translation Spaces,* 5 (1), pp. 1—19.

Gile, D., 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grass, T., 2011. "Plus" est-il synonyme de "mieux"? Logiciels commerciaux contre logiciels libres du point de vue de l'ergonomie. *ILCEA, 14: Traduction et Ergonomie,* available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1052 (accessed 10 October 2018).

Hansen, G., 2006. *Erfolgreich übersetzen. Entdecken und Beheben von Störquellen*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Ijmker, S., Huysmans, M.A., Blatter, B.M., van der Beek, A.J., van Mechelen, W. and Bongers, P.M., 2007. Should office workers spend fewer hours at their computer? A systematic review of the literature. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine,* 64, pp. 211—222.

Jastrzebowski, W., 2006. An outline of ergonomics, or the science of work based upon the truths drawn from the science of nature. In: W. Karwowski (ed.). *International Encyclopedia of Ergonomics and Human Factors,* Vol. 3. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. 129—141.

Kinnunen, T. and Koskinen, K. (eds.), 2010. *Translators' Agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Lavault-Olléon, E., 2011a. L'ergonomie, nouveau paradigme pour la traductologie. *ILCEA, 14: Traduction et Ergonomie,* available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1078?lang=en.html (accessed 15 October 2018).

Lavault-Olléon, E., 2011b. Une introduction à la problématique "Traduction et Ergonomie". *ILCEA, 14: Traduction et Ergonomie,* available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1118 (accessed 15 October 2018).

Licht, D.M., Polzella, D.J. and Boff, K., 1989. *Human Factors, Ergonomics, and Human Factors Engineering: An Analysis of Definitions*. CSERIAC-89-01. Dayton, OH: CSERIAC.

Meidert, U., Neumann, S., Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Becker, H., 2016. Physical ergonomics at translators' workplaces: Findings from ergonomic workplace assessments and interviews. *ILCEA,* 27, available at: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/3996 (accessed 20 October 2018).

Menary, R., 2013. The extended mind. In: H. Pashler (ed.). *Encyclopedia of the Mind*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, pp. 335—338.

Mesa-Lao, B., 2014. Gaze behaviour on source texts: An exploratory study comparing translation and post-editing. In: S. O'Brien, L. Winther Balling, M. Carl, M. Simard and L. Specia (eds.). *Post-Editing of Machine Translation: Processes and Applications*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 219—245.

Muñoz Martín, R., 2009. Typos and co. In: S. Göpferich, A.L. Jakobsen and I.M. Mees (eds.). *Behind the Mind. Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur Press, pp. 167—189.

Muñoz Martín, R., 2010. On paradigms and cognitive translatology. In: G.M. Shreve and E. Angelone (eds.). *Translation and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 169—187.

Muñoz Martín, R., 2012. Just a matter of scope. Mental load in translation process research. *Translation Spaces,* 1, pp. 169—178.

Muñoz Martín, R. (ed.), 2016a. *Reembedding Translation Process Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Muñoz Martín, R., 2016b. Processes of what models? On the cognitive indivisibility of translation acts and events. *Translation Spaces,* 5 (1), pp. 145—161.

Norros, L. and Savioja, P., 2007. Towards a theory and method for usability evaluation of complex human-technology systems. *Activités,* 4 (2), pp. 143—150.

O'Brien, S., 2012. Translation as human-computer interaction. *Translation Spaces,* 1, pp. 101—122.

O'Brien, S., Ehrensberger-Dow, M., Hasler, M. and Connolly, M., 2017. Irritating CAT tool features that matter to translators. *Hermes — Journal of Language and Communication in Business,* 56, pp. 145—162.

O'Brien, S., O'Hagan, M. and Flanagan, M., 2010. Keeping an eye on the UI design of translation memory: How do translators use the "concordance" feature? In: W.P. Brinckman and M. Neerincx (eds.). *Proceedings of the 28th European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics*. Delft: Delft University of Technology, pp. 187—190.

Olohan, M., 2011. Translators and translation technology: The dance of agency. *Translation Studies,* 4 (3), pp. 342—357.

Pym, A., 2011. What technology does to translating. *Translation & Interpreting,* 3 (1), pp. 1—9.

Pym, A., 2013.Translation skill-sets in a machine-translation age. *Meta,* 58 (3), pp. 487—503.

Pym, A., 2015.Translating as risk management. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 85, pp. 67—80.

Risku, H., 2002. Situatedness in Translation Ttudies. *Cognitive Systems Research,* 3, pp. 523—533.

Risku, H., 2014. Translation process research as interaction research: From mental to socio-cognitive processes. *MonTI. Special Iss.,* 1, pp. 331—353.

Robbins, P. and Aydede, M. (eds.), 2008. *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salvendy, G., 2012. *Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics*. 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Taravella, A. and Villeneuve, A.O., 2013. Acknowledging the needs of computer-assisted translation tools users: The human perspective in human-machine translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation,* 19, pp. 62—74.

Teixeira, C.S.C., 2014. *The Impact of Metadata on Translator Performance: How Translators Work with Translation Memories and Machine Translation*. PhD thesis. Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona.

Teixeira, C. and O'Brien, S., 2017. Investigating the cognitive ergonomic aspects of translation tools in a workplace setting. *Translation Spaces,* 6 (1), pp. 79—103.

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

The author

Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Professor of Translation Studies, Institute of Translation an Interpreting, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Winterthur, Switzerland.

E-mail: Ehre@zhaw.ch

To cite this article:

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. 2019, Ergonomics and the Translation Process, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 37—51. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-3.

ЭРГОНОМИКА И ПРОЦЕСС ПЕРЕВОДА

М. Эренсбергер-Доу[1]

[1] Цюрихский университет прикладных наук
CH-8401, Швейцария, Винтертур, ул. Театерштрассе, 15с

Поступила в редакцию 19.09.2018 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-3

Процесс перевода включает множество действующих лиц и факторов, таких как организация работы, процесс коммуникации, управление переводческими проектами, безопасность на рабочем месте и статус переводчика. Физические факторы окружающей среды (например, освещение, температура, качество воздуха, организация пространства), а также роль переводчика и перевода для экономики и общества в целом могут оказывать влияние на процесс перевода. Изучение процесса перевода с эргономической точки зрения может обеспечить надлежащую основу для понимания характера и степени влияния вышеупомянутых факторов на эффективность сложной двуязычной деятельности переводчика. Поскольку процесс перевода требует особой концентрации внимания, переводчики вынужденно тратят энергию и, в конечном счете, когнитивные ресурсы на компенсацию отвлекающих моментов любого рода, начиная с ощущения физического дискомфорта и заканчивая недостаточной производительностью компьютера или проблемами организационного характера. В статье описываются результаты недавних исследований значения эргономики для процесса перевода и для переводчика.

Ключевые слова: *процесс перевода, эргономика, профессиональные переводчики, рабочее место переводчика.*

Список литературы

Baethge A., Rigotti T. Arbeitsunterbrechungen und Multitasking: Ein umfassender Überblick zu Theorien und Empirie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Altersdifferenzen. Dortmund : Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin, 2010.

Beale R., Peter C. (eds.). Affect and Emotion in HCI. Berlin : Springer, 2008.

Bevan N. Psychological and ergonomic factors in machine translation // Practical Experience of Machine Translation / ed. by V. Lawson. Amsterdam : North-Holland Publishing, 1982. P. 75—78.

Cadwell P., Castilho S., O'Brien S., Mitchell L. Human factors in machine translation and post-editing among institutional translators // Translation Spaces. 2016. Vol. 5 (2). P. 222—243.

Canfora C., Ottmann A. Risikomanagement für Übersetzungen // Trans-kom. 2015. Vol. 8 (2). P. 314—346.

CCOHS. Office Ergonomics Safety Guide. 6th ed. Hamilton, ON : CCOHS, 2011.

Chesterman A. The name and nature of translator studies // Hermes — Journal of Language and Communication Studies. 2009. Vol. 42. P. 13—22.

Chesterman A. Models of what processes? // Translation and Interpreting Studies. 2013. Vol. 8 (2). P. 155—168.

Clark A., Chalmers D. J. The extended mind. Reprinted in The Extended Mind / ed. by R. Menary. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 2010. P. 27—41.

Ehrensberger-Dow M., Hunziker Heeb A., Massey G., Meidert U., Neumann S., Becker H. An international survey of the ergonomics of professional translation // ILCEA. 2016. Vol. 27. URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/4004 (дата обращения: 22.09.2018).

Ehrensberger-Dow M., Jääskeläinen R. Ergonomics of translation: methodological, practical and educational implications // Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies / ed. by H. V. Dam, M. N. Brøgger, K. K. Zethsen. L. : Routledge, 2019 (в печати).

Ehrensberger-Dow M., Massey G. Cognitive ergonomic issues in professional translation // The Development of Translation Competence: Theories and Methodologies from Psycholinguistics and Cognitive Science / ed. by J. W. Schwieter, A. Ferreira. Newcastle upon Tyne : Cambridge Scholars, 2014. P. 58—86.

Ehrensberger-Dow M., Massey G. Socio-technical issues in professional translation practice // Translation Spaces. 2017. Vol. 6 (1). P. 104—121.

Ehrensberger-Dow M., O'Brien S. Ergonomics of the translation workplace: Potential for cognitive friction // Translation Spaces. 2015. Vol. 4 (1). P. 98—118.

ELIA 2018. Language Industry Survey — Expectations and Concerns of the European Language Industry 2018. Brussels : European Language Industry Association. URL: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/2017_language_industry_survey_report_en.pdf (дата обращения: 22.09.2018).

Englund Dimitrova B., Ehrensberger-Dow M. Cognitive space: Exploring the situational interface // Translation Spaces. 2016. Vol. 5 (1). P. 1—19.

Gile D. Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2009.

Grass T. "Plus" est-il synonyme de "mieux"? Logiciels commerciaux contre logiciels libres du point de vue de l'ergonomie // ILCEA. 2011. Vol. 14 : Traduction et Ergonomie. URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1052 (дата обращения: 10.10.2018).

Hansen G. Erfolgreich übersetzen. Entdecken und Beheben von Störquellen. Tübingen : Narr Francke Attempto, 2006.

Ijmker S., Huysmans M. A., Blatter B. M. et al. Should office workers spend fewer hours at their computer? A systematic review of the literature // Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 2007. Vol. 64. P. 211—222.

Jastrzebowski W. An outline of ergonomics, or the science of work based upon the truths drawn from the science of nature // International Encyclopedia of Ergonomics and Human Factors. 2nd ed. / ed. by W. Karwowski. Boca Raton, FL : CRC Press, 2006. Vol. 3. P. 129—141.

Kinnunen T., Koskinen K. (eds.). Translators' Agency. Tampere : Tampere University Press, 2010.

Lavault-Olléon E. L'ergonomie, nouveau paradigme pour la traductologie // ILCEA. 2011a. Vol. 14 : Traduction et Ergonomie. URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1078?lang=en.html (дата обращения: 15.10.2018).

Lavault-Olléon E. Une introduction à la problématique "Traduction et Ergonomie" // ILCEA. 2011b. Vol. 14 : Traduction et Ergonomie. URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/1118 (дата обращения: 15.10.2018).

Licht D. M., Polzella D. J., Boff K. Human Factors, Ergonomics, and Human Factors Engineering: An Analysis of Definitions. CSERIAC-89-01. Dayton, OH : CSERIAC, 1989.

Meidert U., Neumann S., Ehrensberger-Dow M., Becker H. Physical ergonomics at translators' workplaces: Findings from ergonomic workplace assessments and interviews // ILCEA. 2016. Vol. 27. URL: https://journals.openedition.org/ilcea/3996 (дата обращения: 20.10.2018).

Menary R. The extended mind // Encyclopedia of the Mind / ed. by H. Pashler. Thousand Oaks : SAGE, 2013. P. 335—338.

Mesa-Lao B. Gaze behaviour on source texts: An exploratory study comparing translation and post-editing // Post-Editing of Machine Translation: Processes and Applications / ed. by S. O'Brien, L. Winther Balling, M. Carl et al. Newcastle upon Tyne : Cambridge Scholars, 2014. P. 219—245.

Muñoz Martín R. Typos and co. // Behind the Mind. Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research / ed. by S. Göpferich, A. L. Jakobsen, I. M. Mees. Copenhagen : Samfundslitteratur Press, 2009. P. 167—189.

Muñoz Martín R. On paradigms and cognitive translatology // Translation and Cognition / ed. by G. M. Shreve, E. Angelone. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2010. P. 169—187.

Muñoz Martín R. Just a matter of scope. Mental load in translation process research // Translation Spaces. 2012. Vol. 1. P. 169—178.

Muñoz Martín R. (ed.). Reembedding Translation Process Research. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2016a.

Muñoz Martín R. Processes of what models? On the cognitive indivisibility of translation acts and events // Translation Spaces. 2016b. Vol. 5 (1). P. 145—161.

Norros L., Savioja P. Towards a theory and method for usability evaluation of complex human-technology systems // Activités. 2007. Vol. 4 (2). P. 143—150.

O'Brien S. Translation as human-computer interaction // Translation Spaces. 2012. Vol. 1. P. 101—122.

O'Brien S., Ehrensberger-Dow M., Hasler M., Connolly M. Irritating CAT tool features that matter to translators // Hermes — Journal of Language and Communication in Business. 2017. Vol. 56. P. 145—162.

O'Brien S., O'Hagan M., Flanagan M. Keeping an eye on the UI design of translation memory: How do translators use the "concordance" feature? // Proceedings of the 28th European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics / ed. by W. P. Brinckman, M. Neerincx. Delft : Delft University of Technology, 2010. P. 187—190.

Olohan M. Translators and translation technology: The dance of agency // Translation Studies. 2011. Vol. 4 (3). P. 342—357.

Pym A. What technology does to translating // Translation & Interpreting. 2011. Vol. 3 (1). P. 1—9.

Pym A. Translation skill-sets in a machine-translation age // Meta. 2013. Vol. 58 (3). P. 487—503.

Pym A. Translating as risk management // Journal of Pragmatics. 2015. Vol. 85. P. 67—80.

Risku H. Situatedness in Translation Ttudies // Cognitive Systems Research. 2002. Vol. 3. P. 523—533.

Risku H. Translation process research as interaction research: From mental to socio-cognitive processes // MonTI. 2014. Special Iss. 1. P. 331—353.

Robbins P., Aydede M. (eds). The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Salvendy G. Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics. 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley, 2012.

Taravella A., Villeneuve A. O. Acknowledging the needs of computer-assisted translation tools users: The human perspective in human-machine translation // The Journal of Specialised Translation. 2013. Vol. 19. P. 62—74.

Teixeira C. S. C. The Impact of Metadata on Translator Performance: How Translators Work with Translation Memories and Machine Translation : PhD thesis. Tarragona Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 2014.

Teixeira C., O'Brien S. Investigating the cognitive ergonomic aspects of translation tools in a workplace setting // Translation Spaces. 2017. Vol. 6 (1). P. 79—103.

Vink P., Kantola J. Advances in Occupational, Social, and Organizational Ergonomics. Boca Raton, FL : CRC Press, 2011.

Об авторе

Морин Эренсбергер-Доу, профессор, Цюрихский университет прикладных наук, Винтертур, Швейцария.

E-mail: Ehre@zhaw.ch

Для цитирования:

Ehrensberger-Dow M. Ergonomics and the Translation Process // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 37—51. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-3.

AUDIOVISUAL TRANSLATION AND RECEPTION

Y. Gambier[1, 2]

[1] University of Turku
University of Turku, Turku, 00014, Finland
[2] Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University
14 Nevskogo Str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia
Submitted on September 15, 2018
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-4

Reception of translated texts has thus far received relatively scant, uneven attention in Translation Studies, even though reception studies theories have been applied in the last decades, first to literary translation and then touching upon other areas and text types. This chapter reports on audiovisual translation in particular, exploring the very concepts of audience and reception. Adjacent concepts are also discussed, all having a bearing on the approach and the methodology, and all chosen for the investigation of reception. Last but not least, the article discusses the opportunities and challenges of interdisciplinarity which has brought, is bringing, and may continue to bring advances to the study of the reception of audiovisual texts in translation.

Keywords: *viewer, reception, audiovisual complexity, accessibility, audience.*

Reception has become recently a kind of buzzword in Translation Studies (TS). But the word remains ambiguous. Very early in TS, translation and interpreting was defined as a social activity and socially embedded action, breaking away from a linear conceptualisation of communication — seen as the formal transfer of information from a sender to a recipient, and taking into account cultural elements. However, the failure to incorporate the reader as the re-interpreter of the translators' work has hampered the study of reader response in TS for a long time. It has also risked placing the translator as the ultimate controller of textual meaning, at least for the target culture audience, and reinforced the transmissionist model by assuming that the translator's interpretation reaches the reader intact.

Nevertheless, the reception of translated texts has been dealt with in TS from different perspectives, with different conceptual tools and different research methods (Gambier 2018). In section 1, we define the basic concepts of AV texts, the ambiguities of perception and reception, and the concept of audience and viewer before proposing a three-type model of reception. In section 2, we examine adjacent concepts that may shed light on reception in AVT and considers how new, challenging avenues could boost reception studies in AVT.

1. Reception and AVT

This section aims at framing AVT: some basic concepts are recalled, namely the complexity of AVT, the types of viewers, the kinds of settings, formats and genres, and accessibility. Finally, a more precise definition of reception is proposed in relation to AVT.

1.1. Basic concepts

AV implies quite a number of signifying codes that operate simultaneously in the production of meaning. The viewers, and the translators, comprehend the series of codified signs, articulated in a certain way by the director (framing and shooting) and the editor (cutting). The way in which all these signs are organised is such that the meaning of the film, documentary or series is more than the simple addition of the meanings of each element or each semiotic code.

There are strong methodological problems regarding how to tackle the multiplicity of signs — the multimodal approach (Taylor 2003) being one possible solution.

So, how does one define what is audiovisual? There are at least two main lines: verbal — non-verbal and audio-visual. The importance and number of certain signs are always relative: the importance of sound can outweigh visual semiotic forms in certain sequences; the film code can outweigh language signs in other sequences. Film genres and types of AVT can be classified according to this flexible scheme (Chaume 2004). The table below sums up the 14 different semiotic codes, which are active to different degrees in the production of meaning. We could also add "objects" to these 14 types of signs, since brands increasingly interfere as sponsors in production and are problems in audio-description.

