ISSN 2225-5346

БФУ им. И. Канта

IKBFU

СЛОВО.РУ: БАЛТИЙСКИЙ АКЦЕНТ

SLOVO.RU: BALTIC ACCENT

2019

Том / Vol. 10

№ 3

Темы и проблемы современного переводоведения

Challenged and Challenging Matters in Translation Studies

Тематический выпуск

Special Issue

Часть 2

Part 2

Издательство Балтийского федерального университета им. Иммануила Канта

Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University Press

2019

СЛОВО.РУ:
БАЛТИЙСКИЙ
АКЦЕНТ
2019
Том 10
№ 3

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

Учредитель
Балтийский
федеральный
университет
им. Иммануила Канта

Адрес: 236016, Россия,
Калининград,
ул. А. Невского, 14

Редакция

Адрес: 236022, Россия,
Калининград,
ул. Чернышевского, 56А

Издательство

Адрес: 236022, Россия,
Калининград,
ул. Гайдара, 6

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.

Журнал включен в Перечень рецензируемых научных изданий, в которых должны быть опубликованы основные научные результаты диссертаций на соискание ученой степени кандидата наук, доктора наук, распоряжением Минобрнауки России от 12 февраля 2019 г. № 21-р

SLOVO.RU:
BALTIC ACCENT
2019
Vol. 10
№ 3

Kaliningrad :
I. Kant Baltic Federal
University Press, 2019.
134 c.

Founders

Immanuel Kant Baltic
Federal University

Address

14 A. Nevskogo St.,
Kaliningrad, Russia,
236016

Editorial office

56A Chernyshevskogo St.,
Kaliningrad, Russia,
236022

Publishing house

6 Gaidara St.,
Kaliningrad, Russia,
236022

Mass Media
Registration Certificate
PI № FS77-46308,
on 26 August, 2011

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S NOTES

In *Slovo* 10 (1), 2019, readers could access to the first part of our overview on Translation Studies —with six articles dealing with the present fragmentation of our field, indirect translation, translation process and ergonomics, audiovisual translation and reception, news translation, and corpus-based studies in conference interpreting. That was a glance at some of the rapid changes in translation and Translation Studies. Today, with this second part, we continue our tour with nine papers. This time, to the five chapters written by Western scholars, we have added four chapters by colleagues from IKBFU (I. Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad) — initiating a dialogue between two geo-linguistic areas which have been distant for too long. We do hope that, in the next issues of *Slovo*, some other scholars, wherever they come from or they are affiliated to, will pursue the discussion, opening up new perspectives, criticizing some current directions, commenting on specific topics, arguing for or against a certain framework, underscoring the benefits and limitations of a given research method.

In the first chapter, D. Folaron (Concordia University, Montreal) claims that digital computers, information and communication technologies (ICTs), and the Internet/Web has broadened the scope of communication in ways unprecedented in human history. Translation as a specific type of communication is taking place in the digital world which implies more than the technical and instrumental aspects and usage of technology; it equally involves our human social engagement and interface with the tools and technologies we have at our disposal. While one can argue that the existing analytical and critical approaches to researching translation can effectively be extended and transposed to the newer digital context, there are also compelling and legitimate reasons for positioning translation squarely within the digital sphere. The author offers a large view on the development of technology in the last decades, showing that the future cannot deny the past.

C. Schäffner (Birmingham), in chapter two, illustrates how discourse analysis has been incorporated in Translation Studies. Concepts and methods of such an approach have been found useful for Translation Studies, partly because they help examining the structure and the function of language in various contexts and/or revealing patterns of belief and habitual action, as well as social roles and power relations (especially in what is called Critical Discourse Analysis).

The chapter three is not only the state of the art of research relating to the concept of voice, applied in quite a few studies mainly regarding literary translation. With "voice", scholars investigate stylistic or structural characteristics of translated texts, intertextuality and other forms of multivocality and ethical questions related to agency, ideology and power in translation and interpreting. K. Taivalkoski-Shilov (Turku) aims also to deepen the discussion on voice in our discipline by introducing the notion of the voice of conscience from philosophy and political science and the notion of inner voices from psychology.

For L. van Doorslaer (chapter four), imagology, the study of national and cultural images (including stereotypes, clichés) as represented in textual discourse such as literary and journalistic texts, is a fruitful approach for disciplines dealing with textual change, such as translation studies. Moreover interest in imagological research, sometimes related to the distribution of a promoted national or cultural self-image, has now also grown in countries outside of Europe. The findings on mental image spread through translation can definitely be validated through collaboration with existing research in sociology and psychology.

The chapter five by U. Stecconi (Brussels) argues that different active players, or agents, of communication determine whether a sign will cross a semiotic fold and translations are willed into existence in three conceivable ways: pull, push and shuffle. Pull is the most intuitive form: a publishing house decides to import i.e. translate a foreign novel. The push mode, in contrast, can be exemplified by a company that decides to export by localising its website to cater for foreign markets. The shuffle mode corresponds to those rare cases in which the process is located neither on the source nor on the target side, but straddles the semiotic barriers or folds that make acts of translating possible or necessary in the first place. The discussion is placed under the theory of signs of Charles S. Pierce.

The next chapters do not pretend to give a general view on the Russian landscape in Translation Studies. They investigate certain items that still deserve more pure and applied research.

In chapter six, Elena Boyarskaya considers the types of ambiguity, its typology, production and effect. She posits that the choice of a translation strategy and the need for disambiguation in general depend on the type of ambiguity, its sources and character, i.e. whether ambiguity is intended or not. She also explores a rarely analyzed event-referential ambiguity, which requires additional conceptual information for disambiguation and, consequently, may pose a problem for translation.

Elena Kharitonova, in the chapter seven, addresses the fundamental issue of variability within a language and aims at studying the specific fragment of the Russian language of the 20th century — Soviet camp sociolect within the frameworks of contrastive sociolectology. Sociolect nature of the source text is viewed as one of the factors increasing the degree of text untranslatability, or why adaption is always part of the performance, why retranslation is a way to push back the limitations of any translation.

The chapter eight by Elizaveta Shevchenko and Irina Thomashevskaya contributes to the study of colour terms as a cognitive phenomenon. Since colour is not a universal concept and an ordinary mind does not perceive colour separately from the object, it is possible to observe the knowledge about colour, which exists in the language but does not exist in its physical sense. This given knowledge is the cause of significant difficulties arising in the translation of various colour terms. The authors characterise some typical colour-related English into Russian translation difficulties which arise at the cognitive level.

In the last chapter, Lyudmila Boyko acknowledges that contemporary methodological landscape in translator training (TT) is dominated by the competence-based principles whose epistemological roots are found in social constructivism. Her paper gives a brief account of the status quo of TT and revisits the controversial issue of appropriateness of combining TT with foreign language teaching (FLT). The author maintains that FLT may, and quite often has to be part of TT course, the share of linguistic component in TT depending on the curriculum design and teaching circumstances. She proposes combining training methods that serve the purposes of both TT and FLT. And she argues that exercise-type activities beneficial for both TT and FLT can be practiced in full harmony with the competence-based student-centred teaching principles.