Elements	Audio channel	Visual channel
Verbal elements (signs)	— *linguistic code* (dialogue, monologue, comments / voices off, reading) — *paralinguistic code* (delivery, intonation, accents) — *literary and theatre codes* (plot, narrative, sequences, drama progression, rhythm)	— *graphic code* (written forms: letters, headlines, menus, street names, intertitles, subtitles)
Non-verbal elements (signs)	— special sound effects/*sound arrangement code* — *musical code* — *paralinguistic code* (voice quality, pauses, silence, volume of voice, vocal noise: crying, shouting, coughing, etc.)	— *iconographic code* — *photographic code* (lighting, perspective, colours, etc.) — *scenographic code* (visualenvironmentsigns) — *film code* (shooting, framing, cutting/editing, genre conventions, etc.) — *kinesic code* (gestures, manners, postures, facial features, gazes, etc.) — *proxemic code* (movements, use of space, interpersonal distance, etc.) — *dress code* (including hairstyle, make up, etc.)

Another issue to be considered is the type of viewers. Let us look at the deaf and hard of hearing (HH) who may have access to audiovisual content by means of intralingual subtitling (or closed caption). There are different types of hearing impairment and it is difficult to obtain reliable statistics on which to base a clear representation of the group as a whole. The numbers change depending on the definitions used, as well as the nature of each medical survey and health system. What is important is the fact that the deaf are not a uniform, homogeneous group. The extent, type and the age of onset of deafness vary widely among individuals. This means that different groups of deaf consumers have very different language and communication needs, which must be understood and taken into consideration. We can differentiate between deafness in one ear and in both ears, temporary deafness, profound deafness and partial deafness, deafness by birth, by accident, because of medicines (hearing loss due to prescribed drugs) or certain diseases, because of a degenerating process and age. As people continue to live longer, the problem is here to stay. All these explain why the deaf and hard of hearing do not have the same command of language or the same development of speech. Some become deaf after they have acquired an understanding of spoken language and they retain some speech ability; some have learnt how to read well before they became deaf or hard of hearing; some have poor reading skills but a good command of a sign language. In other words, some can do lip reading, others finger reading, sign reading, reading a moving text (that is, captioning), or a static text (print). We could add to the deaf people those who have tinnitus (ringing or buzzing in the ears), which creates hearing problems. What do the deaf and HH want when they watch TV, a video, or go to the cinema? It has been found that some of the deaf and hard of hearing could not tolerate complex background noise such as applause; some stated that signing distracted them from reading subtitles; others said that breakdowns and freezes in the subtitles were too frequent. For all, however, having access to subtitles today was thought to be a considerable improvement on not having access to any subtitles in the past. Technology (DVD, teletext, DVB and the Internet) allows for changes and a better service adapted to specific audiences. But how do providers of such services make decisions relating to intralingual subtitling when there are different subgroups of the hearing impaired, with specific needs and expectations? Sometimes intralingual subtitles are a straightforward reproduction of what is said as if the hearing impaired can be assumed to read faster than "ordinary" viewers. The sight-impaired faces similar challenges.

Audio-description is a kind of double dubbing in interlingual transfer for the blind and visually impaired: it involves the reading of information describing what is shown on the screen (action, body language, facial expressions, costumes, etc.), which is added to the soundtrack of the dubbing of the dialogue, with no interference from sound and music effects. Who can benefit from audio description? The term 'blind' is widely used to imply a total loss of vision, but the blind can have some sight, depending upon the nature of the disability which gave rise to their visual impairment. This can range from loss of central vision due to muscular degeneration, to tunnel vision due to glaucoma, retinal detachment, diabetes, etc. The blind and visually impaired need different levels of detail and content in audio descriptions. Most forms of visual disability occur through a progressive degeneration of sight; in this case, the blind have a visual memory. People born blind have no such visual memory to draw upon; hence, they have little or no interest in the colour of someone's hair, description of their clothing, etc. Elderly people can find that audio-description helps them to better understand the plot. There is, therefore, a variety of backgrounds among blind audiences: some will remember TV and films and may be familiar with cinema terminology; others will have no experience of the audiovisual media, the describer for them being a storyteller; many will not understand terms like close-up, mid-shot, long shot, back angle, etc. Some surveys reveal that some genres such as drama, movies, wildlife programmes and documentaries benefit more from the provision of audio-description than news and game shows, which have sufficient spoken content to allow the blind and visually impaired to follow what is happening without assistance. Just as with sighted audiences and the deaf and hard of hearing, the needs and wishes of the visually impaired are not homogeneous. Again, technology can offer a better and more versatile range of services.

Having described these two groups (the hearing and sight impaired), it is easy to realise that different variables related to viewers are to be taken into consideration if and when reception is to be studied: age, sex, education background, reading skill, reading habits, reading rate, oral and reading comprehension in one's mother tongue, frequency and volume of AVT consumption, AVT habits (opinion and preference), command of foreign languages, degree of hearing loss, age of onset of hearing loss, type of language of daily use, etc. This list does not include the multiple types of viewers: children, teenagers, students, middle-aged people, elderly people (all classified according to age), young educated adults, intellectuals, managers and professionals, employees and workers with different levels of qualifications, the middle classes (according to socio-economic parameters),monolingual or multilingual viewers, migrants (according to language proficiency), etc. Also to be added here are fans who, in an unsolicited way, subtitle films and TV series that they want to watch as soon as possible after they are released: fansubbers or user-centred participants are blurring the lines between consumers, users and fans, becoming "prosumers", in other words, both using and creating the content online and therefore shaping "expectancy norms" (Chesterman 1993) at the same time as they produce their own translation (Jiménez-Crespo 2017).

After the complexity of AVT and the categories of viewers, two further elements are worth mentioning. The third is the different kinds of settings and AV formats that AVT can be used in: cinemas for feature-length and short films, television channels (including specialised, thematic, local and regional, and international channels), outdoor screens, DVDs, the Internet (websites, YouTube, etc.), mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets, theatres, museums, etc. Video-streaming, video on demand, podcasting and portable players (mobile phones, iPods, etc.) are creating new demands and new needs, such as new formats, an example being very short films lasting only a few minutes (we already have mobisodes or series for mobile phones lasting one or two minutes). These new formats could place more emphasis on the role of close-ups and soundtrack, thus granting more importance to dubbing. The fourth element is the variation of AV genres (news, interviews, fiction, documentaries, docudramas, TV series, sitcoms, animation, cartoons, children's programmes, drama performances, operas, musicals, advertising, commercial videos, trailers, video clips, computer games, web pages, etc.). When variables such as age, education and types of AV formats and genres are crossed, one generates complex grids: cinema-goers are usually young, educated and computer literate, while TV viewers can be children as well as elderly people.

The final concept to refer to is accessibility. For a number of years, accessibility has been a legal and technical issue in various countries and for the European Union, with a view to ensuring that disabled persons can enjoy physical access to transport, facilities, and cultural venues. Recently, accessibility has also become an important issue in the computer and telecommunications industries and in information technology, the aim being to optimise the user-friendliness of software, websites and other applications (see section 2). The distribution of AV media is also involved in this trend since it is important to cater for the needs of user groups such as the deaf, older people with sight problems, etc. (Di Giovanni 2011). The implications of accessibility coincide to a certain extent with those of localisation: in both cases, the objective is to offer equivalent information to different audiences. Advances in language technology mean that audio-books, set-top boxes, DVDs, tactile communication, sign language interpreting and other systems are now complemented by more recent introductions such as voice recognition, and oral subtitles (subtitles read by text-to-speech software). This social dimension of AVT services demands a better knowledge of viewers' needs, reading habits, and reception capacity. Much work remains to be done in this area in order to ensure that technological progress can best satisfy users' demands and expectations. Accessibility is a key word in AVT, not only as a legal and technical issue but also as a concept that shakes up the dominant way of assessing the quality of a translation (see section 2.1). It may cover a variety of features, including:

• acceptability, related to language norms, stylistic choices, rhetorical patterns and terminology;

• legibility, defined (for subtitling) in terms of font, position of the subtitles and subtitle rate;

• readability, also defined for subtitling in terms of reading rates, reading habits, text complexity, semantic load, shot changes and speech rates, etc.;

• synchronicity, defined (for dubbing, voice-over and free commentary) as the appropriateness of the speech to lip movements, of the utterance in relation to the non-verbal elements, of what is said to what is shown (pictures), etc.;

• relevance, in terms of what information is to be conveyed, deleted, added or clarified in order not to increase the cognitive effort involved in listening or reading.

1.2. Reception: the 3 Rs

Before clarifying the concept of reception, a few words have to be written on the pair of terms 'audience' / and 'viewers'. The 'audience' is a collective entity, out there; it can be local, national, or transnational. It is identifiable and elusive, imaginable and unpredictable (Brooker and Jermyn 2003). Cinema right from the beginning in 1895 was considered to be a collective public event: that is, it has its own characteristics as a show in front of an audience. Before the brothers Lumière created cinema, there were already technical devices able to show animated images but only for one or two persons. The concept of 'audience' includes different types of viewers: citizens, consumers, fans, users, retired people, children, gays, females, etc., all with different viewing practices. There are different models of audience influenced by social classes, ethnicity, national culture, age, gender, and/or linked to global formats or local content. Audience research (first in TV studies) focused on the influence or effects of certain features, for example, the impact of violence on young audiences, the material conditions of reception, etc. It also studied and still does, audience ratings, box office figures, statistics of distribution flows, considering the audience as a kind of market as if the audience was only consuming and being influenced by TV's outputs in a social environment. The interest here has typically been motivated by the need to support programme planners and to attract advertisers. Today, audience studies have enlarged their scope, and include, for instance, audience interest and attitude towards TV series across different cultures.

Viewers (or spectators) are embodied individuals, or a group of individuals, with their subjectivities and personal identities, impacted by the aural, visual and emotional elements of a film or TV programme. Studies can be carried out on their satisfaction (in relation to the quality of translation) and their evaluation (in relation to their comfort). From this perspective, cinema is more an individualised experience, taking place in various temporal, geographical, social and technical settings. Today, the boundaries between public and private, local and global, digital and real worlds are becoming increasingly blurred. The data collected from viewers raise the issue of their representativeness: How do we go from viewers' beliefs and comprehension to those of the audience's attitudes? Further, it is difficult to assign a single cause to viewers' behaviour and audience reaction since many factors can have an influence in contextualised studies.

What about the pair of terms 'perception' and 'reception'? Perception could be defined as what is impressed on the eyes when watching a film and the way in which viewers represent the viewing act: how they think they watch a film, how they believe they apprehend the viewing process. Perception is made of opinions and impressions and varies over time. Studying reception means to investigate the way(s) in which AV products / performances are processed, consumed, absorbed, accepted, appreciated, interpreted, understood and remembered by the viewers, under specific contextual / socio-cultural conditions and with their memories of their experience as cinemagoing (see, for instance, De Linde and Key 1999; Caffrey 2009; Künzli and Ehrensberger-Dow 2011; Lavaur and Bairnstow 2011; Tuominen 2012; Romero 2015; Perego 2016; O'Hagan and Sasamoto 2016; Miquel Iriarte 2017, etc.). In other words, reception studies in AVT seek to describe and explain what viewers do with the AV products that they are watching or that they have watched, and also the role that AVT plays in the circulation of foreign-language films or how the presence of AVT influences choices about film viewing and cinema attendance. Do translations direct reception and how? But how should one understand and measure reception with such a broad variety of recipients?

Reception must be clarified because there are differences, for instance, between the impact of a translation upon reception and the effects (i. e. the response of the viewers) of the translation. Three types of reception (3 Rs) can be differentiated (Kovačič 1995; Chesterman 1998, 219—222; Chesterman 2007, 179—180; Gambier 2009):

— Response or the perceptual decoding (legibility of conventional and creative or aesthetic subtitling (Fox 2016). So far, the "response" has been mostly investigated by experimental psychologists, who have given answers to questions such as: How is attention distributed between images and subtitles? Do we read subtitles word-for-word? Can viewers avoid reading subtitles? When do they start re-reading the subtitles?

— Reaction or the psycho-cognitive issue (readability): What shared knowledge must be assumed by all the partners to allow efficient communication? What is the inference process when watching a subtitled programme? To what extent is there comprehension of the translation, for example, the condensed information in subtitles? The answers to these questions have consequences for translation strategies. The greater the viewers' processing effort, the lower the relevance of the translation;

– Repercussion, understood both as an attitudinal issue (what are the viewers' preferences and habits regarding the mode of AVT?), and the sociocultural dimension of the non-TV context which influences the receiving process (what are the values, the ideology transmitted in the AV programmes?).

1.3. Empirical research in AVT reception

What kind of research and methodology can be used for response and reaction (Tuominen, 2018)? Different variables (Chesterman 1998, 204—208) must be taken into account:

– sociological variables (population to be tested): age, gender, level of education, reading aptitudes, command of foreign languages and hearing / sight difficulties (see section 2.1);

– AV variables (corpus): broadcasting time, types of TV channels (public / commercial), film genre and interplay of images / dialogue.

These variables could be correlated with a range of features, such as:

– the space-time characteristics of subtitles: lead times (in/out time) or presentation speed, exposure time, subtitle rate, lag or delay between speech and subtitles, number of shot changes, position (left / centre justification), length, type and size of font;

– textual parameters (semantic coherence, syntactic complexity, text segmentation, lexical density and lexical frequency);

– para-textual features (such as punctuation).

The focus of research could be on the viewers: What are the cognitive processes activated at the moment of watching an AV product? Surveys using questionnaires, interviews, group discussions or keystrokes can be used to elicit viewers' feedback and assessments related to opinions or perceptions of subtitled programmes. An experimental method can also be used to better control the medium's variables (by manipulating the subtitles), in order to obtain data on the effects of particular subtitling features on reading speed, time lag, attention distribution, etc. For instance, what are children's reactions to reading pace? Is the complexity of a subtitle in relation to programme type? What are the consequences of speed watching (the viewer can watch more series in less time)? A third approach is possible: controlled experimental procedures — to control both the medium and the form of the viewers' response. Such procedures are designed to record actual motor behaviour and then analyse optical pauses, pace of reading, line-breaks, presentation time, re-reading, degrees and types of attention (active / passive, global / selective, linear / partial), depending on whether the focus is on the image (iconic attention), on the plot (narrative attention) or on the dialogue (verbal attention). Here, pupillometry (pupil dilatation), eye tracking, Ikonikat, and bio-logging (heartbeats) are useful (Kruger and Doherty 2018).

The focus of research might be on the translator (subtitler) as a key viewer. There are at least three possibilities:

1. Observation (in situ): What is the behaviour of the translator while producing (performing) subtitles (the somatic dimension of the work since rhythm is a key element in subtitling: rhythm of the action, rhythm of the dialogues and rhythm of the reading). The risks are the researcher's own subjective judgment, the difficulty scale and measuring what is observed.

2. Interviewing and/or questionnaires, to investigate personal attitudes (to obtain data about translation decisions, the personal representation of the targeted audiences, etc.).

3. Think aloud protocol (TAP) and/or eye tracking (combined or not).

If the focus of the research is on the output, the following can be used:

– corpus design: still rare in AVT because of the problem of compilation (need for high memory capacity), the problem of representativeness, the problem of copyright, and the problem of transcription: a tool such a Multimodality Concordance Analysis (MCA) has so far been more useful for video clips and still images (ads) than for feature-length films;

– content analysis: for example, the study of different translations into the same language, different translations of the same film into different languages or for different media (TV, DVD); analysis of certain emotions (anger, fear, disgust, sadness, etc.), culture-specific items, linguistic variation, humour, etc.; and possible regularities in the dialogues: if there are predictable elements, their translation could be automatized.

To sum up, quantitative and qualitative approaches or a multimethod approach can be used, with a combination of sources, data and possible triangulation.

2. Reception and challenging avenues

Two main issues will be dealt with in this section. In a model of communication in which there is a constant, direct or indirect interplay between senders and addresses, some adjacent concepts should not be forgotten. In this perspective, reception studies can open up to new disciplines.

2.1. Reception and adjacent concepts

Three connected concepts can shed light on reception in relation to audiovisual translation research.

Language policy: for sociolinguists, language policy has been relevant in understanding language change, language rights, language minorities and language processes such as creolisation and language standardisation. In the past, 'policy'has been understood in the narrow sense of language status and corpus planning, in relation to state authorities managing language education, linguistic laws, terminology, spelling reforms, etc., as if native speakers and language users have nothing to say about this. Today, besides language management, language policy would include language practices, language beliefs and (overt or covert) translation policy. This means that to cope with a multilingual setting, different strategies are possible, beyond translation and interpreting: we can learn foreign languages, use active or passive bilingualism, switch or mix languages, resort to a lingua franca, etc. In any case, the solution is not top-down but a negotiation between participants (Who decides what? Who calls for interpreters? Who pays?). Language and translation policy are not reduced to official public domains. They also structure international meetings, media, publishing houses, business firms and cultural events. Thus, managers, organisers and planners need to know both sides of the communication — headquarters and subsidiaries, vendors and consumers, local workers and expatriates, artists and spectators, etc. Languages are not only discrete tools but also, and primarily, allow social activities in which different stakeholders are involved with their needs, interests and expectations.

Censorship and self-censorship also play a role in the reception of any translated event, especially if censorship is not limited to the suppression or prohibition of speech or writing by a political or religious institution, on behalf of sexual morality, political orthodoxy, racist considerations, etc. Censorship can depend on ideological, cultural and economic circumstances (Gambier 2002) when explicit criteria or implicit norms impose what is acceptable or unacceptable to read, watch, or translate. More often than not, translators, according to their options or different types of pressure from the publisher or the film distributor, exercise an indeterminate series of self-censorship(s) (or betrayals?) in order to safeguard their status or their socio-personal environment. In an era of globalised fake news, and viral rumours, self-censorship is not set to disappear, along with the lines of an individual ethics and attitude towards religion, sexuality, (in)decency, (im)politeness, truth, family, disability, drugs, etc. Self-censorship can include forms of elimination of insults / blasphemies / and taboo words, distortion, down-grading, paraphrasing, misadjustment, biased translation and omission of swear words or sex-related terms. The manipulation may result from preventive or repressive censorship or self-censorship (in the media or on the Internet) at the hands of a censor, translator, editor or reviser. Translation and (self-)censorship have been the topic of several conferences and publications in the last twenty years. Again, what is worth mentioning here, in relation to reception, is that self-censorship can apply to verbal or non-verbal elements (tobacco and drinks omitted in certain films) and require decisions regarding the interaction between senders and viewers.

The third concept is the quality of a translation. If the focus is not exclusively on the authors' intentions and the text, but also encompasses the reader, the quality of the output can no longer be defined only by a comparison of the target text with the source text. The same applies to the multi-functional and multimodal nature of AV texts in the complexities that derive from context and reception (see section 1.1). Translation quality assessment in TS has been considered through many different lenses: with error analysis, in a retrospective (comparing with the ST) or prospective way (measuring the effect), by lateral assessment(comparing with non-translated parallel texts or against expectancy norms), or according to international standards, such as ISO 17100 (2015), which sets up a quality control system for the process which involves different participants: the client, the language service provider, the translator, the reviser, etc. In that respect, quality is neither based solely on textual features nor on the translator alone. It is the result of a network of committed stakeholders (Abdallah, 2012).

In AVT, that means the quality of subtitles (for instance) is linked, among other criteria, to the working conditions, the purpose of the work and the targeted viewers, with their reading habits and expectations. In their real or virtual network, commissioners (be they private local or multinational AVT companies, public TV broadcasting companies, non-governmental organisations, associations, private firms or festival events), distributors, free-lance or in-house translators, and viewers are in an asymmetrical relationship, with different competences, objectives, resources and interests, where trust is at stake, involving delays, costs, and codes of good practices.

2.2. Opening up

AVTS is a dynamic and prolific field moving from a bipolar one (subtitling and dubbing) to a multi-practice one (including AVT modalities such as audio-description and subtitling for the Deaf). The challenge today for

AVT is not so much its status in the academic and professional worlds (admittedly still to be improved in certain societies) as much as its competition with new fields dealing with multimodal and interactive texts.

One of the most recent research directions is usability or user-centred translation (UCT). UCT offers practical tools and methods to empower translators to act for their readers or active users of translated instructions and other types of documents (Suojanen et al. 2015). In a way, a convergence between UCT and translation as a user-localised activity or user-generated translation by non-professional translators or interpreters could be drawn: in both cases, the conventional strategies of replacement and substitution leave space for more innovation. Recipient-oriented rewriting influences such different mediated discourses as localising software, websites, video games, the popularisation of specialised texts in the sciences, medicine and trans-editing news (or adapting format and content of the foreign news to the expectations of the new readership), etc. AVT here can teach and learn from localisation and collaborative translation: both types work on volatile and intermediate texts (production scripts, dialogue lists, online documents in progress, software under construction and texts regularly updated), exceeding the traditional dichotomy between source text and target text, and requiring the questioning of the concept of an original. Furthermore, the quality criteria are not only of acceptability: comprehensibility, accessibility and usability are also to be taken into account. Such a convergence may eventually change both the name and the position of AVT.

Another direction is Internet studies and web science. Their research agenda is large because cyberspace can be described according to data structures, visual surface, algorithmic processes, site of human-computer interaction, cultural uses, e-commerce, means and venue for artistic expression and e-learning and other forms of the social dimension of Web-applications. These different fields of inquiry go beyond the confines of academic disciplines (sociology, psychology, economics, linguistics, semiotics, etc.) and demand interdisciplinary thinking and practice, including collaboration networks of various scholars. Again, AVT experience can bring in original inputs: about the complex interplay of signs which produces meaning (see section 1.1) and the role of the recipients in decision-making when you translate / subtitle. The same goes for localisation: What is, for instance, the impact of the non-verbal signs of a website (font size, colours, etc.)? Who are the addressees / end-users and to what extent do they determine the home pages, in particular when using English as a lingua franca for an international audience? Does knowledge of the user profiles (thanks to data accumulated on their usages) improve the usability of the website?

3. Concluding remarks

There is a risk in a too strong recipient-oriented practice: the product or performance may become so domesticated that the output is similar to the one viewers are already familiar with. If the needs, expectations and preferences of the targeted viewers shape the adaptation of the source text (including images, which can be technically manipulated as well) into complete domestication, going as far as censoring dialogues, changing parts of the plot to conform to target-culture ideological drives and aesthetic norms, what is then the function of the translation, and the role of the translator? If to translate is to reproduce, imitate fully the target norms and conventions and become a tool of the protectionist use of culture, erasing traces of the foreign voice, why translate at all?

Remaking is an intriguing case in this perspective: if a film is completely recontextualised according to the values, ideology and narrative conventions of the new target culture, do we have a translation or a local production which has sucked the lifeblood from a foreign production? From *La Cage aux Folles* to *The Birdcage*, from *Trois Hommes et un Couffin* to *Three Men and a Baby*, from *Les Fugitifs* to *Three Fugitives*, from *Bienvenue chez les Ch'tis* to *Benvenuti al Sud*, are we facing a translation process or a new production derived from another one as creation has always been: a hybrid process with different influences and filiations? Does translation promote conformism or open us up to differences? With the democratisation of knowledge and practice via the Internet intertwined with existing social demands, the question is not neutral. It is a socio-ethical challenge.

References

Abdallah, K., 2012. *Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on Agency, Quality and Ethics*. PhD thesis. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

Bourdieu, P., 1971. Le marché des biens symboliques. *Année Sociologique,* 22, pp. 49—126.

Bourdieu, P., 1979. *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement.* Paris : Éd. De Minuit.

Brooker, W. and Jermyn, D. (eds.), 2003. *The Audience Studies Reader*. London, New York: Routledge.

Caffrey, C., 2009. *Relevant abuse? Investigating the effects of an abusive subtitling procedure on the perception of TV anime using eye tracker and questionnaire*. PhD thesis. Dublin City University.

Chaume, F., 2004. Film Studies and Translation Studies: Two disciplines at Stake in Audiovisual Translation. *Meta,* 49 (1), pp. 12—24.

Chesterman, A., 1998. Causes, translations, effects. *Target,* 10 (2), pp. 201—230.

Chesterman, A., 1993. From 'is' to 'ought': Laws, norms and strategies in Translation Studies. *Target,* 5 (1), pp. 1—20.

Chesterman, A., 2007. Bridge concepts in translation sociology. In: M. Wolf and A. Fukari (eds.). *Constructing a Sociology of Translation.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 171—183.

De Linde, Z. and Key, N., 1999. *The semiotics of subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Di Giovanni, E. (ed.), 2011. *Between text and receiver: Translation and accessibility. Entre texto y receptor: traducción y accessibilidad*. Bern: P. Lang.

Fox, W., 2016. Integrated titles: An improved viewing experience? In: S. Hansen-Schirra and S. Grucza (eds.). *Eye-tracking and Applied Linguistics*. Berlin: Language Science Press, pp. 5—30.

Gambier, Y., 2002. Les censures dans la traduction audiovisuelle. *TTR,* 15 (2), pp. 203—222.

Gambier, Y., 2009. Challenges in research on audiovisual translation. *Translation Research Project 2*, available at: http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_2_2009/chapters/gambier.pdf (accessed 15 September 2018).

Gambier, Y., 2018. Translation studies, audiovisual translation and reception. In: E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier (eds.). *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 12, pp. 43—66.

Jiménez-Crespo, M. A., 2017. *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kovačič, I., 1995. Reception of subtitles. The non-existent Ideal viewer. *Translatio (Nouvelles de la FIT/FIT Newsletter),* 14 (3—4), pp. 376—383.

Kruger, J.-L. and Doherty, S., 2018. Triangulation of online and offline measures of processing and reception in AVT. In: E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier (eds.). *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 12, pp. 91—110.

Künzli, A. and Ehrensberger-Dow, M., 2011. Innovative Subtitling: A Reception Study. In: C. Alvstad, A. Hild and E. Tiselius (eds.). *Methods and Strategy of Process Research*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 187—200.

Lavaur, J.-M. and Bairnstow, D., 2011. Languages on the screen: Is film comprehension related to viewers' fluency and to the language in the subtitles. *International Journal of Psychology,* 46 (6), pp. 455—462.

Miquel Iriarte, M., 2017. *The Reception of Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.* PhD thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

O'Hagan, M. R. S., 2016. Crazy Japanese subtitles? Shedding light on the impact of impact captions with a focus on research methodology. In: S. Hansen-Schirra and S. Grucza (eds.). *Eye-tracking and Applied Linguistics*. Berlin: Language Science Press, pp. 31—58.

Perego, E., 2016. History, Development, Challenges and Opportunities of Empirical Research in AVT. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 17 (2), pp. 155—162.

Romero-Fresco, P., 2015. *The Reception of Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in Europe.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Suojanen, T., Koskinen, K. and Tuominen, T. (eds.), 2015. *User-centered Translation*. London, New York: Routledge.

Taylor, C., 2003. Multimodal transcription in the analysis, translation and subtitling of Italian films. *The Translator,* 9 (2), pp. 191—205.

Tuominen, T., 2012. *The art of accidental reading and incidental listening: An empirical study on the viewing of subtitled films*. PhD thesis. University of Tampere.

Tuominen T. Multi-method research: Reception in context. In: E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier (eds.). *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 12, pp. 69—90.

Further reading

Assis Rosa, A., 2006. Defining Target Text Reader. Translation Studies and Literary Theory. In: J. Duarte, A. Assis Rosa and T. Seruya (eds.). *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 99—109.

Borodo, M., 2017. *Translation, Globalisation and Younger Audiences. The situation in Poland*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Chan, L., 2010. *Readers, Reading and Reception of Translated Fiction in Chinese*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Enríquez, A. and Mercedes, M., 2007. *Recepción y traducción. Síntesis y crítica de una relación interdisciplinaria.* Málaga: Universidad de Málaga.

Fish, S., 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hammerschmid, B. and Krapoth, H. (eds.), 1998. *Übersetzung als kultureller Prozess: Rezeption, Projektion und Konstruktion des Fremden*. Berlin: Schmidt.

Hickey, L., 2003. The Reader as Translation Assessor. *Studies in Translation,* 1 (1), pp. 59—92.

Iser, W., 1974. *The Implied Reader. Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore, London: John Hopkins UP (1st ed. 1972).

Iser, W., 1978. *The art of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response.* Baltimore: Johns Hopskins University Press.

Jauss, H.R., 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Transl. by T. Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kruger, H. and Kruger, J.L., 2017. Cognition and Reception. In: J.W. Schwieter and A. Ferreira (eds.). *The Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 72—89.

Machor, J. and Goldstein, P., 2001. *Reception Study. From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies.* London, New York: Routledge.

Nardocchio, E.F. (ed.), 1992. *Reader Response. The Empirical Dimension*. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Nightingale, V. (ed.), 2013. *The Handbook of Media Audiences.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rogers, T. and Soter, A.O. (eds.), n.d. *Reading across Cultures. Teaching Literature in a Diverse Society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ruokonen, M., 2011. Target's reader's expectations, and reality: Conformity or Conflict? In: K. Pekka et al. (eds.). *Beyond Borders. Translation moving Languages, Literatures and Cultures.* Berlin: Frank & Timme, pp. 73—100.

Santayo M., César, J. and Lanero Fernández, J.J. (eds.), 2007. *Estudios de traducción y recepción*. Universidad de Léon.

Scott, C., 2012. *Translating the Perception of Text. Literary Translation and Phenomenology*. Oxford: Legenda — Modern Humanities Research Association.

Staiger, J. (ed.), 2005. *Media Reception Studies*. New York: New York UP.

Takahashi, T., 2010. *Audience Studies: A Japanese Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge.

The author

Yves Gambier, Professor Emeritus of Translation (French) School of Languages and Translation Studies, University of Turku, Finland; Professor, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia.

E-mail: yves.gambier@utu.fi

To cite this article:

Gambier, Y. 2019, Audiovisual translation and reception, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 52—68. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-4.

РЕЦЕПЦИЯ В АУДИОВИЗУАЛЬНОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ

И. Гамбье[1, 2]

[1] Университет Турку
00014, Финляндия, Турку, Университет Турку
[2] Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236041, Россия, Калининград, ул. А. Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 15.09.2018 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-4

Рецепция переведенных текстов до сих пор не получала должного освещения в рамках науки о переводе, хотя в последние десятилетия теория рецепции применялась сначала к литературному переводу, а затем и к другим типам текстов. В статье *рассматривается процесс аудиовизуального перевода (АВП), анализируются понятия «аудитория» и «рецепция», а также смежные концепции, имеющие отношение к подходу и методологии исследования рецепции. Наконец, что не менее важно, поднимается вопрос о проблемах и возможностях междисциплинарного подхода, который способствовал, способствует, а в будущем может значительно содействовать изучению рецепции аудиовизуальных текстов.*

Ключевые слова: *зритель, рецепция, комплексность аудиовизуального перевода, доступность, аудитория.*

Список литературы

Abdallah K. Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on Agency, Quality and Ethics : PhD thesis. Joensuu : University of Eastern Finland, 2012.

Bourdieu P. Le marché des biens symboliques // Année Sociologique. 1971. Vol. 22. P. 49—126.

Bourdieu P. La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement. P. : Éd. de Minuit, 1979.

Brooker W., Jermyn D. (eds.). The Audience Studies Reader. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2003.

Caffrey C. Relevant abuse? Investigating the effects of an abusive subtitling procedure on the perception of TV anime using eye tracker and questionnaire: PhD thesis. Dublin City University, 2009.

Chaume F. Film Studies and Translation Studies: Two disciplines at Stake in Audiovisual Translation // Meta. 2004. Vol. 49 (1). P. 12—24.

Chesterman A. Causes, translations, effects // Target. 1998. Vol. 10 (2). P. 201—230.

Chesterman A. From 'is' to 'ought': Laws, norms and strategies in Translation Studies // Target. 1993. Vol. 5 (1). P. 1—20.

Chesterman A. Bridge concepts in translation sociology // Constructing a Sociology of Translation / ed. by M. Wolf, A. Fukari. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2007. P. 171—183.

De Linde Zoé, Key N. The semiotics of subtitling. Manchester : St Jerome, 1999.

Di Giovanni E. (ed.). Between text and receiver: Translation and accessibility. Entre texto y receptor: traducción y accessibilidad. Bern : P. Lang, 2011.

Fox W. Integrated titles: An improved viewing experience? // Eye-tracking and Applied Linguistics / ed. by S. Hansen-Schirra, S. Grucza. Berlin : Language Science Press, 2016. P. 5—30.

Gambier Y. Les censures dans la traduction audiovisuelle // TTR. 2002. Vol. 15 (2). P. 203—222.

Gambier Y. Challenges in research on audiovisual translation // Translation Research Project 2. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2009. URL: http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_2_2009/chapters/gambier.pdf (дата обращения: 15.09.2018).

Gambier Y. Translation studies, audiovisual translation and reception // Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation /ed. by E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2018. Vol. 12. P. 43—66.

Jiménez-Crespo M.A. Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2017.

Kovačič I. Reception of subtitles. The non-existent Ideal viewer // Translatio (Nouvelles de la FIT/FIT Newsletter). 1995. Vol. 14 (3—4). P. 376—383.

Kruger J.-L., Doherty S. Triangulation of online and offline measures of processing and reception in AVT // Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation / ed. by E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2018. Vol. 12. P. 91—110.

Künzli A., Ehrensberger-Dow M. Innovative Subtitling: A Reception Study // Methods and Strategy of Process Research / ed. by C. Alvstad, A. Hild, E. Tiselius. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2011. P. 187—200.

Lavaur J.-M., Bairnstow D. Languages on the screen: Is film comprehension related to viewers' fluency and to the language in the subtitles // International Journal of Psychology. 2011. Vol. 46 (6). P. 455—462.

Miquel Iriarte M. The Reception of Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing : PhD thesis. Barcelona : Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2017.

O'Hagan M., Sasamoto R. Crazy Japanese subtitles? Shedding light on the impact of impact captions with a focus on research methodology // Eye-tracking and Applied Linguistics / ed. by S. Hansen-Schirra, S. Grucza. Berlin : Language Science Press, 2016. P. 31—58.

Perego E. History, Development, Challenges and Opportunities of Empirical Research in AVT // Across Languages and Cultures. 2016. Vol. 17 (2). P. 155—162.

Romero-Fresco P. The Reception of Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in Europe. Bern : Peter Lang, 2015.

Suojanen T., Koskinen K., Tuominen T. (eds.). User-centered Translation. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2015.

Taylor Ch. Multimodal transcription in the analysis, translation and subtitling of Italian films // The Translator. 2003. Vol. 9 (2). P. 191—205.

Tuominen T. The art of accidental reading and incidental listening: An empirical study on the viewing of subtitled films : PhD thesis. University of Tampere, 2012.

Tuominen T. Multi-method research: Reception in context // Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation / ed. by E. Di Giovanni, Y. Gambier. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2018. Vol. 12. P. 69—90.

Для дальнейшего чтения

Assis Rosa A. Defining Target Text Reader. Translation Studies and Literary Theory // Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines / J. Duarte, A. Assis Rosa, T. Seruya (eds.). Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2006. P. 99—109.

Borodo M. Translation, Globalisation and Younger Audiences. The situation in Poland. Bern : Peter Lang, 2017.

Chan L. Readers, Reading and Reception of Translated Fiction in Chinese. Manchester : St Jerome, 2010.

Enríquez A., Mercedes M. Recepción y traducción. Síntesis y crítica de una relación interdisciplinaria. Málaga : Universidad de Málaga, 2007.

Fish S. Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1980.

Hammerschmid B., Krapoth H. (eds.). Übersetzung als kultureller Prozess: Rezeption, Projektion und Konstruktion des Fremden. Berlin : Schmidt, 1998.

Hickey L. The Reader as Translation Assessor // Studies in Translation. 2003. Vol. 1 (1). P. 59—92.

Iser W. The Implied Reader. Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett [1972]. Baltimore ; L. : Johns Hopkins UP, 1974.

Iser W. 1978. The art of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response. Baltimore : Johns Hopskins University Press.

Jauss H. R. Toward an Aesthetic of Reception / transl. by T. Bahti. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Kruger H., Kruger J. L. Cognition and Reception // The Handbook of Translation and Cognition / ed. by J. W. Schwieter, A. Ferreira. Hoboken, NJ : John Wiley & Sons, 2017. P. 72—89.