We warmly thank all the contributors who have accepted to share their knowledge and experience for the making of the two volumes of *Slovo*. Let's hope that some next issues will enlarge the geo-linguistic and interdisciplinary landscape of the overview.

Yves Gambier

DIGITAL WORLD COMMUNICATION AND TRANSLATION

D. Folaron[1]

[1] Concordia University
1455 Boulevard de Maisonneuve, Ouest
Montréal, Québec, H3G 1M8, Canada
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-1

The introduction of digital computers, information and communication technologies (ICTs), and the Internet/Web has broadened the scope of communication globally in ways unprecedented in human history. The "digital world" implies more than the technical and instrumental aspects and usage of technology; it equally involves our tangible human social engagement and interface with the tools and technologies themselves. The relevance of digital studies to translation studies, and vice versa, is substantial. Both fields intrinsically deal with language, information, and communication and are inextricably linked to technology. After a brief introduction, the article highlights first the essential informational and communicational foundation of technology development that intertwined with histories of translation technology. The convergence of these multiple histories has led to today's 24/7 digital infrastructure. It then considers the social and cultural facets of the digital world, presenting research areas in digital studies that can be explored in relation to translation studies. While the existing analytical and critical approaches to researching translation can arguably be extended and transposed to include elements of the contemporary digital context, there are also compelling and legitimate reasons for contextualizing translation within the broader, global communication universe, positioning it wholly within the digital sphere.

Keywords*: digital, translation, technology, Internet, communication.*

1. Introduction

The interdisciplinarity of translation studies has taken many forms and turns since the field's spin-off from linguistics during the latter half of the 20th century, with the connecting and putting into relation of ideas and concepts across disciplinary boundaries yielding insightful perceptions. Fundamentally, translation is a unique kind of communication that assumes a priori cultural knowledge and a cognitive space of at least two languages. The identifying marker of what actually constitutes a translation by any given social group or community can potentially fall at any one of many different and varying points on a continuum of linguistic interaction between languages. The growth and expansion of translation studies set in motion a fruitful investigation of more than one translation history, namely the exploration of concepts, norms, practices, and practitioners of translation as they are understood within diverse linguistic and cultural traditions and histories around the world.

The introduction of computers, information and communication technologies (ICTs), and the Internet has broadened the scope of communication in ways unprecedented in human history, affecting translation as well. The

World Wide Web, released to the public in August 1991, has steadily admitted into its social net and conversational space approximately 60 % of the world's population. The nearly thirty-year history of the Web, until very recently, has been almost systematically narrated through Anglo-American eyes and voices. While this perspective does reflect a certain development and evolution of predominant multinational corporations, it does not fully recognize and convey the multiple local historical trajectories forged in other linguistic, cultural contexts. Perhaps more importantly, these gaps in the digital world narrative underrate the value and power of translation (although not necessarily multilingualism), rendering many of its interventions invisible. Translation and localization intermingle with single-language production within communicational spaces, and are not always easily discernible. While digital information and communication are increasingly universally global, they are also particularly and uniquely local.

The relevance of digital studies — an interdisciplinary field that has developed and matured notably over the past decade — to translation studies, and vice versa, is considerable. Both domains intrinsically deal with information and communication, using culturally informed language as a vehicle. In our contemporary era, both fields are also inextricably linked to technologies, which have transformed the ways information is conceptualized, produced, communicated, circulated, and consumed. While existing analytical and critical approaches to researching translation can arguably be extended and transposed to include elements of the digital context, there are also compelling and legitimate reasons for contextualizing and positioning translation wholly within the digital sphere. This article begins by highlighting the essential informational and communicational foundation of technology development that inevitably intertwined with the histories of translation technology. Like all areas related to information and communication (e. g. journalism), the transition from pre-digital to digital has entailed a transition from printed text and conventional forms of mass media to a 24/7 digital infrastructure. The "digital world" implies more than the technical and instrumental aspects and usage of technology, however; it equally involves our concrete human social engagement and interface with these tools and technologies, in an increasingly dynamic relationship that is symbiotic, dialectical, dialogical. The article then considers the social and cultural facets of the digital world, presenting some areas of research in digital studies with relevance to translation studies. While the ubiquity of today's digital communication (translation included) feels seamless, it is the resulting convergence of diverse historical paths of critical technologies.

2. Technology as a bridge concept-practice between translation and digital studies

2.1. Computing and information technologies

The digital world we experience and know today has its roots in mid-20th century computing technologies, conceptualized and developed on a foundation of binary mathematics and logic, that is to say with information able to be encoded, controlled, and transmitted in binary form on the basis

of the symbols 0 and 1. The evolution of these technologies is due to many converging factors and processes. They involve theoretical contexts (e.g. Alan Turing's 1936 paper on the "computing machine"; Norman Wiener's 1948 book *Cybernetics*; John von Neumann's "stored program in memory" concept in the late 1940s; etc.), electronic and microelectronic technologies and engineering, and information processing methods and models which then found their application in machines and systems designed to carry out complex calculations and textual word-processing. The growth of these machines and systems was inspired, encouraged, and supported by governmental agencies, scientists, researchers, and various commercial entities, and the subject of small- and large-scale projects. Early U.S. initiatives include ENIAC, UNIVAC, and the IBM 701 (Ceruzzi 2012). In Soviet Russia, the work of scientists Anatoly Kitov, Aleksei Lyapunov, and Sergei Sobolev contributed to ushering in cybernetics. Their article "The Main Features of Cybernetics", published in 1955 in the journal *Voprosi Filosophii* [Problems of Philosophy], was "at once an introduction, a reclamation, and a creative translation of Wiener's *Cybernetics*", and created a cybernetic terminology, in part by "retooling Wiener's conceptual vocabulary into a Soviet language of science" (Peters 2016b, 36; see also Malinovsky 2010). These origins, and the ongoing intertwined histories of hardware and software development underpin the history of the digital, manifest today in the recognition of its materiality and in material-centered approaches to interaction design (Wiberg 2018). Highlights of the early period of computing and information processing include the transition from mainframe computers to personal computers (PCs), the creation of machine and high-level languages for programming purposes, and the steady rise in computation capacity and velocity (Ceruzzi 2012; Malinovsky 2010; Peters 2016a; Price et al. 2013). These keystone points undergird the base of digital information technology. As the means to produce informational documentation proliferated, managing its production, modification, storage, and transmission became paramount (Buckland 2017). Goals also shifted abroad, with corporations like IBM broadening their areas of interest and influence to include foreign objectives. Destined for users in other languages, informational documentation was delegated and outsourced to others for multilingual translation, practices which would result in the "industrialization" of professional processes of modern translation production.