Machor J., Goldstein Ph. Reception Study. From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2001.

Nardocchio E. F. (ed.). Reader Response. The Empirical Dimension. Berlin ; N. Y. : Mouton De Gruyter, 1992.

Nightingale V. (ed.) The Handbook of Media Audiences. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Rogers Th., Soter A. O. (eds.). Reading across Cultures. Teaching Literature in a Diverse Society. N. Y. : Teachers College Press, 1997.

Ruokonen M. Target's reader's expectations, and reality: Conformity or Conflict? // Beyond Borders. Translation moving Languages, Literatures and Cultures / ed. by K. Pekka et al. Berlin : Frank &Timme, 2011. P. 73—100.

Santayo Mediavilla J. C., Lanero Fernández J. J. (eds.). Estudios de traducción y recepción. Léon : Universidad de Léon, 2007.

Scott C. Translating the Perception of Text. Literary Translation and Phenomenology. Oxford : Legenda — Modern Humanities Research Association, 2012.

Staiger J. (ed.). Media Reception Studies. N. Y.: New York UP, 2005.

Takahashi T. Audience Studies : A Japanese Perspective. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2010.

Об авторе

Ив Гамбье, почетный профессор, Школа языков и перевода, Университет Турку, Финляндия; профессор, Балтийский федеральный университет им. Иммануила Канта, Калининград, Россия.

E-mail: Yves.gambier@utu.fi

Для цитирования:

Gambier Y. Audiovisual translation and reception // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 52—68. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-4.

THE MOVING BOUNDARIES OF NEWS TRANSLATION

L. Davier[1]

[1] University of Genève
24 Général-Dufour Str., 1211, Genève 4
Submitted on September 15, 2018
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-5

News translation has been investigated more systematically since the mid-2000s. Since then, it has kept pushing the boundaries of translation studies by asking such questions as the following: Can we study multilingual practices that do not necessarily have an identified source text? If so, what do we analyze and compare? Can we call these practices 'translation'? How do we integrate multimodality into our traditionally textual analyses? This article formulates tentative answers based onrecent publications in the field. It calls for sustained research in the reception of news translation and with cognitive methods, as well as intensified exchanges with audiovisual translation.

Keywords: *news translation, journalistic translation research, methodology, media convergence, multimodality.*

Technological and economic developments have left one aspect unchanged in today's mediascape: multilingualism and translation still permeate the production of news. If your mother tongue is not English, you will hear or read about Catholic Church sex abuse cases in the United States through translation. If you live in a multilingual country, you will consume national news that contains elements of translation. Even if you are only based in a multilingual region, you are very likely to come across translations in local news. However, very few listeners or readers have ever thought about this possibility and its implications. This paper reiterates the importance of research in news translation and points at the conceptual, methodological, and practical problems that scholars may face in this field.

1. What is news translation?

Rather what is journalistic translation research — to refer to the term coined by Valdeón (2015a)? Although researchers probably quarreled about the delimitations of the field, it is necessary to resort to a working definition in this article. While news translation covers translational phenomena occurring "in news gathering and dissemination" (Palmer 2011, 186), journalistic translation encompasses all journalistic production, even if it is not news proper (e. g., features, columns, or comment). Moreover, news translation includes press releases, which are not journalistic products per se but raise similar questions (see investigations into other news producing organizations, such as the work of Tesseur 2014a). From my point of view, news translation should not be opposed to audiovisual translation (see section 4.1). This section can only temporarily crystallize what news translation tends to be — or what it tends not to be.

1.1. What news translation tends to be

As an object at the periphery of translation studies, news translation has attracted many considerations about its nature and definition. The term "transediting" (Stetting 1989) has been often used these past 15 to 20 years to describe the transformations involved in the process but has also been harshly criticized by leading scholars in the field (Schäffner 2012) who think that the concept of "translation" is broad enough to encompass changes made for the sake of the target audience. Other authors have suggested using "localization" (Pym 2004, Orengo 2005) or "transadaptation"(Li 2006), but the same criticism applies here.

The tendency to avoid the concept of translation may be explained by the fact that news editors almost never consider their production to be the result of an activity of translation (Holland 2013), that translation is completely integrated into the process of news writing (van Doorslaer 2010b, 181), and that traces of translation are erased in the published products (Hernández Guerrero 2011). This is due to organizational aspects in news outlets (Palmer 2011), the multiplication of source texts and their various transformation procedures (van Doorslaer 2010a), and the multi-authored nature of many journalistic target texts (Schäffner 2012). Both Hernández Guerrero (2008) and Valdeón (2015b) notice different translation techniques if the sources of the news are "stable" (e. g., a column by a renowned journalist or a politician) or "unstable" (e. g., a report published by a news agency), but other researchers find that this distinction does not always work, for instance in newswires (Davier 2017).

1.2. What news translation is not

I am not in favour of excluding research projects from a field of study, which is why this section is short. If a line needs to be drawn, I would say that news translation does not deal with fictional works, such as movies, although there can be fruitful intersections with research in audiovisual translation.

In addition, the label of "news translation" cannot be attached to any study using news reports in its data set. Contrary to Valdeón (2015a), who cites Baker's book (2006) in his article, I argue that, for instance, Baker's work does not fall into the field of news translation because "news translation was not the focus of her book" (Valdeón 2015a, 648), although she supports her arguments with news texts. I would say that — in its current state — news translation does not encompass all comparisons between translated news reports, but only analyses that raise questions about the nature of translation in the media or the impact of translation on the news.

2. Main research trends in news translation

This article does not intend to give an exhaustive review of news translation during the last 20 years of its development (for this, Valdeón 2015a is a more appropriate resource), but to offer an overview of its main research axes. The classification chosen for this article follows Holland's (2013) categorization as product-oriented ("focusing mainly on translations themselves" (ibid., 335)) and process-oriented approaches ("concerned with questions of how translations are produced, by whom and in what contexts" (ibid., 336)). I would like to add reception-oriented approaches, which Holland calls "audience analysis" (ibid., 343).

2.1. Product-oriented approaches

As often happens in translation studies, product-oriented approaches seem to be more prominent among publications about news translation. As a consequence, it is difficult to present them in an exhaustive manner. Valdeón (2015a) provides an excellent overview of this type of research starting in the 1990s. While some scholars focus on the domesticating or foreignizing strategies adopted by the journalists (Kwieciñski 1998; Bassnett 2005; Kang 2007; Bielsa and Bassnett 2009; Károly 2012; Pan 2014; Pym and Matsushita 2018), others investigate the ideological influence of translation on the news story (Sidiropoulou 2004; Schäffner 2005; Valdeón 2005; Kang 2007; Valdeón 2007; Schäffner 2008; Gottlieb 2010; Conway 2011; van Rooyen 2011; Gagnon 2012, 2013; Conway 2015). Hernández Guerrero, one of the more prolific authors in news translation, has almost developed her own strand of research about journalistic genres, norms, and conventions (among others, Cortés Zaborras and Hernández Guerrero 2005; Hernández Guerrero 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012). Critical discourse analysis has been a popular instrument for publications about ideologies conveyed or transformed by news translation (Valdeón 2015a, 647).

2.2. Process-oriented approaches

This section brings together a growing number of researchers who are interested in the ways translation interacts with news production. This emerging trend was doubtlessly created by Bielsa and Bassnett's (2009) seminal book based on extensive fieldwork in three international news agencies. Bielsa and Bassnett lay the methodological foundations for future process-oriented research. Davier (2017), Matsushita (accepted), Pan (2014), Tesseur (2013, 2014b), and Xia (2016) combine participant-oriented methods (participant or non-participant observation, semi-structured interviews, surveys, etc.) with discourse or shift analysis to gain a richer understanding of news production in multilingual contexts.

Coming from the neighbouring field of applied linguistics (and media linguistics, more specifically), Perrin (2013) develops a methodology of his own that he suggests can be applied to the study of news translation (Ehrensberger-Dow and Perrin 2013). This mixed-methods approach, called "progression analysis", triangulates data obtained by keystroke logging, screen recordings, eye tracking, cue-based retrospective verbalization, and version analysis.

In the volatile context of community radios in South Africa, where the "texts" of radio bulletins disappear immediately after their broadcast (if they ever existed at all), van Rooyen (2018) is not realistically left with the choice of shift analysis. Thus her work is only based on data gathered in the field through quantitative and qualitative methods.

In terms of results, scholars following Bielsa and Bassnett (2009) walk in their steps. Davier attempts to refine their findings in the context of two multilingual newswires based in Switzerland (2014, 2017), then in monolingual media based in Canada (accepted). Matsushita illustrates how keeping the English original in a Japanese translation can be a risk mitigation strategy (Pym and Matsushita 2018). In a completely different ideological context, Pan (2014) and Xia (2016) show that translation is located "at the dominant centre of the whole operational procedure of producing news texts" (Pan 2014, 557) at Reference News in China. Tesseur (2013) demonstrates that translation policies vary from central language units to local sections of a non-governmental organization. In a political context with considerable inequalities between language communities, van Rooyen (accepted) exemplifies how the digital divide materializes through news translation.

During the development of these process-oriented methods in translation studies, a whole group of scholars in applied linguistics (NT&T 2018) uses linguistic ethnography to explore tensions between language communities in various media landscapes(e.g., Jacobs and Tobback 2013, Bouko and al. forthcoming).

2.3. Reception-oriented approaches

"A sense of audience is clearly of central importance to many of those involved in the production and dissemination of news […]", writes Holland (2013, 343). Although he calls for studies examining "audience reception of broadcast news across societies" (ibid., 343), researchers who have explored the reception of translated news since the 2010s have been interested in other questions.

Conway and Vaskivska (2010) investigate a news translation experiment: how readers of Russian and English react to articles about the Russian government published by the New York Times and translated into Russian. They conclude that the reader comment sections could "improve communication across linguistic and cultural lines" (Conway and Vaskivska 2010, 233) but that their potential is limited by the functionalities of the section (e.g., when it is not possible to answer a previous comment) and the behaviour of readers, who only take into account a limited number of other comments.

Tian and Chao's (2012) research is comparable (they analyze 846 forum posts following an Economist news report about China), except that they analyze the (dis)satisfaction of the readers of one news item. This news item is a story in English about the deadly riot that occurred in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region in China, which is an instance of "cultural translation" (Conway 2012) rather than news translation.

From a different perspective, Cadwell (2015) presents a case study in an ethnographic tradition to understand how foreign residents used translation/interpreting to communicate and collect news during the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011.

In her PhD thesis, Scammell (2016) revisits the question of domestication/foreignization from the angle of reader response. Using focus groups, she shows that foreignized translations of culture-specific items and quotes in news dispatches do not have a negative impact on reading ease. With this experiment, she opens the door to disruptive cosmopolitan practices in news translation.

Although a few scholars have started to explore the numerous possibilities that are open around the reception of translated news, I am not currently aware of ongoing research in this area. Young researchers almost have a terra incognita to discover. Instead of criticizing manipulation through translation, they could wonder whether participants would be willing to consume news reports that require more cognitive efforts. Instead of complaining about the invisibility of translation in the news from a research perspective, they could ask readers and viewers whether they are aware of translational practices in the media. Instead of disapproving of the low quality of live news translation, they could approach readers to learn whether they are disturbed by typos and shortcomings in the translation.

3. Methodological issues in news translation

The issue of definitions and concepts introduced above (see section 1.1) echoes methodological questions. During the previous two decades, scholars illustrated that the source text and the author are myths that do not hold in the media. What is left to translation scholars if these basic concepts are challenged? How are translation studies scholars equipped to deal with unclear source text—target text situations; in other words, how do they deal with materials that contain "translational elements" (Gentzler 2017) but no (or very few) complete translations? These questions are tackled in a special issue of Across languages and cultures dedicated to methods in news translation (Davier, van Doorslaer and Schäffner 2018).

3.1. Uncertainties about identified source texts

Davier and van Doorslaer show that source texts are never a given in today's media, where "[i]ntegral and explicitly mentioned translations are extremely rare" (2018, 245). Even in the instances where a source text seems to exist, unexpected problems arise: the exact translation direction is not always clear; a written text can be presented as a source, although journalists based their translation on the oral version of a speech; and there can be pseudo-translations for political reasons (Holland 2006).

3.2. Absence of an identified source text

In this special issue (Davier, van Doorslaer and Schäffner 2018), several contributions — which are at least partly product oriented — struggle with the absence of an identified source text. Davier and van Doorslaer (2018) highlight the difficulty of collecting corpora, including source texts (or texts identified as such at the time of data collection). Instead, they suggest that scholars could build multilingual comparable corpora that do not explicitly contain translations. They can then either analyze these corpora without specifically taking into account their translational elements (e. g., in the spirit of a comparative media analysis) or by examining them to discover traces of translation (Davier and van Doorslaer 2018). The authors warn that the work necessary to find these traces is extremely time consuming and does not always allow researchers to identify a source, but only two similar news items. They also argue that triangulation using a participant-oriented method can usefully complement textual analysis (ibid., 250).

Facing similar problems, Gagnon, Boulanger and Kalantari (2018) have decided to work with a bilingual comparable corpus composed of journalistic texts. They acknowledge that interlingual translation is so invisible that it is mostly untraceable with a concordancer (ibid., 235). Nevertheless, they discover numerous instances of intralingual translation (such as rewording and popularization) that they think to add to the general understanding of news translation.

Another article in the same issue (Caimotto and Gaspari 2018) proposes a new methodology by which to overcome the dichotomy between parallel and comparable corpora: the comparallel corpus analysis. A comparallel corpus contains both translated and non-translated texts (ibid.). However, the authors note that the application of this methodology still needs to be tested with news texts. They also call for interdisciplinary collaborations, for instance between translation studies, corpus linguistics, critical discourse analysis, and media studies (ibid.).

3.3. Challenges of cognitive approaches

To the best of my knowledge, cognitive approaches have only been used in news translation by one team of researchers working with Perrin (see, among others, Ehrensberger-Dow and Perrin 2013; Perrin 2013; Perrin, Ehrensberger-Dow and Zampa 2017). Although the mixed methodology Perrin presents (process, participant, and product-oriented) is very promising, it requires a whole team of researchers to set up and expensive equipment (an eye tracker and software for computer logging and screen recording). These hurdles may prevent young researchers from going in this direction. In addition, they raise particular ethical issues at a time where research ethics boards are more and more demanding. While an ethics board can understand the justified use of computer logging and screen recording, media organizations may not be as open to the request. With recent developments in the mediascape, such as convergence, researchers may have to tackle yet other methodological challenges.

4. News translation and audiovisual translation

In a recent volume, Davier and Conway (accepted) show that the phenomenon of convergence (or multi-platform journalism) opens new avenues for research and creates new methodological problems for scholars.

4.1. Multi-modality

Although scholars interested in news translation and audiovisual translation usually attend separate panels at international conferences in translation studies, for more than a decade, a few authors have shown that news is not restricted to the print media and that audiovisual products go beyond fiction and Hollywood movies. Among them are Tsai (2005, 2006, 2010), in her double role as a scholar and TV journalist; Conway (2008, 2011); Gambier (2010); Darwish (2010); Kang (2012); and Perrin (2013).

More recently, the interest in the translation of multimodal news has grown unsurprisingly alongside the phenomenon of "convergence" (for an introduction to the concept, see Deuze 2004, Quinn 2005, Quandt and Singer 2009). The differences between traditional media (print media, radio, and television) have progressively merged with newspapers producing audio and video content on their websites, broadcasters publishing written news reports online, and social networks requiring multimedia content. Does convergence (sometimes also called "cross-platform journalism") have an impact on translation or vice versa? This fundamental question is addressed by a collective volume on the topic (Davier and Conway accepted).

It seems that convergence reduces the space dedicated to translation. Journalists try to avoid showcasing foreign voices in audiovisual content because of their audience's tolerance to hearing another language (Davier accepted, Gendron, Conway, and Davier accepted). Convergence could increase the risk of losing multilingual voices in journalism, as already observed in a pre-convergence framework (Jacobs and Tobback 2013; Davier 2017; Perrin, Ehrensberger-Dow and Zampa 2017). Nevertheless, we need multiplied case studies to check whether this result — obtained in the specific context of public broadcasting in Canada — is similar in other media landscapes.

With convergence and increased paces of publication, the "lines separating translation and interpreting" are blurring, as shown by Caimotto (accepted) in a case study of the Italian media. News translation gets closer to oral communication: typos cannot be corrected immediately online but in the printed version of a news report. In addition, the multiple source texts already described by van Doorslaer (2010a) and Schäffner (2012) are further fragmented into multimedia elements: short live translations, videos with subtitles or voice-overs, embedded tweets, and so on (Caimotto, accepted).

4.2. New challenges for data collection and analysis

The development of cross-platform journalism and social networks poses new challenges in terms of data collection and analysis for which journalistic translation researchers may not yet be equipped. For many scholars, who were still trained in departments of language and linguistics with a separate representation of written translation and oral interpreting, this may require them changing their mindsets and acquiring new skills.

The multimedia fragmentation investigated by Caimotto (in press) and described in the previous section creates further conceptual problems for researchers. As argued by Davier, Schäffner, and van Doorslaer (2018), the source text and target text are no longer useful conceptual tools. The sources may be speeches that are not available to the researcher, while the target texts are "volatile like speech" (Caimotto, in press) since they can disappear and be replaced by a more accurate version any time online.

Live translation necessarily implies live data collection, which may not always be feasible, given competing duties. In addition, for comparative analyses between various media outlets, simultaneous data collection requires a team of researchers. Live translation also forces scholars to anticipate the data they want to collect instead of searching for them posteriori on massive news databases, such as Nexis®. Because of the constraints of live data collection, researchers may have to analyze ad hoc corpora (Valdeón, accepted) instead of corpora neatly composed according to transparent criteria of comparability (Davier and van Doorslaer 2018). Unanticipated challenges are likely to arise when several scholars are working on these types of data.

Even the collection of digital stories on a media website results is much more problematic than in the era before convergence. Gendron, Conway and Davier (accepted) write that it was easier to identify stories as discrete units in traditional media but that "the distinction between one web-based story and another is far less clear, especially when video and sound (which also frequently stand alone) are integrated into a written text" (ibid.). The authors suggest solving this problem by treating digital stories as pages with a single link on the analyzed websites (ibid.), but this solution may not work in all digital contexts.