2.2. Early machine translation (MT) and computer-assisted translation (CAT) technologies

The digital age, and most notably the past few years, has witnessed an upsurge in the public use of MT (Google Translate, MS/Bing Translator, Yandex Translate, iFLYTEK Translator). The first half of the 20th century set the historical stage for these technologies as well. Like the history of computing and information technologies, the history of computational language processing and translation has its roots in earlier ideas and initiatives. In the 1930s interwar period, Georges Artsrouni and Petr Petrovitch Smirnov-Trojanskij filed patent applications for machines which, respectively, could encode,

store, search, and find words in different languages, and code and select words for interlingual translation (Poibeau 2017, 45—47). In 1949, Warren Weaver wrote his persuasive "Translation" memorandum proposing the use of computers to translate (Hutchins 2000; Poibeau 2017). The post-World War II and Cold War periods supported intense research on MT, particularly in methods of rule-based systems (RBMT). The 1966 release of the ALPAC [Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee) Report, which cast doubt on the feasibility of fully automated high-quality MT (FAHQMT) and recommended research be applied to develop computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools, caused a notable drop in U.S. funding for MT research. It continued in other countries such as Canada and France, and in China, Japan, Soviet Union, and the early EU. During the 1980s, the volume of electronic documentation in source and target translation languages increased, inspiring research on text alignment (bitext, parallel corpora). The growing corpus of aligned multilingual documentation in turn served to develop and improve methods for example-based machine translation (EBMT) and for CAT-tool alignment, translation memory (TM), and terminology management technologies (Quah 2006). This body of research, and the ongoing large corporate documentation processes of multinational companies (IBM, Microsoft, Adobe, etc.), dovetailed with the emerging history of localization. Localization technologies included not only CAT functionalities but also the capacity to technically adjust software program source code files, in order to adapt user interface (UI), help files, manuals, and culturally-specific items like units of measurement and language scripts for non-native usage. By the early 1990s, commercialized CAT software (e.g. IBM Translation Manager, TRADOS MultiTerm / Translator's Workbench) was routinely used by technical translators commissioned as outsourced expertise by either direct clients or specialized language service providers (LSPs) for translation. CAT and localization software tools were thus subsumed within the digital technology landscape.

2.3. Networking and (tele)communication technologies

Computing and information technologies, and their concurrent first-generation translation technologies, constitute the first critical layer of the foundation of the future digital world. The second, and indeed decisive, layer comprises networking and (tele)communication technologies. From the 1960s to 1980s, DOS- and command-based computing and computers were mostly confined to military and academic programmers, specialists, and researchers sharing information openly among themselves. In the U.S., the implementation of networking technologies to link four university nodes of computers for communication purposes first came through the DARPA-sponsored ARPANET. Launched in 1969, it functioned according to a packet-switching, distributed computing logic that respected a standard protocol known as the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP). This communication technology became the telecommunications backbone of the global Internet. While this technical core is part of today's internationally shared history of the Internet, many individual histories of network and Internet development beyond the U.S. and some European countries remain

unwritten, with studies in local languages not yet translated (Goggin and McLelland 2017). For instance, Peters puts forth that in 1959 Anatoly Kitov of Soviet Russia was likely the first "to propose a national computer network for civilian communication anywhere": EASU (*Ekonomicheskaya avtomatizirovannaya systema upravleniya*) [Economic Automatic Management Systems] (2016b, 90, 86; see Strukov 2014; Konradova and Schmidt 2014). Other projects were also proposed, such as OGAS (*Obschya-Gosudarstvennaya Avtomatizirovanaya Sistema*) [Nation-wide Automated Economics Control System] by Viktor Mikhailovich Glushkov.

A critical and rapid sequence of innovations in the West during the 1990s, however, set in motion the pattern of information and communication technology convergences that continues to this day. Four main areas are worth emphasizing: the orientation of technology towards users; the launch of the WWW; the promotion of standards and protocols; and the continuing capacity enhancement of ICT infrastructure. The act of replacing earlier command codes by a more user-friendly graphical user interface (GUI) in computer operating systems thrust computing into the broader user domain. The 1991 launch of the WWW by Tim Berners-Lee and CERN researchers transitioned this interface technology to the Internet, initiating market competition around Web browser, search engine, and online platform development. The Web environment introduced two main open protocols: HyperText Mark-up Language (HTML) and HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP). Together they constitute the technical mainstay by which users hyperlink and access uniquely identified digital resources (URI/URL) online among networked computers. Initiatives for a more uniform character encoding of the world's language scripts were also underway. Crucial both for the computational representation of natural language in binary code and for its compatible, interoperable, cross-platform processing and communication among different software applications and devices, it materialized in a first release of Unicode in 1991. Microsoft's launch of the first Unicode-enabled Office suite of applications in the year 2000 effectively ushered in a new period of networked communication that was both global and multilingual.

The bandwidth needed to transmit volumes of data through wired and wireless communication networks have increased exponentially, with digital access shifting from phone dial-up to DSL, cable, cell phone, satellite, and fiber connections. WiFi- and cellular- enabled mobile devices led to personal user flexibility and 24/7 real-time access to the always online Internet. These technologies enable and facilitate users' experience of the WWW, empowering them to create, share, modify, circulate, purchase, and sell content of all types. With the turn to Web 2.0 during the mid-2000s, online digital sites and platforms have become the primary source of information and communication. Successive Web technologies have transformed the digital milieu from static to dynamic, from the mere posting of digitized pages to a massive production of user-generated content (UGC) dependent on automated database and Cloud technologies. The pivotal turn to social networking and social media platforms has opened up a wide vista of possibilities for users: peer-to-peer file (text, video, audio, image) sharing, remix and mashup creation, self-publishing, collaborative networking, data aggregation and syndi-

cation, content curation, metadata tagging, archiving, geolocation, third-party application interfacing, streaming, and tools for producing podcasts, blogs and microblogs. Digital technology users of all types (individuals, businesses, governments, institutions, organizations) now network and communicate through the Internet. An ideology of openness (open source; open access) guides a significant portion of development (Russell 2014). Software — everything from utility apps to games — is in a continual state of flux, propelled by constant feedback loops between content creators and users. Globally, all of these digital technologies thrive in multiple language iterations and environments.

2.4. CAT, localization, and their convergence with MT technologies

Logically, if informational and user-generated content were now overwhelmingly digital, then translation technologies had to follow suit in order to be able to process this content. Like ICT and computing histories, the development and use of specialized CAT and localization tools (and subtitling) were initially constrained to narrow spheres of expertise: software programmers, language engineers, and technical translators. The historical trajectory of digital translation technologies can be usefully envisioned through 'generational' phases (Folaron, forthcoming 2019), particularly through the lens of localization history (Folaron 2006).