5. Concluding remarks

I certainly do not have a crystal ball to foretell the future of news translation, but I can see areas of interest that are still under-researched and that would have considerable potential for young scholars. While publications centered on the product have already attracted much attention, triangulation using process-oriented methods (e.g., interviews, observation, experiments, or cognitive methods) can still complement them in a useful way. Studies focusing on this process can also help solve methodological challenges, such as when great uncertainty surrounds the source text. Moreover, on the side of reception, almost everything still has to be done.

The changes brought about by media convergence also need to be closely scrutinized. With convergence between text, image, and sound, young scholars will need to embrace interdisciplinarity more fully than in past decades. Journalistic translation researchers who were proficient in critical discourse analysis and frame analysis will have to get trained in the audiovisual analysis. Sustained interactions with researchers active in audiovisual translation may be helpful. Convergence also poses new challenges for data collection and data segmentation, which need to be addressed with great transparency. Aside from these issues, social networks will also have to be part of the new landscape. One thing is certain: there will be absolutely no room for boredom.

References

Baker, M., 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S., 2005. Bringing the News Back Home: Strategies of Acculturation and Foreignisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 5(2), pp. 120—130. 10.1080/14708470508668888.

Bielsa, E. and Bassnett, S., 2009. *Translation in Global News*. London, New York: Routledge.

Bouko, C. et al. (in press). Being a Journalist in a Multilingual Country: Representations of Dutch among Belgian French-Speaking Journalists. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*.

Cadwell, P., 2015. Translation and Trust: A Case Study of How Translation Was Experienced by Foreign Nationals Resident in Japan for the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake. PhD thesis. School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University.

Caimotto, M.C. (in press). Transediting Trump: The Inaugural Speech Reported in Italy. In: L. Davier and K. Conway, eds. *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Caimotto, M.C. and Gaspari, F., 2018. Corpus-Based Study of News Translation: Challenges and Possibilities. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (2), pp. 205—220. 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.4.

Conway, K., 2008. A Cultural Studies Approach to Semantic Instability: The Case of News Translation. *Linguistica Antverpiensia,* 7, pp. 29—43.

Conway, K., 2011. *Everyone Says No: Public Service Broadcasting and the Failure of Translation*. Montreal, etc.: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Conway, K., 2012. A Conceptual and Empirical Approach to Cultural Translation. *Translation Studies,* 5 (3), pp. 264—279. 10.1080/14781700.2012.701938.

Conway, K., 2015. What Is the Role of Culture in News Translation? A Materialist Approach. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 23 (4), pp. 521—535. 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1026833.

Conway, K. and Vaskivska, T., 2010. Consuming News Translation: *The New York Times* Online and the 'Kremlin Rules' Experiment. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 11 (2), pp. 233—253. 10.1556/Acr.11.2010.2.6.

Cortés Zaborras, C. and Hernández Guerrero, M. J. (eds.), 2005. *La traducción periodística*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Darwish, A., 2010. *Translation and News Making in Contemporary Arabic Television*. Victoria: Writescope.

Davier, L., 2014. The Paradoxical Invisibility of Translation in the Highly Multilingual Context of News Agencies. *Global Media and Communication,* 10(1), pp. 53—72. 10.1177/1742766513513196.

Davier, L., 2017. *Les enjeux de la traduction dans les agences de presse*. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion.

Davier, L. (in press). Technological Convergence Threatening Translation and the Cultural Other: The Professional Vision of Francophone Journalists in Canada. In: L. Davier and K. Conway (eds.). *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davier, L. and Conway, K. (in press). Introduction: Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence. In: L. Davier and K. Conway (eds.). *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davier, L. and van Doorslaer, L., 2018. Translation without a Source Text: Methodological Issues in News Translation? *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (2). 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.6.

Davier, L., van Doorslaer, L. and Schäffner, C., 2018. The Methodological Remainder in News Translation Research: Outlining the Background. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (2).

Deuze, M., 2004. What Is Multimedia Journalism? *Journalism Studies,* 5 (2), pp. 139—152. 10.1080/1461670042000211131.

Doorslaer, L. van, 2010a. The Double Extension of Translation in the Journalistic Field. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 11 (2), pp. 175—188. 10.1556/Acr.11.2010.2.3.

Doorslaer, L. van, 2010b. Journalism and Translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 180—184.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Perrin, D., 2013. Applying a Newswriting Research Approach to Translation. *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies,* 25 (1), pp. 77—92. 10.1075/target.25.1.07ehr.

Gagnon, C., 2012. La visibilité de la traduction au Canada en journalisme politique: Mythe ou réalité? *Meta: journal des traducteurs,* 57 (4), pp. 943—959. 10.7202/1021226ar.

Gagnon, C., 2013. Traduction et politique canadienne: Quel est le rôle des journalistes entre 1942 et 1995? *Meta: journal des traducteurs,* 58 (3), pp. 522—541. 10.7202/1025049ar.

Gagnon, C., Boulanger, P.-P. and Kalantari, E., 2018. How to Approach Translation in a Financial News Corpus? *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (2), pp. 221—240. 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.5.

Gambier, Y., 2010. Media, information et traduction à l'ère de la mondialisation. In: R.A. Valdéón, ed. *Translating Information*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, pp. 13—30.

Gendron, P., Conway, K. and Davier, L. (in press). News Translation on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's English and French Websites. In: L. Davier and K. Conway (eds.). *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gentzler, E., 2017. *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Gottlieb, H., 2010. English-Inspired Post-9/11 Terms in Danish Media. In: R. Valdeón (ed.). *Translating Information*. Oviedo: Ediuno, pp. 125—150.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2005. La traducción de los géneros periodísticos. In: C.C. Zaborras and M.J.H. Guerrero (eds.). *La traducción periodística*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2008. Los artículos de opinión traducidos en la prensa escrita: El trasvase transcultural de la opinion. In: M.J.H. Guerrero and S. Peña Martín (eds.). *La traducción factor de cambio*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 93—114.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2009. *Traducción y periodismo*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2010. Las noticias traducidas en el diario *El Mundo*: El trasvase transcultural de la información. In: R.A. Valdeón (ed.). *Translating Information*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, pp. 51—85.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2011. Presencia y utilización de la traducción en la prensa española. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 56 (1), pp. 101—118. 10.7202/1003512ar.

Hernández Guerrero, M.J., 2012. La traducción al servicio de una línea editorial: La primavera árabe en el diario *El País*. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 57 (4), pp. 960—976.

Holland, R., 2006. Language(S) in the Global News: Translation, Audience Design and Discourse (Mis)Representation. *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies.* 18 (2), pp. 229—259.

Holland, R., 2013. News Translation. In: C. Millán and F. Bartrina, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 332—346.

Jacobs, G. and Tobback, E., 2013 Is Language a News Value in Belgium? *Journalism Studies,* 14 (3), pp. 407—422.

Kang, J.-H., 2007. Recontextualization of News Discourse: A Case Study of Translation of News Discourse on North Korea. *The Translator,* 13 (2), pp. 219—242. 10.1080/13556509.2007.10799239.

Kang, J.-H., 2012. Translating Mad Cow Disease: A Case Study of Subtitling for a Television News Magazine. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 57 (2), pp. 439—463. 10.7202/1013955ar.

Károly, K., 2012. News Discourse in Translation: Topical Structure and News Content in the Analytical News Article. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 57 (4), pp. 884—908. 10.7202/1021223ar.

Kwieciñski, P., 1998. Translation Strategies in a Rapidly Transforming Culture: A Central European Perspective. *The Translator,* 4 (2), pp. 183—206. 10.1080/13556509.1998.10799019.

Li, D., 2006. Translators as Well as Thinkers: Teaching of Journalistic Translation in Hong Kong. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 51 (3), pp. 611—619. 10.7202/013566ar.

Matsushita, K. (in press). Globalization of the Emerging Media Newsroom: Implications for Translation and International News Flow in the Case of Buzzfeed Japan. In: L. Davier and K. Conway (eds.). *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

NT&T, 2018. *News, Text and Talk*, available at: http://www.newstalktext.org/ (accessed 14 September 2018).

Orengo, A., 2005. Localising News: Translation and the 'Global-National' Dichotomy. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 5 (2), pp. 168—187. 10.1080/14708470508668889.

Palmer, J., 2011. News Gathering and Dissemination. In: M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 186—189.

Pan, L., 2014. Investigating Institutional Practice in News Translation: An Empirical Study of a Chinese Agency Translating Discourse on China. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 22 (4), pp. 547—565. 10.1080/0907676X.2014.948888.

Perrin, D., 2013. *The Linguistics of Newswriting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Perrin, D., Ehrensberger-Dow, M. and Zampa, M., 2017. Translation in the Newsroom: Losing Voices in Multilingual Newsflows. *Journal of Applied Journalism and Media Studies,* 6 (3), pp. 463—483. 10.1386/ajms.6.3.463_1.

Pym, A., 2004. *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation and Distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pym, A. and Matsushita, K., 2018. Risk Mitigation in Translator Decisions. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (1), pp. 1—18. 10.1556/084.2018.19.1.1.

Quandt, T. and Singer, J.B., 2009. Convergence and Cross-Platform Content Production. In: K. Wahl-Jorgensen and T. Hanitzsch (eds.). *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. New York, London: Routledge, pp. 130—144.

Quinn, S., 2005. Convergence's Fundamental Question. *Journalism Studies,* 6 (1), pp. 29—38. 10.1080/1461670052000328186.

Rooyen, M. van, 2011. A Mediation Model for the Translation of Radio News Texts in a Multicultural Newsroom. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,* 29 (1), pp. 17—29.

Rooyen, M. van, 2018. Investigating Translation Flows: Community Radio News in South Africa. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 19 (2).

Rooyen, M. van (in press). Tracing Convergence in the Translation of Community Radio News. In: L. Davier and K. Conway (eds.). *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Scammell, C.N., 2016. Putting the Foreign in News Translation: A Reader-Response Investigation of the Scope for Foreignising the Translation Strategies of the Global Agencies. PhD thesis. King's College London.

Schäffner, C., 2005. Bringing a German Voice to English-Speaking Readers: Spiegel International. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 5 (2), pp. 154—167. 10.1080/14708470508668891.

Schäffner, C., 2012. 'The Prime Minister Said...': Voices in Translated Political Texts. *Synaps: Fagspråk, Kommunikasjon, Kulturkunnskap,* 22, pp. 3—25.

Schäffner, C., 2012. Rethinking Transediting. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 54 (4), pp. 866—883. 10.7202/1021222ar.

Sidiropoulou, M., 2004. *Linguistic Identities through Translation, Approaches to Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Stetting, K., 1989. Transediting: A New Term for Coping with the Grey Area between Editing and Translating. In: Graham et al. (eds.). *Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Conference for English Studies*. Caie, Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, pp. 371—382.

Tesseur, W., 2013. Amnesty International's Language Strategy Put into Practice: A Case Study of the Translation of Press Releases. In: G. González Núñez, Y. Khaled and T. Voinova (eds.). *Emerging Research in Translation Studies: Selected Papers of the Cetra Research Summer School 2012*, pp. 1—17.

Tesseur, W., 2014a. Institutional Multilingualism in Ngos: Amnesty International's Strategic Understanding of Multilingualism. *Meta: Translators' Journal,* 59 (3), pp. 557—577. 10.7202/1028657ar.

Tesseur, W., 2014b. Transformation through Translation: Translation Policies at Amnesty International. PhD thesis. Aston University.

Tian, D. and Chao, C.-C., 2012. Testing News Trustworthiness in an Online Public Sphere: A Case Study of the Economist's News Report Covering the Riots in Xinjiang, China. *Chinese Journal of Communication,* 5 (4), pp. 455—474. 10.1080/17544750.2012.723388.

Tsai, C., 2005. Inside the Television Newsroom: An Insider's View of International News Translation in Taiwan. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 5 (2), pp. 145—153. 10.1080/14708470508668890.

Tsai, C., 2006. *Translation through Interpreting: A Television Newsroom Model*. Translation in Global News, University of Warwick.

Tsai, C., 2010. News Translator as Reporter. In: C. Schäffner and S. Bassnett (eds.). *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 178—197.

Valdeón, R. A., 2005. The CNN en español News. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 13 (4), pp. 255—267. 10.1080/09076760608668996.

Valdeón, R. A., 2007. Ideological Independence or Negative Mediation: BBC Mundo and CNN En Español's (Translated) Reporting of Madrid's Terrorist Attacks. In: M. Salama-Carr, ed. *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 99—118.

Valdeón, R. A., 2015a. Fifteen Years of Journalistic Translation Research and More. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 23 (4), pp. 634—662. 10.1080/0907676X. 2015.1057187.

Valdeón, R. A., 2015b. (Un)Stable Sources, Translation and News Production. *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies,* 27 (3), pp. 440—453. 10.1075/target. 27.3.07val.

Xia, L., 2016. *News Translation in Cankao Xiaoxi in China: Manipulation, Institutionalisation, and Power*. PhD thesis. University of Sydney.

The author

Lucile Davier, Assistant Professor, Training Coordinator Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies, Faculty of Translation and Interpretation, University of Geneva.

E-mail: Lucile.Davier@unige.ch

To cite this article:

Davier, L. 2019, The moving boundaries of news translation, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 69—86. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-5.

ПОДВИЖНОСТЬ ГРАНИЦ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ НОВОСТЕЙ

Л. Давье[1]

[1] Женевский университет
1211, Швейцария, Женева 4, ул. Генерал-Дюфур, 24

Поступила в редакцию 15.09.2018 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-5

Начало более системного изучения перевода новостных текстов относится к 2000-м годам. С этого момента теория перевода расширяет границы исследования в поисках ответа на целый ряд вопросов. Можно ли изучать многоязычные процессы, когда не обязательно имеется достоверно идентифицированный исходный текст? Если да, то какие тексты подвегаются сравнительному анализу? Можем ли мы назвать такой процесс переводом? Каким образом мультимодальность может быть интегрирована в традиционный анализ текста? В данной статье формулируются возможные ответы на эти и другие вопросы на основе недавних научных публикаций,

посвященных данной теме. Перевод новостей требует более системного изучения восприятия новостных текстов, в том числе с использованием когнитивных методов. Необходима бóльшая синергия с исследованиями в области аудиовизуального перевода.

Ключевые слова: *перевод новостей, исследование перевода текстов журналистики, методология, конвергенция СМИ, мультимодальность.*

Список литературы

*Baker M. Translati*on and Conflict: A Narrative Account. London : Routledge, 2006.

Bassnett S. Bringing the News Back Home: Strategies of Acculturation and Foreignisation // Language and Intercultural Communication. 2005. Vol. 5 (2). P. 120—130. doi: 10.1080/14708470508668888, 2005.

Bielsa E., Bassnett S. Translation in Global News. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2009.

Bouko C. et al. Being a Journalist in a Multilingual Country: Representations of Dutch among Belgian French-Speaking Journalists // Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication (в печати).

Cadwell P. Translation and Trust: A Case Study of How Translation Was Experienced by Foreign Nationals Resident in Japan for the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake: PhD thesis. Dublin : Dublin City University, 2015.

Caimotto M.C. Transediting Trump: The Inaugural Speech Reported in Italy // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

Caimotto M.C., Gaspari F. Corpus-Based Study of News Translation: Challenges and Possibilities // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (2). P. 205—220. doi: 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.4, 2018.

Conway K. A Cultural Studies Approach to Semantic Instability: The Case of News Translation // Linguistica Antverpiensia. 2008. Vol. 7. P. 29—43.

Conway K. Everyone Says No: Public Service Broadcasting and the Failure of Translation. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011.

Conway K. A Conceptual and Empirical Approach to Cultural Translation // Translation Studies. 2012. Vol. 5 (3). P. 264—279. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2012.701938.

Conway K. What Is the Role of Culture in News Translation? A Materialist Approach // Perspectives: Studies in Translatology. 2015. Vol. 23 (4). P. 521—535. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1026833.

Conway K., Vaskivska T. Consuming News Translation: *The New York Times* Online and the 'Kremlin Rules' Experiment // Across Languages and Cultures. 2010. Vol. 11 (2). P. 233—253. doi: 10.1556/Acr.11.2010.2.6.

Cortés Zaborras C., Hernández Guerrero M.J. (eds.). La traducción periodística. Cuenca : Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2005.

Darwish A. Translation and News Making in Contemporary Arabic Television. Victoria : Writescope, 2010.

Davier L. The Paradoxical Invisibility of Translation in the Highly Multilingual Context of News Agencies // Global Media and Communication. 2015. Vol. 10 (1). P. 53—72. doi: 10.1177/1742766513513196.

Davier L. Les enjeux de la traduction dans les agences de presse. Lille : Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 2017.

Davier L. Technological Convergence Threatening Translation and the Cultural Other: The Professional Vision of Francophone Journalists in Canada // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

Davier L., Conway K. Introduction: Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

Davier L., Doorslaer L. van. Translation without a Source Text: Methodological Issues in News Translation? // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (2). doi: 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.6.

Davier L., Doorslaer L. van, Schäffner C. The Methodological Remainder in News Translation Research: Outlining the Background // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (2).

Deuze M. What Is Multimedia Journalism? // Journalism Studies. 2004. Vol. 5 (2). P. 139—152. doi: 10.1080/1461670042000211131.

Doorslaer L. van. The Double Extension of Translation in the Journalistic Field // Across Languages and Cultures. 2010a. Vol. 11 (2). P. 175—188. doi: 10.1556/Acr. 11.2010.2.3.

Doorslaer L. van. Journalism and Translation // Handbook of Translation Studies / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2010b. P. 180—184.

Ehrensberger-Dow M., Perrin D. Applying a Newswriting Research Approach to Translation // Target: International Journal on Translation Studies. 2013. Vol. 25 (1). P. 77—92. doi: 10.1075/target.25.1.07ehr.

Gagnon C. La visibilité de la traduction au Canada en journalisme politique: Mythe ou réalité? // Meta: journal des traducteurs. 2012. Vol. 57 (4). P. 943—959. doi: 10.7202/1021226ar.

Gagnon C. Traduction et politique canadienne: Quel est le rôle des journalistes entre 1942 et 1995? // Meta: journal des traducteurs. 2013. Vol. 58 (3). P. 522—541. doi: 10.7202/1025049ar.