The first phase corresponds to the translation and localization of computer software programs. CAT tools are used to create and update terminology and TM databases, the latter relying in part on segmentation algorithms and techniques from earlier MT research. Localization tools apply additional algorithms able to separate a program's source code from its translatable text strings, and to decompile and recompile the program ('convert' between binary and high-level code) to verify functionality in translated, localized versions. Translation management systems (TMS) automate certain procedures of multilingual translation and localization project processes in the workflow, including those of linguistic and technical quality control. Given that a percentage of SL content is repeated in subsequent versions and updates, terms and phrases are kept as uniform as possible so as not to confuse end-users. Over time, and as the number of required target languages has risen, best practices for internationalization and globalization have been integrated into these workflows. (see also Dunne and Dunne 2011)

The second phase focuses on translation of material online for the Web. CAT and localization tool functionalities were expanded in order to handle website UI and content. They include not only the processing of HTML and other types of tagged content but also that of scripting languages inserted in the mark-up languages by Web programmers. The additional technology functionalities separate this Web 'code' from translatable segments so that translators will not delete the tags or cascading style sheet (CSS) and other presentation information needed for successful display of content on the Web. As in the case of general ICTs, the exchange and handling of content-data and its accessibility across diverse platforms and systems without corruption is aided by certain protocols and standards. Within the translation

digital environment, the termbase exchange (TBX), translation memory exchange (TMX), and XML localization interchange file format (XLIFF) protocols provide formats in which to save and share translation and localization data and metadata. As such, translator-users working with different tools can work and share collaboratively. From a cultural perspective, localization for the Web likewise technically adapts certain features: images, icons, currency and payment portals for e-commerce, customized news feeds, and many other dynamic processes.

The third phase follows the turn to Web 2.0, namely the translation and localization of social networking sites and platforms, Web-enabled mobile device apps and games, and the content generated from a number of programs, devices, and online portals and spaces used by consumer-users today. Many traditional CAT and localization functionalities have now merged into more comprehensive digital workspaces that are interactive, collaborative, and able to support an increasing number of world languages. In addition to existing commercial proprietary and open software, leading Internet technology companies like Google have introduced their own online portals and systems for translation. Digital ICTs and translation technologies are currently transitioning into another phase. The recent advances in deep learning and the voluminous data generated online in many languages have allowed MT researchers and developers to refine statistical and neural MT (SMT and NMT) methods and commercialize them through new programs and devices. Not only do LSPs and translation technology companies integrate them into translation management workflows; translators and the public at large use them as well. Automated translation output, including that of apps in real time, is informally or formally post-edited for different degrees of quality or accepted as is for communication purposes. Voice technology research is also underway, as seen by the initiatives to develop voice user interface (VUI) and to give translation capability to virtual digital assistants such as Amazon's Alexa.

3. Translation in concept and practice within a globalizing digital world

3.1. Defining the contemporary digital — concept and practice/s

The perfuse integration of digital technologies in society is undeniable. Moreover, use of the word "digital" in the media and in academic literature as a qualifier for "society" or "culture" implies the deeper connection of a socio-technical state or condition. Benjamin Peters argues for an enriched notion of the word "digital", one that moves beyond the strictly technical and computational realms to embrace the digitally social, in terms of a signifying system that can be interpreted symbolically, indexically, and referentially (2016a, 94). The social and cultural negotiation of meaning within digitally complex structures of communication is similarly highlighted in Felix Stalder's concept of the "digital condition", exemplary by its features of referentiality, communality, and algorithmicity (2018, 3). And as Vincent Miller points out, the material digitality of media has created a fundamentally different communication paradigm when compared to print and broadcast

media; through its binary numerical representation and form (0, 1), digital content (textual, audio, visual) is always inherently programmable, alterable, and subject to algorithmic manipulation by users for production, distribution, and consumption in ICT networks (2011, 15). As long advocated by Lev Manovich, these structural qualities are the reason why software itself, as an intrinsically mediating interface, must be factored into analyses of representation, communication, simulation, decision-making, memory, vision, writing, interaction, and control: it is "a layer that permeates all areas of contemporary societies" (2013, 15). The conflation of technical *and* social networks and digital (im)materiality yield the global digital networks of today. These networks are both global and local. As Manuel Castells observes, the effects of the processes occurring in this dominant digital social structure of global networks are ultimately felt in some way by all, and mirror or echo the social and cultural power dynamics in place (2004, 22). Still, as Adrian Athique asserts, even while "binary computing is the central technology defining social organization and personal interaction in the world today", human-centered problems, concerns, and solutions remain at the core of this technological innovation (2013, 263).

3.2. Digital studies and its approaches

One point of departure for conceptualizing a digital communication framework (translation an integral part) is by way of the principle of "Internet governance", defined by the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) as follows:

Internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector, and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet. (Kurbalija 2016, 5)

The range of multiple stakeholders in the Internet spans a wide variety of actors, from the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), World Trade Organization (WTO), and World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) to Internet Bandwidth Providers (IBPs), Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and users. These actors, and more, all contribute to the convergences, reconfigurations and power dynamics of the thousands of networks (private, local, regional, national, international) that appear and operate within spheres of communication worldwide. The centrality and trans-territorial aspect of this originally decentralized digital infrastructure (a combination of physical hardware, logical standards and protocols, software applications, UGC, and data) in human social interactions has led to a diverse array of analyses. These analyses interrogate the conceptual underpinnings and practices of accessibility, interoperability, digital rights and policies, privacy, security, and the regulation and ownership of data created through digital platforms, all in relation to digital identity and subjectivity, digital authorship, and digital citizenship (Hintz et al. 2019; Kurbalija 2016).

The humanities and social sciences at large, and from differing perspectives, have for centuries probed the existential, ontological, and epistemolog-

ical dimensions of human nature and the human condition, and these in relation to social organization and regulation, cultural production, commercial enterprise, and the notion of rights inscribed in political polities. The gradual penetration and embeddedness of computers, ICTs, Internet, and AI within these relations have engendered their digital dimensions, for instance as digital cultures of connectivity (van Dijck 2013), characterized as collaborative and participatory (Barney et al. 2016; Jenkins et al. 2016). Observations of communities of practice have led researchers to reconfigure disciplinary approaches and to embark on a more profound quest of understanding the subtler nuances of human-machine and machine-machine relations and symbiotic partnerships (e.g. robots). Via philosophy, Luciano Floridi posits human identity itself as one intrinsically informational, formulating a notion of humans as "inforgs" (2014, 96, 6). Through a cultural lens, Vito Campanelli speaks of "machinic subjectivity", one composed of human and machinical / technological components connected to and dependent on digital networks, with networking emerging as a cultural practice that multiplies a human subject's identities and roles (2010, 226). Here, decentralizing forces of heterogeneity compete with centralizing forces of homogeneity with repercussions on linguistic and cultural expression, creating a new vocabulary of Web aesthetics grounded in such increasingly routinized expressions as copy-paste and remix (2010, 21). Manovich, remarking on aesthetic diversity in the expanding context of automated and sophisticated AI practices, proposes a taxonomy of "cultural AI" whose production entails:

- *Selecting* content from larger collections (search, discovery, curation, recommendations, and filtering […])
- *Targeting* content (e.g. one-to-one marketing, behavioral targeting, market segmentation)
- *Assistance* in creation/editing of new content (…AI as 'participation' in content creation)
- *Fully autonomous* creation (e.g., AI writing news articles […], creating visualizations from datasets, designing websites, generating email responses, etc.) (2018, loc 80—81)

These reflections, coupled with the pursuit to understand and know the dynamics and tensions between human and machine-generated intelligences, technologies, and their ensuing forms, are a vital link to exploring the nuances that revolve around informational and communicational practices in the digital world today. The absorption of these practices within spheres conceived by social media relations has guided many in the social sciences to reconceptualize research procedures and reformulate tools and techniques in relation to their disciplinary subjects of inquiry (Ackland 2013). Two such examples are the emergence of digital sociologies (Daniels et al. 2017) and digital geographies (Ash et al. 2019). The digitization, digital creation, and coding of content have likewise sparked the need for digital tools and techniques apt for data mining, statistical analysis, visualization, ethnography (Gold and Klein 2016), and for computer-assisted textual and interpretation analysis (Rockwell and Sinclair 2016) in the digital humanities. Nearly every conceivable domain of study or practice is grappling with the

impact and effects of digital ICTs and the Internet: politics and government; health and social welfare; finance; economics and commerce; law and jurisprudence; education; academia; activism and human rights (see Schreibman et al. 2016; Chadwick and Howard 2009; Kroker and Kroker 2013; Gottlieb 2018; Ziccardi 2013). The quickly approaching Next Internet and "post-Internet society", with their more tightly integrated, converging technologies in the form of deep learning algorithms, the Internet of Things (IoT), inter-Cloud interoperability, big data analytics, and robotics (Mosco 2017) will bring other challenges and issues of accountability as users and devices move across not only the data thresholds between human and machine-generated content, but also those of languages and cultures.

3.3. Translation practices and communication in a digital world

The brief overview of translation and localization technologies provided earlier is indicative of the extent to which translation practices too have evolved in sync with the evolution of the digital world — technologically, technically, socially, and culturally. Hand-in-hand with mainstream technologies, translation technologies (including MT) are reconfiguring translation practices from within an expanding pool and wide diversity of actors, begging the question of who translates what, where, how, and why. Three broad dynamics among users are perceptible. In one, the computing, information, communication, content management, and Web-based collaborative technologies used by the general public are adopted and adapted by professionals in the translation sector for use as well. In another, more purpose-oriented technologies are specifically conceptualized and designed for professional translation work: CAT, localization, translation management, MT, and subtitling tools. In yet another, the concepts and designs for professional translation tools are repurposed for and adopted by the general public wishing to translate, organize, and carry out their own translation and localization projects, whether for low-resource languages, humanitarian causes, activism, or non-profit sectors (Folaron 2013). The initial contacts and encounters between translation and the digital world took shape within a restricted nucleus of language and technology expertise: early MT researchers and the industry stakeholders applying and superimposing the emerging digital technologies and associated production workflows onto traditional processes of human translation. Paradoxically, translation, experts, and the general public in the digital world now seem to have converged. And while target users of translated content may once have been an abstraction to the actors organizing translation and localization production cycles, they are now often concrete digital consumer-users interacting with and reacting to content producers, with community and crowdsourced participants involved as well. Indeed, many projects organized and managed by volunteers and communities have inverted the more traditional and established corporate paradigms. Moreover, analogous to other domains, professional and non-professional users alike involved in translation activities profit from Web 2.0 features; they transmit, exchange, and consult information with ease via portals, video and audio channels, webinars, blogs, digital publications, online

help, chatbot or live agent customer support, remote access technical assistance, knowledge bases, specific communities, etc. As the Internet user base expands, initiatives for social inclusion and accessibility for disabilities too have acquired more value. Translation activity has not only been subsumed in the digital world; it plays an active role in its formation, through the many voices and needs of its users.

3.4. Translation studies in digital context

Academic digital studies and translation studies share important points in common. They are interdisciplinary, with their affiliated research in the humanities and social sciences having grown "organically" out of already existing disciplines. They both share an intersectional relationship with technologies and communication. Like all disciplines, the positioning of the Internet/Web and ICTs as an integral component of research inquiry provokes the daunting question of how to scientifically investigate a complex socio-technical infrastructure whose technologies and effects so rapidly change. For digital studies (or Internet studies, Web studies, network studies) and similarly minded research organizations (Web Science Trust, Oxford Internet Institute, Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society, Internet Interdisciplinary Institute), the approach is one of a network-principled, symbiotic relationship between the Web as structurally technical (with input from computer sciences, engineering, mathematics, data sciences, networking, artificial intelligence) and social (with input from communication and media studies, sociology, anthropology, economics, politics, law, philosophy, history, literary and cultural studies) (see Brügger and Milligan 2019).

For translation studies, approaches to the digital aspects of translation practices have been especially prolific in the research areas of audiovisual and multimedia translation, localization (software, Web, mobile apps, games), accessibility for disabilities, CAT tools, education and training, and in terminology, online interpreting, and corpus-, cognitive-, and process-oriented domains. Given the recent convergences in the industry and market, it is important to note the existing large body of research on MT, even though it has not played a major role traditionally in translation studies. Similar to other disciplines, the early literature (professional and academic) on translation in relation to ICTs and the Internet predominantly focuses on the instrumentality of the new technologies, i.e. with attention as to how they can best be used and incorporated within existing disciplinary objectives and methodologies. Over the past several years, digitally-focused work in translation studies has been gradually widening to embrace topics and issues that are of similar import and concern to digital studies. For instance, there is emphasis on user perspectives, usability, user-centered design, user preferences and priorities, reception and experience, ergonomics, and assessments of quality.

Digital aspects of translation practices have also been introduced within existing translation studies frameworks and paradigms. They include, for example, skopos-oriented approaches, descriptive translation studies re-

search, historical traditions (Sin-Wai 2015), genre and critical discourse analyses, translation and localization strategies, retranslation and reception, tool evaluation, and quality metrics. Equally present are sociologically oriented approaches to translation that analyze professional and non-professional social networks, participatory culture, interactivity, and crowdsourcing and collaborative practices (Jiménez-Crespo 2017). Social network analysis is used to quantitatively, qualitatively, and statistically measure diverse types of social relationships and structures through network and graph theories, for example, translator networks and digital publishing networks. Translated and localized UGC in open content online encyclopedias like Wikipedia, or on discussion lists and social media sites (see Desjardins 2017), are analyzed as well. Other works explore power dynamics (Baumgarten and Cornellà-Detrell 2019) and issues of trust, responsibility, ethics, and translation activity from the perspectives of theory (Pym 2004), digitality (Cronin 2013; Folaron 2010; Folaron 2012), post-industrial, techno-capitalism (Baumgarten and Cornellà-Detrell 2017), globalization (Cronin 2003), and sustainability (Cronin 2016).