Gagnon C., Boulanger P.-P., Kalantari E. How to Approach Translation in a Financial News Corpus? // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (2). P. 221—240. doi: 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.5.

Gambier Y. Media, information et traduction à l'ère de la mondialisation // Translating Information / ed. by R. A. Valdéón. Oviedo : Universidad de Oviedo, 2010. P. 13—30.

Gendron P., Conway K., Davier L. News Translation on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's English and French Websites // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

Gentzler E. Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies. N. Y. : Routledge, 2017.

Gottlieb H. English-Inspired Post-9/11 Terms in Danish Media // Translating Information / ed. by R. Valdeón. Oviedo : Ediuno, 2010. P. 125—150.

Hernández Guerrero M. J. La traducción de los géneros periodísticos // La traducción periodística / ed. by C. Cortés Zaborras, M. J. Hernández Guerrero. Cuenca : Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2005.

Hernández Guerrero M. J. Los artículos de opinión traducidos en la prensa escrita: El trasvase transcultural de la opinión // La traducción factor de cambio / ed. by M. J. Hernández Guerrero, S. Peña Martín. Bern : Peter Lang, 2008. P. 93—114.

Hernández Guerrero M. J. Traducción y periodismo. Bern : Peter Lang, 2009.

Hernández Guerrero M. J. Las noticias traducidas en el diario *El Mundo*: El trasvase transcultural de la información // Translating Information / ed. by R. A. Valdeón. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 2010. P. 51—85.

Hernández Guerrero M. J. Presencia y utilización de la traducción en la prensa española // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2011. Vol. 56 (1). P. 101—118. doi: 10.7202/1003512ar.

Hernández Guerrero M.J. La traducción al servicio de una línea editorial: La primavera árabe en el diario El País // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2012. Vol. 57 (4). P. 960—976.

Holland R. Language(S) in the Global News: Translation, Audience Design and Discourse (Mis)Representation // Target: International Journal on Translation Studies. 2006. Vol. 18 (2). P. 229—259.

Holland R. News Translation // The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies / ed. by C. Millán, F. Bartrina. L. : Routledge, 2013. P. 332—346.

Jacobs G., Tobback E. Is Language a News Value in Belgium? // Journalism Studies. 2013. Vol. 14 (3). P. 407—422.

Kang J.-H. Recontextualization of News Discourse: A Case Study of Translation of News Discourse on North Korea // The Translator. 2007. Vol. 13 (2). P. 219—242. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2007.10799239.

Kang J.-H. Translating Mad Cow Disease: A Case Study of Subtitling for a Television News Magazine // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2012. Vol. 57 (2). P. 439—463. doi: 10.7202/1013955ar.

Károly K. News Discourse in Translation: Topical Structure and News Content in the Analytical News Article // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2012. Vol. 57 (4). P. 884—908. doi: 10.7202/1021223ar.

Kwieciñski P. Translation Strategies in a Rapidly Transforming Culture: A Central European Perspective // The Translator. 1998. Vol. 4 (2). P. 183—206. doi: 10.1080/13556509.1998.10799019.

Li D. Translators as Well as Thinkers: Teaching of Journalistic Translation in Hong Kong // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2006. Vol. 51 (3). P. 611—619. doi: 10.7202/013566ar.

Matsushita K. Globalization of the Emerging Media Newsroom: Implications for Translation and International News Flow in the Case of Buzzfeed Japan // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

NT&T. News, Text and Talk [2018]. URL: http://www.newstalktext.org/ (дата обращения: 14.09.2018).

Orengo A. Localising News: Translation and the 'Global-National' Dichotomy // Language and Intercultural Communication. 2005. Vol. 5 (2). P. 168—187. doi: 10.1080/14708470508668889.

Palmer J. News Gathering and Dissemination // Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies / ed. by M. Baker, G. Saldanha. L. : Routledge, 2011. P. 186—189.

Pan L. Investigating Institutional Practice in News Translation: An Empirical Study of a Chinese Agency Translating Discourse on China // Perspectives: Studies in Translatology. 2014. Vol. 22 (4). P. 547—565. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2014.948888.

Perrin D. The Linguistics of Newswriting. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2013.

Perrin D., Ehrensberger-Dow M., Zampa M. Translation in the Newsroom: Losing Voices in Multilingual Newsflows // Journal of Applied Journalism and Media Studies. 2017. Vol. 6 (3). P. 463—483. doi: 10.1386/ajms.6.3.463_1.

Pym A. The Moving Text: Localization, Translation and Distribution. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2004.

Pym A., Matsushita, K. Risk Mitigation in Translator Decisions // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (1). P. 1—18. doi: 10.1556/084.2018.19.1.1.

Quandt T., Singer J. B. Convergence and Cross-Platform Content Production // The Handbook of Journalism Studies / ed. by K. Wahl-Jorgensen, Th. Hanitzsch. N. Y. ; L. : Routledge, 2009. P. 130—144.

Quinn S. Convergence's Fundamental Question // Journalism Studies. 2005. Vol. 6 (1). P. 29—38. doi: 10.1080/1461670052000328186.

Rooyen M. van. A Mediation Model for the Translation of Radio News Texts in a Multicultural Newsroom // Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies. 2011. Vol. 29 (1). P. 17—29.

Rooyen M. van. Investigating Translation Flows: Community Radio News in South Africa // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19 (2).

Rooyen M. van. Tracing Convergence in the Translation of Community Radio News // Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence / ed. by L. Davier, K. Conway. Amsterdam : Benjamins (в печати).

Scammell C.N. Putting the Foreign in News Translation: A Reader-Response Investigation of the Scope for Foreignising the Translation Strategies of the Global Agencies: PhD thesis / Department of Education and Professional Studies. L. : King's College London, 2016.

Schäffner C. Bringing a German Voice to English-Speaking Readers: *Spiegel International* // Language and Intercultural Communication. 2005. Vol. 5 (2). P. 154—167. doi: 10.1080/14708470508668891.

Schäffner C. 'The Prime Minister Said...': Voices in Translated Political Texts // Synaps: Fagspråk, Kommunikasjon, Kulturkunnskap. 2008. Vol. 22. P. 3—25.

Schäffner C. Rethinking Transediting // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2012. Vol. 54 (4). P. 866—883. doi: 10.7202/1021222ar.

Sidiropoulou M. Linguistic Identities through Translation, Approaches to Translation Studies. Amsterdam : Rodopi, 2004.

Stetting K. Transediting: A New Term for Coping with the Grey Area between Editing and Translating // Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Conference for English Studies / ed. by G. Caie et al. Copenhagen : University of Copenhagen, 1989. P. 371—382.

Tesseur W. Amnesty International's Language Strategy Put into Practice: A Case Study of the Translation of Press Releases // Emerging Research in Translation Studies: Selected Papers of the Cetra Research Summer School 2012 / ed. by G. González Núñez, Y. Khaled, T. Voinova. Cetra, 2013. P. 1—17.

Tesseur W. Institutional Multilingualism in Ngos: Amnesty International's Strategic Understanding of Multilingualism // Meta: Translators' Journal. 2014a. Vol. 59 (3). P. 557—577. doi: 10.7202/1028657ar.

Tesseur W. Transformation through Translation: Translation Policies at Amnesty International : PhD thesis. Birmingham : Aston University, 2014b.

Tian D., Chao C.-C. Testing News Trustworthiness in an Online Public Sphere: A Case Study of *the Economist*'s News Report Covering the Riots in Xinjiang, China // Chinese Journal of Communication. 2012. Vol. 5 (4). P. 455—474. doi: 10.1080/17544750.2012.723388.

Tsai C. Inside the Television Newsroom: An Insider's View of International News Translation in Taiwan // Language and Intercultural Communication. 2005. Vol. 5 (2). P. 145—153. doi: 10.1080/14708470508668890.

Tsai C. Translation through Interpreting: A Television Newsroom Model // Translation in Global News. University of Warwick, 2006.

Tsai C. News Translator as Reporter // Political Discourse, Media and Translation / ed. by Ch. Schäffner, S. Bassnett. Cambridge : Cambridge Scholars, 2010. P. 178—197.

Valdeón R.A. The CNN en español News // Perspectives: Studies in Translatology. 2005. Vol. 13 (4). P. 255—267. doi: 10.1080/09076760608668996.

Valdeón R.A. Ideological Independence or Negative Mediation: BBC Mundo and CNN En Español's (Translated) Reporting of Madrid's Terrorist Attacks // Translating and Interpreting Conflict / ed. by M. Salama-Carr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007. P. 99—118.

Valdeón R.A. Fifteen Years of Journalistic Translation Research and More // Perspectives: Studies in Translatology. 2015a. Vol. 23 (4). P. 634—662. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1057187.

Valdeón R.A. (Un)Stable Sources, Translation and News Production // Target: International Journal on Translation Studies. 2015b. Vol. 27 (3). P. 440—453. doi: 10.1075/target.27.3.07val.

Xia L. News Translation in Cankao Xiaoxi in China: Manipulation, Institutionalisation, and Power: PhD thesis / Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Sydney : University of Sydney, 2016.

Об авторе

Люсиль Давье, доцент, факультет письменного и устного перевода, Женевский университет, Швейцария.

E-mail: Lucile.Davier@unige.ch

Для цитирования:

Davier L. The moving boundaries of news translation // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 69—86. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-5.

CORPUS-BASED STUDIES IN CONFERENCE INTERPRETING

M. Russo[1]

[1]Bologna University
136 Course of the Republic, Forlì, 47100, Italy
Submitted on September 15, 2018
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-6

Corpus-based interpreting studies (CIS) are a relatively recent "Off-shoot of Corpus-based Translation Studies" to quote the seminal paper (1998) by the late Miriam Shlesinger, a constant source of inspiration for the T&I community. This line of research is now gaining ground in both conference interpreting and community interpreting. The present paper focuses on conference interpreting and covers the evolution of the concept of interpreting corpus by providing an overview of the most representative examples, from the early collections of transcribed source and target speeches to full-fledged machine-readable corpora based on corpus linguistic standards and tools. Furthermore, methodological issues and original results from a variety of recent CIS are presented.

Keywords: *parallel corpus, comparable corpus, multimodal corpus, intermodal corpus, transcription, metadata.*

Introduction

Over the decades conference interpreting has been studied through a variety of paradigms: cognitive, psycholinguistic neurolinguistic, sociolinguistic, linguistic, pragmatic (Pöchhacker 2015). It was not until recently, however, that the prescriptive or anecdotal approaches to professional interpreters' performances, mainly based on the observation of a very limited number of interpreters during a handful of communicative events, have been enriched by descriptive approaches made possible by the implementation of new methodologies developed in the field of corpus linguistics (Bernardini and Russo 2018). This approach had already been embraced by translation studies scholars thus enabling 'a major leap from prescriptive to descriptive statements, from methodologizing to proper theorizing, and from individual and fragmented pieces of research to powerful generalizations' (Baker 1993, 248). An early milestone is the special issue of the journal Meta, published in 1998 and edited by Sara Laviosa, which established the corpus-based approach as a new paradigm in translation studies. That issue contained the seminal work "Corpus-based interpreting studies as an offshoot of corpus-based translation studies" by Miriam Shlesinger who was the first scholar to highlight the relevance and potential of the corpus-based approach for research into interpreting. She suggested that the corpus linguistics (CL) methodology could be extended to interpreting, 'through (1) the creation of parallel and comparable corpora comprising discourse which is relevant to interpreting; and (2) the use of existing monolingual corpora as sources of materials for testing hypotheses about interpreting' (Shlesinger 1998, 486). Interpreting corpora would add a new dimension to interpreting studies because they would overcome anecdotal observations and also provide information typical of CL, i.e. word frequencies, type-token ratios (lexical variety), co-occurrences, lexical density, grammatical constructions, textual operations, discourse patterns, etc. (ib.).

Shlesinger's call was first put into practice several years later by a multidisciplinary team made up of interpreting scholars/trainers, corpus linguists and IT technicians of the University of Bologna. They developed the first online machine-readable interpreting corpus, the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC) (Monti et al. 2005; Russo et al. 2012), a trilingual corpus of source and target speeches delivered during EP sessions (see further on).

An interpreting corpus is a systematized, machine-readable collection of a mass of interpreters' performances, which lends itself to both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Interpreting corpora are insightful for many reasons. They are key resources for the observation and analysis of the surface structure organization of interpreting data of different natures. Rather than attempt to read the interpreter's mind, interpreting corpora provide an insight into textual operations: many of them, by multiple interpreters, in multiple settings (conference, institutional assemblies, community, court, and media), modes (sign-language, dialogue, simultaneous, consecutive, remote) levels of proficiency (professional, trainee, ad hoc interpreter) and conditions (real-life, simulated, experimental). They also allow for the observation of interpreters' translational behaviour. Indeed, the quantitative and qualitative analysis of parallel corpora can yield insights about interpreters' language transfer skills. These can profitably be contrasted with translators' language transfer skills through intermodal interpreting/translation corpora, an example of which is the European Parliament Translation and Interpreting Corpus (EPTIC), a multilingual corpus derived from EPIC (Bernardini et al. 2016). EPTIC is a bidirectional (English<>Italian) intermodal corpus of interpreted and translated EU Parliament proceedings, featuring the parallel outputs of interpreting and translation processes, aligned to each other and to the corresponding source texts.

Basic features to be included in interpreting corpora are: metadata (information concerning the ethnographic dimension of the study or 'situatedness', i.e. data on the speaker; date, speed and mode of delivery; subject; number of words, timing; location), linguistic features (information on morphosyntactic and lexical features), paralinguistic features (information on disfluencies, prosody, etc.). Depending on the corpus typology, proxemics, gestural and pragmatic features could also be included, e.g. for signed language.

Guidelines on the methodology to build interpreting corpora can be found in Sandrelli et al. (2010), Setton (2011) and Bernardini et al. (2018). The delay in the creation of interpreting corpora and, consequently, in the publication of corpus-based interpreting studies vs corpus-based translation studies is mainly due to two factors. First: the accessibility to conference interpreting events, including both originals and interpreted versions. This obstacle has now been partially overcome by the advent of the Internet which offers many live streaming or archived conferences and parliamentary debates with interpretations, for instance on the European Parliament (EP) website which is still the main source of materials for interpreting corpora with simultaneous interpretations.

Another issue linked to accessibility is the need for authorizations, which may create difficulties to compile conference interpreting corpora with genuine field data.

The second major obstacle is the requirement to transcribe both the source speeches and the interpreters' linguistic output. This explains the scarcity of large machine-readable interpreting corpora. As is well known, transcription is an extremely time-consuming task and, at the same time, the first level of data selection for subsequent analyses. The lack of user-friendly and shared conventions for transcribing linguistic and paralinguistic features of orality in conference interpreting further adds to the problem (Cencini 2002; Hu and Tao 2013; Niemants 2015). A possible course of action implemented by some authors has been to keep corpus transcription and annotation to basic features, thus striking the best possible balance between user-friendliness in both coding and using corpus data. This makes it possible to share corpora to be used on different platforms. This was the case with the EPIC corpus that could also be exploited by Shlesinger's team in Bar Ilan University (Russo et al. 2012).

As to transcription, speech recognition software, often combined with shadowing (the transcriber repeats aloud what s/he hears), may speed up the process, even though transcripts still need double-checking and editing before creating/integrating a corpus.

Despite the use of software or methods to streamline the transcription procedure, the production of source and target text transcripts remains a major challenge for a major interpreting corpus project. That is why interpreting corpora are still considered a "cottage industry" by some scholars (Setton 2011) or, more audaciously, a "cottage (wired) industry" by others (Bendazzoli 2018).

Yet, as also reported in detail by the above-mentioned authors, since 2004 several electronic interpreting corpora were created. These display different designs:

— parallel corpora include transcripts of source texts and corresponding target texts with or without text-to-sound / video alignment;

— comparable corpora include source texts and c target texts as monolingual productions, i. e. English source texts and English interpreted target texts;

— multimodal corpora include several interpreting modalities or input / output channels (video, audio, transcripts);

— intermodal corpora include source texts and the corresponding interpreted and translated target texts.

The source-target text / sound / video alignment is a very important feature, which is difficult to obtain, due to the laborious manual encoding. The alignment software generally used in corpus-based studies are: CLAN, ELAN, EXMARaLDA, syncWRITER, TRANSCRIBER, TRANSANA, WINPITCH (Niemants 2015).

In the following sections, the development of interpreting corpora from collections of speeches to electronic corpora will be briefly described (section 1), then a review of the available conference interpreting corpora will be provided with some significant research results (section 2) and some concluding remarks (section 3).

1. From collections of transcribed speeches to electronic interpreting corpora

Conference interpreting, both simultaneous and consecutive, entails the interlinguistic transfer of an oral message, which, by its very nature, is evanescent, and, therefore, any attempt to study the product and process of interpreting for didactic or research purposes requires the fixation on a material support (transcription) of the interpreter's linguistic output, usually coupled with that of the speaker's. Interpreting corpora, that is a collection of transcribed source and target speeches, were created and their development went through a series of stages leading up to the present availability of full-fledged electronic corpora. Both Setton (2011) and Bendazzoli (2018) provide a detailed account of the main features of interpreting corpora appeared in the literature so far, providing updated information on their language composition, size, availability (or lack of) etc.

Here, we shall provide an overview of the characteristics of the interpreting corpora developed at each stage.

At first, collections of transcripts of moderate size and generally involving only a few interpreters were taken as a basis for theorizing on interpreting processes and products. Despite their limits, these studies exerted a great influence on interpreting theories and interpreter education: a notable example is Seleskovitch's *Langage, langues et mémoire. Etude de la prise de notes en interprétation consecutive* (1975), where interpreters' notes were collected and analysed.

In a second phase, scholars started collecting larger quantities of real-life interpreting data from specific professional settings. They carried out qualitative analyses of their data sets with manually aligned STs and TTs. Given their vast amount of field data and the extended recording periods (from several months to several years), these can be considered the first genuine descriptive studies (in the sense of Toury 1995), thus providing insights into interpreters' operational norms, styles, strategies, skills and field challenges.

Examples of these corpora are those developed by Vuorikoski and Straniero Sergio.