Other areas of translation studies research reflect promising potential for linkages with digital studies research. One example regards the actions of stakeholders such as government, business, and civil society groups and individuals. Here, studies focus on translation, localization, and technology in relation to diverse types of policies and censorship (regulatory, social, political), the promotion of open Internet standards as a global, commonly-shared "public good" (Sandrini and García-González 2015), the use of digital media for political or social dissent and activism, and specific areas of human rights such as accessibility, vital information provision, and crisis intervention (Federici 2016). Studies also explore translation in terms of intellectual property law, digital rights, public copyright licenses (Creative Commons), and translated or localized content and metadata in relation to translator rights.

Another example of a relevant research area underscores the motivation for Internet diversity and global inclusivity. In this case, attempts to bridge the "digital divide" are not only technical and technological but also in line with aspirations for a fairer representation of linguistically and culturally diverse social groups, especially for low-resource, less-translated, and sign languages. International uniform character encoding (Unicode) for scripts and languages, user accessibility for transliteration, and the creation of international top-level domain names (IDN-enabled TLDs) are key technical issues. In this regard, localization activity is also critical, whether in the public (governmental, non-profit, NGO) or commercial private domain (see Dunne 2006; Esser et al. 2016; Jiménez-Crespo 2013; O'Hagan and Mangiron 2013; Roturier 2015), with its emphasis on linguistic, cultural, and technical quality adaptation to meet user needs.

Finally, a basic assumption in the digital context is the constant need for users of all kinds to retrain and self-learn. Digital education and training therefore play an important role in research, particularly on how Internet and ICTs (through social media, video-sharing platforms, VoIP, online recording) are used to teach and learn about translation, localization, interpre-

ting, and translation technology practices. Translators-as-users of technology also constitutes a critical research focus. Corpus-based (concept-mapping, terminology, specialized discourse, etc.) and cognitive approaches study not only the challenges posed by digital technologies but also the translator's cognitive space and human-machine interface (Kenny 2017; Jakobsen and Mesa-Lao 2017). Translators and users of translations are implicated in issues of quality with regard to MT output and post-editing as well (O'Brien et al. 2014), with a growing body of research focusing on how MT is used on the public Web.

4. Conclusion

Digital studies and translation studies research are potentially a complementary and natural fit. As sketched out above, many themes and issues are already held in common. They serve as potential bridges for engaging more dynamically with each other. There are distinct advantages for a more sustained encounter between them. For instance, almost all digital studies research is monolingually-focused (see Goggin and McLelland 2009; Gorham et al. 2014); a translation perspective could provide a distinct critical lens through which to consider all digital relations. Taking into account the translational layers of computing, ICT, and Internet-mediated communication would only enrich analyses of the multilingual digital world. By the same token, translation studies could benefit from the different methodologies being tested, tried, and used to research digital information and communication. The deterrents in digital research are multiple. Among them, the technological evolution and co-evolution of social and cultural practices are rapid; continual investment in new technologies is expensive; digital contexts and user practices are not easily defined and managed; huge data sets problematize "quality" and "value"; data types are complex; and researcher expectations do not necessarily coincide with practical realities (Price et al. 2013, 473—475). It is clear that in order for all disciplines to advance with digital research, collaboration on methods and resources across disciplinary lines and the inclusion of skills such as data mining, analytics, visualization, and statistics, need to occur. The development of sound and reliable research practices across linguistically and culturally diverse digital contexts becomes a basis on which to participate in the evolving digital world and respond to pressing questions. How do search engines and algorithms everywhere mediate user access to information and policy-making? What legal and ethical frameworks or guidelines can be created to deal with potential over-reliance on AI (see Broad 2018), machine learning, and commercialized digitally-mediated activities? What accountability should translation have, particularly if it is generated automatically by machine? How can we measure and share data more effectively? In what ways can we contribute to a fairer representation of digital citizenship? In order to participate in these global discussions on digitality, now and in the future, translation studies must position itself wholly within the digital sphere.

References

Ackland, R., 2013. *Web Social Science. Concepts, Data and Tools for Social Scientists in the Digital Age*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Ash, J., Kitchin, R. and Leszczynski, A. eds., 2019. *Digital Geographies*. London: SAGE Publications.

Athique, A., 2013. *Digital Media and Society: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Barney, D., Coleman, G., Ross, C., Sterne, J. and Tembeck, T. eds., 2016. *The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baumgarten, S. and Cornellà-Detrell, J. eds., 2017. Translation in times of technocapitalism. Special issue. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 29(2).

Baumgarten, S. and Cornellà-Detrell, J. eds., 2019. *Translation and Global Spaces of Power*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Broad, E., 2018. *Made by Humans. The AI Condition*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Brügger, N. and Milligan, I. eds., 2019. *The SAGE Handbook of Web History*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Buckland, M., 2017. *Information and Society*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Campanelli, V., 2010. *Web Aesthetics. How Digital Media Affect Culture and Society*. Rotterdam: Institute of Network Cultures and Nai Publishers.

Castells, M. ed., 2004. *The Network Society. A Cross-cultural perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, Ltd.

Ceruzzi, P., 2012. *Computing. A Concise History*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chadwick, A. and Howard, P.N. eds., 2009. *Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics*. New York/London: Routledge.

Cronin, M. 2003. *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge.

Cronin, M. 2013. *Translation in the Digital Age*. London: Routledge.

Cronin, M. 2016. *Eco-Translation. Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*. London: Routledge.

Daniels, J., Gregory, K. and McMillan Cottom, T. eds., 2017. *Digital Sociologies*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Desjardins, R., 2017. *Translation and Social Media. In Theory, in Training, and in Professional Practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dunne, K.J. ed., 2006. *Perspectives on Localization*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Dunne, K.J. and Dunne, E.S. eds., 2011. *Translation and Localization Project Management*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Esser, A., Bernal-Merino, M.Á. and Smith, I.R. eds., 2016. *Media Across Borders. Localizing TV, Film and Video Games*. New York: Routledge.

Federici, F.M. ed., 2016. *Mediating Emergencies and Conflicts. Frontline Translating and Interpreting*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Floridi, L., 2014. *The 4th Revolution. How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Folaron, D., 2006. A discipline coming of age in the digital age. In: K.J. Dunne, ed. *Perspectives on Localization*. American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series. Vol. XIII. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 195—219.

Folaron, D., 2010. Web and Translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 446—450.

Folaron, D., 2012. Digitalizing Translation. *Translation Spaces*, 1, pp. 5—31.

Folaron, D., 2013. Foreword. In: P. Sánchez-Gijón, O. Torres-Hostench and B. Mesa-Lao, eds. *Conducting Research in Translation Technologies*, New Trends in Translation Studies. Vol. 13. Oxford/Bern: Peter Lang. pp. 1—16.

Folaron, D., 2019 forthcoming. Technology, Technical Translation and Localization. In: M. O'Hagan, ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology*. London: Routledge.

Goggin, G. and McLelland, M. eds., 2009. *Internationalizing Internet Studies. Beyond Anglophone Paradigms*. New York: Routledge.

Goggin, G. and McLelland, M. eds., 2017. *The Routledge Companion to Global Internet Histories*. New York: Routledge.

Gold, M.K. and Klein, L.F. eds., 2016. *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gorham, M.S., Lunde, I. and Paulsen, M. eds., 2014. *Digital Russia. The language, culture and politics of new media communication*. London: Routledge.

Gottlieb, B., 2018. *Digital Materialism. Origins, Philosophies, Prospects*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Ltd.

Hintz, A., Dencik, L. and Wahl-Jorgensen, K., 2019. *Digital Citizenship in a Datafied Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hutchins, W.J. ed., 2000. *Early Years in Machine Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Jakobsen, A.L. and Mesa-Lao, B. eds., 2017. *Translation in Transition. Between cognition, computing and technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Jenkins, H., Ito, M. and boyd, D., 2016. *Participatory Culture in a Networked Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jiménez-Crespo, M.A., 2013. *Translation and Web Localization*. London: Routledge.

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

Kenny, D. ed., 2017. *Human Issues in Translation Technology*. London: Routledge.

Konradova, N. and Schmidt, H. 2014. From the utopia of autonomy to a political battlefield: towards a history of the "Russian Internet". In: M.S. Gorham, I. Lunde and M. Paulsen, eds. *Digital Russia: The language, culture and politics of new media communication*, London: Routledge. pp. 34—54.

Kroker, A. and Kroker, M. eds., 2013. *Critical Digital Studies. A Reader. 2nd edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kurbalija, J., 2016. *An Introduction to Internet Governance. 7th edition*. DiploFoundation.

Malinovsky, B.N., 2010. *Pioneers of Soviet Computing. 2nd edition*. Available at: http://www. sigcis. org/files/SIGCISMC2010_001.pdf [accessed 14 May 2019].

Manovich, L., 2013. *Software Takes Command*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Manovich, L., 2018. *AI Aesthetics*. Moscow/London: Strelka Press.

Miller, V., 2011. *Understanding Digital Culture*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Mosco, V., 2017. *Becoming Digital. Toward a Post-Internet Society*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Ltd.

O'Brien, S., Balling, L.W., Carl, M., Simard, M. and Specia, L. eds., 2014. *Post-editing of Machine Translation. Processes and Applications*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

O'Hagan, M. and Mangiron, C., 2013. *Game Localization. Translating for the global digital entertainment industry*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Peters, B. ed., 2016a. *Digital Keywords. A Vocabulary of Information Society and Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Peters, B., 2016b. *How Not To Network A Nation. The Uneasy History of the Soviet Internet*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Poibeau, T., 2017. *Machine Translation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Price, S., Jewitt, C. and Brown, B. eds., 2013. *The SAGE Handbook of Digital Technology Research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Pym, A., 2004. *The Moving Text. Localization, translation, and distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Quah, C.K., 2006. *Translation and Technology*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rockwell, G. and Sinclair, S., 2016. *Hermeneutica. Computer-Assisted Interpretation in the Humanities*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Roturier, J., 2015. *Localizing Apps. A practical guide for translators and translation students*. London: Routledge.

Russell, A.L., 2014. *Open Standards and the Digital Age. History, Ideology, and Networks*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sandrini, P. and García-González, M. eds., 2015. *Translation and Openness*. Innsbruck: Innsbruck University Press.

Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth, J. eds., 2016. *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Sin-Wai, C. ed., 2015. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Stalder, F., 2018. *The Digital Condition*. Trans. V.A. Pakis. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Strukov, V., 2014. The (im)personal connection: computational systems and (post-)Soviet cultural history. In: M.S. Gorham, I. Lunde and M. Paulsen, eds. *Digital Russia: The language, culture and politics of new media communication*, London: Routledge. pp. 11—33.

Van Dijck, J., 2013. *The Culture of Connectivity. A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiberg, M., 2018. *The Materiality of Interaction. Notes on the Materials of Interaction Design*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Ziccardi, G., 2013. *Resistance, Liberation Technology and Human Rights in the Digital Age*. Heidelberg: Springer Dordrecht.

The author

Debbie Folaron, Professeure agrégée, Concordia University, Département d'Etudes françaises/MA in Translation Studies.

E-mail: Debbie.Folaron@concordia.ca

To cite this article:

Folaron, D. 2019, Digital World Communication and Translation, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 9—27. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-1.

КОММУНИКАЦИЯ В ЦИФРОВОМ МИРЕ И ПЕРЕВОД

Д. Фоларон[1]

[1] Университет Конкордия
H3G 1M8, Канада, Квебек, Монреаль, бульвар де Мэзоннёв, 1455

Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-1

Цифровизация, внедрение новых информационных и коммуникационных технологий (ИКТ) и распространение Интернета раздвинули рамки традиционной коммуникации. Новый цифровой мир более не основан исключительно на техничном, утилитарном подходе к использованию технологий; он требует иных форм социального взаимодействия, которое также включает отношения между человеком и технологией. Сегодня цифровые исследования являются актуальным направлением теории перевода. Переводоведение, в свою очередь, также вносит вклад в развитие цифровых исследований. Оба направления неразрывно связаны с изучением языка, информации и коммуникации на основе технологий. В статье освещаются основные этапы развития ИКТ и

этапы развития и использования технологии в переводе. Конвергенция технологий привела к формированию современной цифровой инфраструктуры. В статье охарактеризованы социальные и культурные аспекты цифровизации, а также основные направления цифровых исследований, которые могут получить развитие в теории перевода. Современные аналитические и критические методы исследований процесса перевода инкорпорируют отдельные элементы современного цифрового контекста. Однако существуют веские причины полагать, что перевод может быть полностью контекстуализирован в более широком глобальном коммуникационном пространстве – цифровой среде.

Ключевые слова: *цифровой, перевод, технология, Интернет, коммуникация.*

Список литературы

Ackland R. Web Social Science. Concepts, Data and Tools for Social Scientists in the Digital Age. Los Angeles : SAGE Publications, 2013.

Ash J., Kitchin R., Leszczynski A. (eds.). Digital Geographies. L. : SAGE Publications, 2019.

Athique A. Digital Media and Society: An Introduction. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2013.

Barney D., Coleman G., Ross C., Sterne J., Tembeck T. (eds.). The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Baumgarten S., Cornellà-Detrell J. (eds.). Translation in times of technocapitalism. Special issue. Target : International Journal of Translation Studies, 2017. Vol. 29, №2.

Baumgarten S., Cornellà-Detrell J. (eds.). Translation and Global Spaces of Power. Bristol : Multilingual Matters, 2019.

Broad E. Made by Humans. The AI Condition. Victoria : Melbourne University Press, 2018.

Brügger N., Milligan I. (eds.). The SAGE Handbook of Web History. L. : SAGE Publications Ltd., 2019.

Buckland M. Information and Society. Cambridge : The MIT Press, 2017.

Campanelli V. Web Aesthetics. How Digital Media Affect Culture and Society. Rotterdam : Institute of Network Cultures and Nai Publishers, 2010.

Castells M. (ed.). The Network Society. A Cross-cultural perspective. Cheltenham : Edward Elgar Publishing, Ltd., 2004.