Vuorikoski (2004) evaluated the quality of 30 interpreters' linguistic outputs, in a corpus of 120 original speeches in English, Finnish, German and

Swedish delivered at the European Parliament and their simultaneous interpretation into these languages. Her focus was 'accuracy' and 'faithfulness'. In a subsequent publication on the same corpus (2012), she concentrated on speech acts containing modals in English EP speeches and concluded that interpreters were not always aware of the several roles of speech acts, an issue that she recommended should be incorporated into interpreter training.

Straniero Sergio developed the Italian Television Interpreting Corpus (CorIT), featuring 1200 consecutive and simultaneous interpretations broadcast by public and private TV networks. His aim was 'to respond to the pressing need for authentic data on SI' (2003, 136), tracing the history of media interpreting and highlighting differences with conference interpreting and other forms of dialogue interpreting. Since 1999, numerous CorIT-based studies have appeared (Straniero and Falbo 2012). CorIT does not contain performances in traditional conference settings, but it is nevertheless a unique and invaluable interpreting corpus of reference for the massive quantity of consecutive and interpreting performances.

Before full-fledged electronic corpora, a third phase can be identified. This includes large sets of real-life interpreting data, collected and stored with criteria inspired by corpus linguistics, in that they envisage the use of tools to retrieve features of source texts and target texts, albeit still manually aligned (Wallmach 2000), or of tools to allow for multiple visualizations of the texts stored (Collados et al. 2004). Wallmach (2000) recorded 110 hours of simultaneous interpretations by 16 professional interpreters working between English, Afrikaans, Zulu and Sepedi to investigate the effect of speed on interpreters' performance and to highlight interpreters' strategies and language-specific norms in a South African legislative context. In her pilot study (8 hours, approximately 40.000 tokens), using the parallel concordancing programme, ParaConc for Windows, she identified language-specific difficulties and strategies influenced by text complexity and lack of source text-target text equivalents.

In 2003, Collados Aís and collaborators (2004) developed the multilingual ECIS corpus (Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea) which contains 43 EP speeches and 73 interpretations, with an interface for multivariate visualizations. They explored other important aspects of quality, namely non-verbal, paralinguistic and prosodic features, thus providing a more comprehensive evidence-based evaluative framework for the study of interpreters' performances and their effect on users.

The turn from collections of manually transcribed speeches to the use of corpus linguistic tools and methodologies in compiling interpreting corpora has allowed for numerous new perspectives on the investigation of interpreting from a corpus-based approach.

2. Interpreting corpora and study results

While corpus-based translation studies also tackled common topics in different corpora and approaches (see Bernardini and Russo 2018 for an overview), corpus-based interpreting studies do not seem to follow this pattern. Therefore, what follows is an overview of the most prominent lines of investigation through the available interpreting corpora and their contributions to our understanding of interpreting processes and products in conference interpreting.

Between 2004 and 2006, the first free, open, machine-readable, on-line corpus was developed in the Forlì Campus of the University of Bologna: the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC), a pos-tagged, lemmatised and indexed corpus enabling simple and advanced queries (http://sslmitdev-online.sslmit.unibo.it/corpora/corporaproject.php?path=E.P.I.C). EPIC is made up of nine sub-corpora (approx. 180,000 tokens), three sub-corpora of English, Spanish and Italian original speeches and six sub-corpora of the corresponding simultaneous interpretations in these three languages (for a detailed description of EPIC, its applications and developments, see Russo et al. 2012). The EPIC parallel and comparable design allows for a variety of study typologies. For instance, lexical patterns were investigated to ascertain whether the results obtained by Laviosa (1998) for translated versus non-translated texts held true also for original vs. interpreted speeches. Laviosa found that non-translated texts displayed higher lexical density (content vs. grammatical words) and lexical variety (proportion of high-frequency words vs. low-frequency words) compared to translated English texts. EPIC-based results differed from Laviosa'sfindings on lexical density, but generally not for lexical variety (Russo 2018). Shlesinger (2009), who applied a different method, calculating the ratio of types to tokens, to identify linguistic richness in her intermodal corpus, obtained a similar result. Other topics investigated in EPIC are disfluencies and repairs (Bendazzoli et al. 2011), text-processing strategies (Russo 2010), gender-based trends (Russo 2011, 2016), universals in interpreting (Lobascio 2017).

Building on the expertise gained through EPIC, another corpus was created in Forlì: the Directionality Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus (DIRSI), an English-Italian corpus of medical conferences (approx. 130.000 tokens) with a dedicated web interface to study the effect of directionality on interpreter's output (Bendazzoli 2012). DIRSI is text-to-sound and source text - target text aligned, indexed, pos — and time-tagged: this enables the contextual analysis of transcripts and sound.

A further development arising from EPIC is the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (at) Ghent (EPICG) which is an open, multilingual (initially French>Dutch and English), partly aligned (time-ST-TT) and pos-tagged corpus of about 250.000 tokens, also containing metadata (speaker, speech and situational details). Several topics have been explored, such as connective markers (Defrancq et al. 2015), ear-voice-span (Defrancq 2015) gender-based trends (Magnifico and Defrancq 2016, 2017).

Press conference data from different cultural and professional settings are included in three corpora compiled to study communicative interactions and interpreters' strategies and norms: the Football in Europe (FOOTIE) corpus, the Chinese-English Interpreting Corpus of the Chinese Premier's annual press conferences (CEIPPC) and the Chinese-English Conference Interpreting Corpus (CECIC).

FOOTIE was developed by Sandrelli (2012) at UNINT University of Rome. It contains 16 interpreter-mediated press conferences held during the 2008 European Football Championship. It is a multimedia, multilingual (French, English, Spanish, Italian), closed, untagged corpus; the transcripts of the source texts and simultaneously interpreted target texts are organized as a table which also includes extra-linguistic information (word/turn, word/min, etc.).

CEIPPC was developed at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China. The corpus data span 14 years (1998—2011) and include transcripts (over 100.000 tokens) of video recordings of seven interpreters (Wang 2012; Wang and Zou 2018). The Chinese CECIC is an annotated corpus in TEI format, with head information mark-up, pos-tags and paralinguistic information tags compiled by Hu and Tao (2013), who, based on this corpus, found that interpreted texts exhibit greater normalization and explicitation than written translated texts.

One of the few common research topics is the interpreter's language or 'interpretese', which spurred the creation of small comparable, pos-tagged, annotated corpora designed to identify lexical and morphosyntactic features. At Bar Illan University, Shlesinger (2009) and Shlesinger and Ordan (2012) developed an English>Hebrew intermodal corpus of source texts, interpreted target texts and translated target texts. At the University of Bologna in Forlì, Aston (2015, 2018) detected typical lexical patterns in his 2249i, a corpus of English interpreted speeches at the EP consisting of aprox. 60,000 words. A more recent study on interpretese, Kajzer-Wietrzny (2018) from the University of Poznán (Poland) investigated the use of optional "that" in her TIC corpus.

An example of a multimodal corpus is the open-source consecutive and simultaneous corpus CoSi (House et al. 2012), compiled to study the effect of the interpreting mode on the processing of discourse markers, mitigators and proper nouns. Extensive information on the corpus design is provided in this work, to encourage corpus exchange in corpus-based interpreting studies.

The most recent publications providing further insights into corpus-based interpreting studies emerge from two events gathering the most active scholars in the field: Emerging Topics in Translation and Interpreting (Trieste, 16—18 June 2010) with one session devoted to corpus-based interpreting studies (Straniero and Falbo 2012) and the First Forlì International Workshop on Corpus-based Interpreting Studies: The State of the Art (Forlì, 7—8 May 2015). A selection of the papers describing several new corpora and insightful research results presented at Forlì appeared in Russo et al. (2018) and Bendazzoli et al. (2018).

3. Concluding remarks

The corpus-based approach in interpreting studies is opening unprecedented opportunities to investigate conference interpreters' linguistic output and their cognitive behaviour highlighted by text-processing strategies. The quantitative approach, typical of corpus linguistics, serves the purpose to detect trends and peculiarities, which could be better understood through a qualitative approach, which allows for an in-depth analysis. As we have seen, however, compiling spoken corpora is beset with more difficulties than translation corpora, which explains the delay in their development in conference interpreting.

In order to test the hypothesis, theorize on interpreting products and processes, and exploit interpreting corpora for didactic purposes, massive and representative data are required. Therefore, it appears to be high time for the interpreting community to join efforts and harmonize methodologies to foster the sharing corpora and comparison of results.

References

Aston, G., 2015. Learning phraseology from speech corpora. In: A. Lenko-Szymanska and A. Boulton (eds.). *Multiple affordances of language corpora for data-driven learning*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 65—84.

Aston, G., 2018. Acquiring the language of interpreters: A Corpus-based Approach. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 83—96.

Baker, M., 1993. Corpus linguistics and translation studies. Implications and applications. In: M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.). *Text and Technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 233—250.

Bendazzoli, C., 2012. From international conferences to machine-readable corpora and back: An ethnographic approach to simultaneous interpreter-mediated communicative events. In: F. Straniero Sergio and C. Falbo (eds.). *Breaking Ground in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Peter Lang AG, pp. 91—117.

Bendazzoli, C., 2018. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies: Past, Present and Future Developments of a (Wired) Cottage Industry. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 1—19.

Bendazzoli, C., Sandrelli, A. and Russo, M., 2011. Disfluencies in simultaneous interpreting: A corpus-based analysis. In: A. Kruger, K. Wallmachand and J. Munday (eds.). *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Research and Applications*. New York, Continuum, pp. 282—306.

Bendazzoli, C., Russo, M. and Defrancq, B. (eds.), 2018. New Findings in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. *InTRALinea,* 20, available at: http://www.intralinea.org/current (accessed 23 September 2018).

Bernardini, S., Ferraresi, A. and Miličević, M., 2016. From EPIC to EPTIC — Exploring simplification in interpreting and translation from an intermodal perspective. *Target,* 28 (1), pp. 58—83.

Bernardini, S. and Russo, M., 2018. Corpus Linguistics, Translation and Interpreting. In: K. Malmkjær (ed.). *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics*. London, Routledge, pp. 342—356.

Bernardini, S., Ferraresi, A., Russo, M., Collard, C. and B. Defrancq., 2018. Building Interpreting and Intermodal Corpora: A How to for a Formidable Task. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 21—42.

Cencini, M., 2002. On the importance of an encoding standard for corpus-based interpreting studies: Extending the TEI scheme. *InTRALinea*. *CULT2K*, available at: www.intralinea.org/specials/article/1678 (accessed 23 September 2018).

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

Defrancq, B., 2015.Corpus-based research into the presumed effects of short EVS. *Interpreting*, 17 (1), pp. 26—45.

Defrancq, B., Plevoets, K. and Magnifico, C., 2015. Connective markers in interpreting and translation: Where do they come from? *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics*, 3, pp. 195—222.

House, J., Meyer B. and Schmidt, T., 2012. CoSI-A Corpus of Consecutive and Simultaneous Interpreting. In: T. Schmidt and K. Wörner (eds.). *Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 295—304.

Hu, K. and Tao, Q., 2013. The Chinese-English conference interpreting corpus: Uses and limitations. *Meta,* 58 (3), pp. 626—642.

Kajzer-Wietrzny, M., 2018. Interpretese vs. Non-native Language Use: The Case of Optional That. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq, eds. Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. New Frontiers in Translation Studies. Springer, Singapore, pp. 97—114.

Laviosa, S., 1998. Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable corpus of English narrative prose. *Meta,* 43 (4), pp. 557—570.

Lobascio, M., 2017. *Genitive variation and unique items hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting from Italian into English. An intermodal study based on EPIC*. MA Dissertation. University of Bologna.

Magnifico, C. and Defrancq, B., 2016. Impoliteness in interpreting: a question of gender? *Translation and Interpreting,* 8 (2), pp. 26—45.

Magnifico, C. and Defrancq B., 2017. Hedges in conference interpreting: The role of gender. *Interpreting,* 19 (1), pp. 21—46.

Monti, C., Bendazzoli, C., Sandrelli, A. and Russo, M., 2005. Studying directionality in simultaneous interpreting through an electronic corpus: EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus). *Meta,* 50 (4), available at: http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019850ar.pdf (accessed 23 September 2018).

Niemants, N., 2015. Transcription. In: F. Pöchhacker (ed.). *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 421—422.

Pöchhacker, F. (ed.), 2015. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. London, Routledge.

Russo, M., Bendazzoli, C. and Sandrelli, A., 2006. Looking for lexical patterns in a trilingual corpus of source and interpreted speeches: Extended analysis of EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus). *Forum,* 4 (1), pp. 221—254.

Russo, M., 2010. Reflecting on interpreting practice: Graduation theses based on the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC). In: L. Zybatow (ed.). *Translationswissenschaft – Standund Perspektiven. Innsbrucker Ringvorlesungenzur Translationswissenschaft* VI *(Forum Translationswissenschaft, Bd. 12)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 35—50.

Russo, M., 2011. Text processing patterns in simultaneous interpreting (Spanish-Italian): A corpus-based study. In: I. Ohnheiser, W. Pöckl and P. Sandrini (eds.). *Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Lew Zybatow Translation – Sprachvariation – Mehrsprachigkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 83—103.

Russo, M., 2016. Orality and Gender: A corpus-based study on lexical patterns in simultaneous interpreting. In: C. Calvo and N. Spinolo (eds.). *MonTI. Special iss. Translating orality / La traducción de la oralidad*, pp. 307—322.

Russo M., 2018. Speaking patterns and gender in the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus. A quantitative study as a premise for qualitative investigations. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 115—131.

Russo, M., Bendazzoli, C., Sandrelli A. and Spinolo N., 2012. The European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC): Implementation and developments. In: F. Straniero Sergio and C. Falbo (eds.). *Breaking ground in corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 35—90.

Russo, M., Bendazzoli, C. and Defrancq, B. (eds.), 2018. *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies.* Series: New Trends in translation Studies. Singapore: Springer.

Sandrelli, A., 2012. Introducing FOOTIE (Football in Europe): Simultaneous interpreting in football press conferences. In: F. Straniero Sergio and Falbo, C. (eds.). *Breaking Ground in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Peter Lang AG, pp. 119—153.

Sandrelli, A., Bendazzoli, C. and Russo, M., 2010. European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC): Methodological issues and preliminary results on lexical patterns in SI. *International Journal of Translation,* 22 (1—2), pp. 165—203.

Seleskovitch, D., 1975. *Langage, Langues et Mémoire. Etude de la Prise de Notes en Interprétation Consécutive.* Paris: Minard.

Setton, R., 2011. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies (CIS): Overview and prospects. In: A. Kruger, K. Wallmach and J. Munday (eds.). *Corpus-Based Translation Studies. Research and Applications.* New York: Continuum, pp. 33—75.

Shlesinger, M., 1998. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies as an Offshoot of Corpus-based Translation Studies. *Meta,* 43 (4), pp. 486—493.

Shlesinger, M., 2009. Towards a definition of Interpretese. An intermodal, corpus-based study. In: G. Hansen, A. Chesterman and H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds.). *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research.A tribute to Daniel Gile.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 237—253.

Shlesinger, M. and Ordan, N., 2012. More spoken or more translated? Exploring a known unknown of simultaneous interpreting. *Target,* 24 (1), pp. 43—60.

Straniero Sergio, F., 2013. Norms and quality in media interpreting: The case of Formula One press-conferences. *The Interpreters' Newsletter,* 12, pp. 135—174.

Straniero Sergio, F. and Falbo, C. (eds.), 2012. *Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Tohyama, H., Ryu, K., Mastubara, S., Kawaguchi, N. and Inagaki, Y., 2004. *Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus.* Proceedings of Oriental COCOSDA, available at: http://slp.itc.nagoya-u.ac.jp/web/papers/2004/Oriental-COCOSDA2004_tohyama.pdf (accessed 23 September 2018).

Vuorikoski, A.R., 2004. *A Voice of Its Citizens or a Modern Tower of Babel? The Quality of Interpreting as a Function of Political Rhetoric in the European Parliament*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, available at: http://tampub.uta.fi/handle/10024/67348 (accessed 23 September 2018).

Vuorikoski, A.R., 2012. Fine-tuning SI quality criteria: Could speech act theory be of any use? In: C.J. Kellett Bidoli (ed.). *Interpreting across Genres: Multiple Research Perspectives.* Trieste: EUT, pp. 152—170.

Wallmach, K., 2000. Examining simultaneous interpreting norms and strategies in a South African legislative context: A pilot corpus analysis. *Language Matters*, 31 (1), pp. 198—221.

Wang, B., 2012. Interpreting strategies in real-life interpreting: Corpus-based description of seven professional interpreters' performance. *Translation Journal,* 16 (2), available at: http://translationjournal.net/journal/60interpreting.htm (accessed 23 September 2018).

Wang, B. and Zou, B., 2018. Exploring Language Specificity as a Variable in Chinese-English Interpreting. A Corpus-Based Investigation. In: M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli and B. Defrancq (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 65—82.

The author

Mariachiara Russo, Professor, Department of Translation and Interpreting, Bologna University, Forli, Italy.

E-mail: mariachiara.russo@unibo.it

To cite this article:

Russo, M. 2019, Corpus-based studies in conference interpreting, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1, p. 87—100. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-6.

КОРПУСНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В КОНФЕРЕНЦ-ПЕРЕВОДЕ

М. Руссо[1]

[1] Болонский университет
47100, Италия, Форли, ул. Курс Республики, 136

Поступила в редакцию 15.09.2018 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-6

Корпусные исследования в рамках теории устного перевода появились относительно недавно как «следствие применения корпусов в изучении письменного перевода». Так их происхождение описывается в основополагающей статье Мириам Шлезингер (1998), работы которой являются постоянным источник вдохновения для переводоведов. В настоящее время переводческие корпусы все чаще используются для изучения конференц- и сопровождающего перевода. В статье основное внимание уделяется исследованию процесса конференц-перевода, рассматривается эволюция собственно концепта «корпус устных переводов», а также приводится обзор наиболее репрезентативных примеров из ранних собраний транскрибированных оригиналов речей и их переводов, которые были обработаны с учетом принятых лингвистических стандартов и инструментов цифровых корпусов. Используя аутентичные примеры, автор анализирует ряд методологических проблем, связанных с применением переводческих корпусов.

Ключевые слова: *параллельный корпус, сопоставительный корпус, мультимодальный корпус, интермодальный корпус, транскрипция, метаданные.*

Список литературы

Aston G. Learning phraseology from speech corpora // Multiple affordances of language corpora for data-driven learning / ed. by A. Lenko-Szymanska, A. Boulton. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2015. P. 65—84.

Aston G. Acquiring the language of interpreters: A Corpus-based Approach // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 83—96.

Baker M. Corpus linguistics and translation studies. Implications and applications // Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair / ed. by M. Baker, G. Francis, E. Tognini-Bonelli. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1993. P. 233—250.

Bendazzoli C. From international conferences to machine-readable corpora and back: An ethnographic approach to simultaneous interpreter-mediated communicative events // Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies / ed. by F. Straniero Sergio, C. Falbo. Bern : Peter Lang, 2012. P. 91—117.

Bendazzoli C. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies: Past, Present and Future Developments of a (Wired) Cottage Industry // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 1—19.

Bendazzoli C., Sandrelli A., Russo M. Disfluencies in simultaneous interpreting: A corpus-based analysis // Corpus-based Translation Studies: Research and Applications / ed. by A. Kruger, K. Wallmach, J. Munday. N. Y. : Continuum, 2011. P. 282—306.

Bendazzoli C., Russo M., Defrancq B. (eds.). New Findings in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies // InTRALinea. 2018. Special Iss. Vol. 20. URL: http://www.intralinea.org/current (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Bernardini, S., Ferraresi, A. and Miličević, M. From EPIC to EPTIC — Exploring simplification in interpreting and translation from an intermodal perspective // Target. 2016. Vol. 28 (1). P. 58—83.

Bernardini S., Russo M. Corpus Linguistics, Translation and Interpreting // Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics / ed. by K. Malmkjær. L. : Routledge, 2018. P. 342—356.

Bernardini S., Ferraresi A., Russo M. et al. Building Interpreting and Intermodal Corpora: A How to for a Formidable Task // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 21—42.

Cencini M. On the importance of an encoding standard for corpus-based interpreting studies: Extending the TEI scheme // InTRALinea. 2002. Special Iss. : CULT2K. URL: www.intralinea.org/specials/article/1678 (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Collados Aís Á., Fernández Sánchez M.M., Iglesias Fernández E. et al. Presentación de Proyecto de Investigación sobre Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea (Bff2002-00579) // Actas del IX Seminario Hispano-Ruso de Traducción e Interpretación. Moscú (Moscow) : Universidad Estatal Lingüística de Moscú (MGLU), 2004. P. 3—15.

Defrancq B. Corpus-based research into the presumed effects of short EVS // Interpreting. 2015. Vol. 17 (1). P. 26—45.

Defrancq B., Plevoets K., Magnifico C. Connective markers in interpreting and translation: Where do they come from? // Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics. 2015. Vol. 3. P. 195—222.

House J., Meyer B., Schmidt T. CoSI-A Corpus of Consecutive and Simultaneous Interpreting // Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis / ed. by T. Schmidt, K. Wörner. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2012. P. 295—304.

Hu K., Tao Q. The Chinese-English conference interpreting corpus: Uses and limitations // Meta. 2013. Vol. 58 (3). P. 626—642.

Kajzer-Wietrzny M. Interpretese vs. Non-native Language Use: The Case of Optional That // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 97—114.

Laviosa S. Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable corpus of English narrative prose // Meta. 1998. Vol. 43 (4). P. 557—570.

Lobascio M. Genitive variation and unique items hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting from Italian into English. An intermodal study based on EPIC : MA dissertation. Bologna : University of Bologna, 2017. URL: http://amslaurea.unibo.it/12721/ (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Magnifico C., Defrancq B. Impoliteness in interpreting: a question of gender? // Translation and Interpreting. 2016. Vol. 8 (2). P. 26—45.

Magnifico C., Defrancq B. Hedges in conference interpreting: The role of gender // Interpreting. 2017. Vol. 19 (1). P. 21—46.

Monti C., Bendazzoli C., Sandrelli A., Russo M. Studying directionality in simultaneous interpreting through an electronic corpus: EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus) // Meta. 2005. Vol. 50 (4). URL: http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019850ar.pdf (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Niemants N. Transcription // Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies / ed. by F. Pöchhacker. L. : Routledge, 2015. P. 421—422.

Pöchhacker F. (ed.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies. L. : Routledge, 2015.

Russo M., Bendazzoli C., Sandrelli A. Looking for lexical patterns in a trilingual corpus of source and interpreted speeches: Extended analysis of EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus) // Forum. 2006. Vol. 4 (1). P. 221—254.

Russo M. Reflecting on interpreting practice: Graduation theses based on the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC) // Translationswissenschaft — Standund Perspektiven. Innsbrucker Ringvorlesungenzur Translationswissenschaft VI (Forum Translationswissenschaft, Bd. 12) / ed. by L. Zybatow. Frankfurt a/M: Peter Lang, 2010. P. 35—50.

Russo M. Text processing patterns in simultaneous interpreting (Spanish-Italian): A corpus-based study // Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Lew Zybatow Translation — Sprachvariation — Mehrsprachigkeit / ed. by I. Ohnheiser, W. Pöckl, P. Sandrini. Frankfurt a/M : Peter Lang, 2011. P. 83—103.

Russo M. Orality and Gender: A corpus-based study on lexical patterns in simultaneous interpreting // MonTI. 2016. Special iss. №3: Translating orality / La traducción de la oralidad / ed. by C. Calvo, N. Spinolo. P. 307—322.

Russo M. Speaking patterns and gender in the European Parliament Interpreting Corpus. A quantitative study as a premise for qualitative investigations // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 115—131.

Russo M., Bendazzoli C., Sandrelli A., Spinolo N. The European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC): Implementation and developments // Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies / ed. by F. Straniero Sergio, C. Falbo. Bern : Peter Lang, 2012. P. 35—90.

Russo M., Bendazzoli C., Defrancq B. (eds.). Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies. Singapore: Springer, 2018.

Sandrelli A. Introducing FOOTIE (Football in Europe): Simultaneous interpreting in football press conferences // Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies / ed. by F. Straniero Sergio, C. Falbo. Bern : Peter Lang, 2012. P. 119—153.

Sandrelli A., Bendazzoli C., Russo M. European Parliament Interpreting Corpus (EPIC): Methodological issues and preliminary results on lexical patterns in SI // International Journal of Translation. 2010. Vol. 22 (1—2). P. 165—203.

Seleskovitch D. Langage, Langues et Mémoire. Etude de la Prise de Notes en Interprétation Consécutive. P. : Minard, 1975.

Setton R. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies (CIS): Overview and prospects // Corpus-Based Translation Studies. Research and Applications / ed. by A. Kruger, K. Wallmach, J. Munday. N. Y. : Continuum, 2011. P. 33—75.

Shlesinger M. Corpus-based Interpreting Studies as an Offshoot of Corpus-based Translation Studies // Meta. 1998. Vol. 43 (4). P. 486—493.

Shlesinger M. Towards a definition of Interpretese. An intermodal, corpus-based study // Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research. A tribute to Daniel Gile / ed. by G. Hansen, A. Chesterman, H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2009. P. 237—253.

Shlesinger M., Ordan N. More spoken or more translated? Exploring a known unknown of simultaneous interpreting // Target. 2012. Vol. 24 (1). P. 43—60.

Straniero Sergio F. Norms and quality in media interpreting: The case of Formula One press-conferences // The Interpreters' Newsletter. 2013. Vol. 12. P. 135—174.

Straniero Sergio F., Falbo C. (eds.). Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies. Bern : Peter Lang, 2012.

Tohyama H., Ryu K., Mastubara S. et al. CIAIR Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus, Proceedings of Oriental COCOSDA [2004]. URL: http://slp.itc.nagoya-u.ac.jp/web/papers/2004/Oriental-COCOSDA2004_tohyama.pdf (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Vuorikoski A. R. A Voice of Its Citizens or a Modern Tower of Babel? The Quality of Interpreting as a Function of Political Rhetoric in the European Parliament. Tampere : Tampere University Press, 2004. URL: http://tampub.uta.fi/handle/10024/67348 (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Vuorikoski A. R. Fine-tuning SI quality criteria: Could speech act theory be of any use? // Interpreting across Genres: Multiple Research Perspectives / ed. by C. J. Kellett Bidoli. Trieste : EUT, 2012. P. 152—170.

Wallmach K. Examining simultaneous interpreting norms and strategies in a South African legislative context: A pilot corpus analysis // Language Matters. 2000. Vol. 31 (1). P. 198—221.

Wang B. Interpreting strategies in real-life interpreting: Corpus-based description of seven professional interpreters' performance // Translation Journal. 2012. Vol. 16 (2). URL: http://translationjournal.net/journal/60interpreting.htm (дата обращения: 23.09.2018).

Wang B., Zou B. Exploring Language Specificity as a Variable in Chinese-English Interpreting. A Corpus-Based Investigation // Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies. Series: New Trends in translation Studies / ed. by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, B. Defrancq. Singapore : Springer, 2018. P. 65—82.

Об авторе

Мариякьяра Руссо, профессор лингвистики и устного перевода, кафедра устного и письменного перевода, Болонский университет, Форли, Италия.

E-mail: mariachiara.russo@unibo.it

Для цитирования:

Russo M. Corpus-based studies in conference interpreting // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №1. С. 87—100. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-6.

ТРЕБОВАНИЯ К ПОДГОТОВКЕ СТАТЕЙ ДЛЯ ПУБЛИКАЦИИ В ЖУРНАЛЕ «СЛОВО.РУ: БАЛТИЙСКИЙ АКЦЕНТ»

Правила публикации статей в журнале

1. Представляемая для публикации статья должна быть актуальной, обладать новизной, содержать постановку задач (проблем), описание основных результатов исследования, полученных автором, выводы, а также соответствовать правилам оформления.

2. Материал, предлагаемый для публикации, должен быть оригинальным, не публиковавшимся ранее в других печатных изданиях. При отправке рукописи в редакцию журнала автор автоматически принимает на себя обязательство не публиковать ее ни полностью, ни частично без согласия редакции.

3. Рекомендованный объем статьи — до 1,5 п.л.; научного сообщения — до 0,5 п.л. (включая заглавие, аннотацию, ключевые слова, список литературы на русском и английском языках).

4. Все присланные в редакцию рукописи проходят двойное «слепое» рецензирование, а также проверку по системе «Антиплагиат», по результатам чего принимается решение о возможности включения статьи в журнал. Уровень оригинальности авторских материалов по данным системы «Антиплагиат» должен составлять не менее 80 % (с учетом оформленного цитирования и самоцитирования).

5. Плата за публикацию рукописей не взимается.

6. Для рассмотрения редакционной коллегией статья может быть отправлена по электронной почте главному редактору либо ответственному редактору журнала. Также статья может быть подана на рассмотрение через электронную форму на сайте Единой редакции научных журналов БФУ им. И. Канта: *http://journals.kantiana.ru/*

7. Решение о публикации (доработке, отклонении) статьи принимается редакционной коллегией журнала после ее рецензирования и обсуждения.

Комплектность и форма представления авторских материалов

1. Статья должна содержать следующие элементы:

- индекс УДК, который должен достаточно подробно отражать тематику статьи (основные правила индексирования по УДК см.: *http://www.naukapro.ru/metod.htm*);
- название статьи строчными буквами на русском и английском языках;
- аннотацию на русском и summary на английском языке (200—250 слов); аннотация располагается перед ключевыми словами после заглавия, summary — после статьи перед references;
- ключевые слова на русском и английском языках (4—10 слов); располагаются перед текстом после аннотации;
- список литературы, оформленный в соответствии с ГОСТом Р 7.0.5.-2008, и references на латинице (Harvard System of Referencing Guide);
- сведения об авторе(-ах) на русском и английском языках (Ф. И. О. полностью, ученая степень, звание, должность, место работы, e-mail, контактный телефон, почтовый адрес места работы).

2. Оформление списка литературы.

- Список литературы, оформленный в соответствии с ГОСТом Р 7.0.5.-2008, приводится в конце статьи в алфавитном порядке без нумерации. Сначала перечисляются источники на русском языке, затем — на иностранных языках.

Если в списке литературы есть несколько публикаций одного автора одного года издания, то рядом с годом издания каждого источника ставятся буквы *а, б* и др. Например:

Брюшинкин В. Н. Взаимодействие формальной и трансцендентальной логики // Кантовский сборник. 2006. №26. С. 148—167.

Кант И. Пролегомены ко всякой будущей метафизике, которая может появиться как наука // Сочинения : в 8 т. М., 1994а. Т. 4.

Кант И. Метафизические начала естествознания // Сочинения : в 8 т. М., 1994б. Т. 4.

Howell R. Kant's Transcendental Deduction: An Analysis of Main Themes in His Critical Philosophy. Dordrecht ; Boston ; L., 1992.

• Источники, опубликованные в интернет-изданиях или размещенные на интернет-ресурсах, должны содержать точный электронный адрес и обязательно дату обращения к источнику (в круглых скобках) по образцу:

Walton D.A. Reply to R. Kimball. URL: www.dougwalton.ca/papers%20in%20pdf/07ThreatKIMB.pdf (дата обращения: 09.11.2009).

3. Оформление references.

В английский блок статьи необходимо добавить список литературы на латинице (references), оформленный по требованиям *Harvard System of Referencing Guide*: сначала дается автор, затем год издания. В отличие от списка литературы, где авторы выделяются курсивом, в references курсивом выделяется название книги (журнала). В квадратных скобках дается перевод на английский язык названия указанного источника, если он издан не на латинице. Например:

Книга на кириллице: Borisov, K.G. 1988, *Mehanizm pravovogo regulirovanija processa internacionalizacii mnogostoronnih nauchno-tehnicheskih svjazej v sovremennoj vseobshhej sisteme gosudarstv* [The mechanism of legal regulation of the internationalization process of multilateral scientific and technical relations in the modern system of universal], Moscow, 363 p.

Книга на латинице: Keohane, R. 2002, *Power and Interdependence in a Partially Globalized World*, New York, Routledge.

Журнальная статья на кириллице: Dezhina, I. G. 2010, Menjajushhiesja priority mezhdunarodnogo nauchno-tehnologicheskogo sotrudnichestva Rossii [Changing priorities of international scientific and technological cooperation between Russia], *Ekonomicheskaja politika* [Economic policy], no. 5, pp. 143—155, available at: www.iep.ru/files/text/policy/2010_5/dezgina.pdf (accessed 08 April 2013).

Журнальная статья на латинице: Johanson, J., Vahlne, J.-E. 2003, Business Relationship Learning and Commitment in the Internationalization Process, *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, no. 1, pp. 83—101.

Более подробно с правилами составления references можно ознакомиться на сайте: *libweb.anglia.ac.uk/referencing/harvard.htm*

4. Оформление ссылок на литературу в тексте.

• Ссылки на литературу в тексте даются в круглых скобках: автор или название источника из списка литературы и через запятую год и (для цитаты) номер страницы: (Кант, 1994а, с. 197) или (Howell, 1992, p. 297).

• Ссылка на многотомное издание: автор или название источника из списка литературы, затем через запятую год, номер тома и номер страницы: (Шопенгауэр, 2001, т. 3, с. 22).

5. Предоставленные для публикации материалы, не отвечающие вышеизложенным требованиям, в печать не принимаются, не редактируются и не рецензируются.

Общие правила оформления текста

Авторские материалы должны быть подготовлены ***в электронной форме*** в формате А4 (210 × 297 мм).

Все текстовые авторские материалы принимаются исключительно в формате *doc* и *docx* (Microsoft Office).

Подробная информация о правилах оформления текста, в том числе таблиц, рисунков, ссылок и списка литературы, размещена на сайте Единой редакции научных журналов БФУ им. И. Канта: *https://journals.kantiana.ru/journals/slovoru/pravila-oformleniya/*

Порядок рецензирования рукописей

1. Все рукописи, поступившие в редколлегию, проходят двойное «слепое» рецензирование.

2. Главный редактор журнала определяет соответствие статьи профилю журнала, требованиям к оформлению и направляет ее на рецензирование специалисту, доктору или кандидату наук, имеющему наиболее близкую к теме статьи научную специализацию.

3. Сроки рецензирования определяются с учетом создания условий для максимально оперативной публикации статьи.

4. В рецензии устанавливается:

а) соответствует ли содержание статьи заявленной в названии теме;

б) насколько статья соответствует современным достижениям научно-теоретической мысли в данной области;

в) доступна ли статья читателям, на которых она рассчитана, с точки зрения языка, стиля, расположения материала, наглядности таблиц, диаграмм, рисунков и формул;

г) целесообразна ли публикация статьи с учетом имеющейся по данному вопросу литературы;

д) в чем конкретно заключаются положительные стороны, а также недостатки статьи, какие исправления и дополнения должны быть внесены автором;

е) рекомендуется (с учетом исправления отмеченных рецензентом недостатков) или не рекомендуется статья к публикации в журнале.

5. Текст рецензии направляется автору по электронной почте.

6. Если в рецензии содержатся рекомендации по исправлению и доработке статьи, главный редактор журнала направляет автору текст рецензии с предложением учесть их при подготовке нового варианта статьи или аргументированно (частично или полностью) их опровергнуть. Доработанная (переработанная) автором статья повторно направляется на рецензирование.

7. Статья, не рекомендованная к публикации хотя бы одним из рецензентов, к повторному рассмотрению не принимается. Текст отрицательной рецензии направляется автору по электронной почте, факсом или обычной почтой.

8. Наличие положительной рецензии не является достаточным основанием для публикации статьи. Окончательное решение о целесообразности публикации принимается редколлегией.

9. После принятия редколлегией решения о допуске статьи к публикации ответственный редактор информирует об этом автора и указывает сроки публикации.

10. Оригиналы рецензий хранятся в редакции журнала в течение пяти лет.

СЛОВО.РУ:
БАЛТИЙСКИЙ АКЦЕНТ

2019

Том 10
№ 1

Редактор *Д. А. Малеваная*. Корректор *С. В. Ильина*
Компьютерная верстка *Г. И. Винокуровой*

Подписано в печать 07.02.2019 г.
Формат 70×108 1/16. Усл. печ. л. 9,1
Тираж 120 экз. (1-й завод — 40 экз.). Заказ 26

Издательство Балтийского федерального университета им. Иммануила Канта
236022, г. Калининград, ул. Гайдара, 6