Ceruzzi P. Computing. A Concise History. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 2012.

Chadwick A., Howard P.N. (eds.). Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics. N. Y. ; L. : Routledge, 2009.

Cronin M. Translation and Globalization. L. : Routledge, 2003.

Cronin M. Translation in the Digital Age. L. : Routledge, 2013.

Cronin M. Eco-Translation. Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene. L. : Routledge, 2016.

Daniels J., Gregory K., McMillan Cottom T. (eds.). Digital Sociologies. Bristol : Policy Press, 2017.

Desjardins R. Translation and Social Media. In Theory, in Training, and in Professional Practice. L. : Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Dunne, K.J. ed., 2006. Perspectives on Localization. Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing.

Dunne K.J., Dunne E.S. (eds.). Translation and Localization Project Management. Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.

Esser A., Bernal-Merino M.Á., Smith I.R. (eds.). Media Across Borders. Localizing TV, Film and Video Games. N. Y. : Routledge, 2016.

Federici F.M. (ed.). Mediating Emergencies and Conflicts. Frontline Translating and Interpreting. L. : Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Floridi L. The 4th Revolution. How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2014.

Folaron D. A discipline coming of age in the digital age // Dunne K.J. (ed.). Perspectives on Localization. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2006. P. 195—219.

Folaron D. Web and Translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 446—450.

Folaron D. Digitalizing Translation // Translation Spaces. 2012. Iss. 1. P. 5—31.

Folaron D. Foreword // Sánchez-Gijón P., Torres-Hostench O., Mesa-Lao B. (eds.). Conducting Research in Translation Technologies, New Trends in Translation Studies. Oxford ; Bern : Peter Lang, 2013. Vol. 13. P. 1—16.

Folaron D. Technology, Technical Translation and Localization // O'Hagan M. (ed.). The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology. L. : Routledge, 2019 (в печати).

Goggin G., McLelland M. (eds.). Internationalizing Internet Studies. Beyond Anglophone Paradigms. N. Y. : Routledge, 2009.

Goggin G., McLelland M. (eds.). The Routledge Companion to Global Internet Histories. N. Y. : Routledge, 2017.

Gold M.K., Klein L.F. (eds.). Debates in the Digital Humanities. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Gorham M.S., Lunde I., Paulsen M. (eds.). Digital Russia. The language, culture and politics of new media communication. L. : Routledge, 2014.

Gottlieb B. Digital Materialism. Origins, Philosophies, Prospects. Bingley : Emerald Publishing Ltd, 2018.

Hintz A., Dencik L., Wahl-Jorgensen K. Digital Citizenship in a Datafied Society. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2019.

Hutchins W.J. (ed.). Early Years in Machine Translation. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2000.

Jakobsen A.L., Mesa-Lao B. (eds.). Translation in Transition. Between cognition, computing and technology. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2017.

Jenkins H., Ito M., Boyd D. Participatory Culture in a Networked Era. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2016.

Jiménez-Crespo M.A. Translation and Web Localization. L. : Routledge, 2013.

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

Kenny D. (ed.). Human Issues in Translation Technology. L. : Routledge, 2017.

Konradova N., Schmidt H. From the utopia of autonomy to a political battlefield: towards a history of the "Russian Internet" // Gorham M.S., Lunde I., Paulsen M. (eds.). Digital Russia: The language, culture and politics of new media communication. L. : Routledge, 2014. P. 34—54.

Kroker A., Kroker M. (eds.). Critical Digital Studies. A Reader. 2nd ed. Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Kurbalija J. An Introduction to Internet Governance. 7th ed. DiploFoundation, 2016.

Malinovsky B.N. Pioneers of Soviet Computing. 2nd ed. 2010. URL: http://www.sigcis.org/files/SIGCISMC2010_001.pdf (дата обращения: 14.05.2019).

Manovich L. Software Takes Command. N. Y. : Bloomsbury, 2013.

Manovich L. AI Aesthetics. Moscow ; L. : Strelka Press, 2018.

Miller V. Understanding Digital Culture. Los Angeles : SAGE Publications, 2011.

Mosco V. Becoming Digital. Toward a Post-Internet Society. Bingley : Emerald Publishing Ltd., 2017.

O'Brien S., Balling L.W., Carl M., Simard M., Specia L. (eds.). Post-editing of Machine Translation. Processes and Applications. Newcastle-upon-Tyne : Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

O'Hagan M., Mangiron C. Game Localization. Translating for the global digital entertainment industry. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2013.

Peters B. (ed.). Digital Keywords. A Vocabulary of Information Society and Culture. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 2016a.

Peters B. How Not To Network A Nation. The Uneasy History of the Soviet Internet. Boston, MA : Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2016b.

Poibeau T. Machine Translation. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 2017.

Price S., Jewitt C., Brown B. (eds.). The SAGE Handbook of Digital Technology Research. L. : SAGE Publications, 2013.

Pym A. The Moving Text. Localization, translation, and distribution. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.

Quah C.K. Translation and Technology. L. : Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Rockwell G., Sinclair S. Hermeneutica. Computer-Assisted Interpretation in the Humanities. Cambridge : The MIT Press, 2016.

Roturier J. Localizing Apps. A practical guide for translators and translation students. L. : Routledge, 2015.

Russell A.L. Open Standards and the Digital Age. History, Ideology, and Networks. N. Y. : Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Sandrini P., García-González M. (eds.). Translation and Openness. Innsbruck : Innsbruck University Press, 2015.

Schreibman S., Siemens R., Unsworth J. (eds.). A New Companion to Digital Humanities. Malden, MA : Wiley Blackwell, 2016.

Sin-Wai C. (ed.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology. Abingdon : Routledge, 2015.

Stalder F. The Digital Condition. Trans. V.A. Pakis. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2018.

Strukov V. The (im)personal connection: computational systems and (post-)Soviet cultural history // Gorham M.S., Lunde I., Paulsen M. (eds.). Digital Russia: The language, culture and politics of new media communication. L. : Routledge, 2014. P. 11—33.

Van Dijck J. The Culture of Connectivity. A Critical History of Social Media. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2013.

Wiberg M. The Materiality of Interaction. Notes on the Materials of Interaction Design. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 2018.

Ziccardi G. Resistance, Liberation Technology and Human Rights in the Digital Age. Heidelberg : Springer Dordrecht, 2013.

Об авторе

Дебби Фоларон, доцент, кафедра французских исследований, Университет Конкордия, Монреаль, Канада.

E-mail: Debbie.Folaron@concordia.ca

Для цитирования:

Folaron D. Digital World Communication and Translation // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 9—27. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-1.

TRANSLATION AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS[1]

Ch. Schäffner[1]

[1] Aston University,
Aston Triangle, Birmingham, B4 7ET, UK
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2

This paper will illustrate how discourse analysis had been incorporated in Translation Studies. Discourse Analysis originated in Applied Linguistics and refers to the investigation of language in use. Depending on whether the term 'discourse' is understood in a narrower or a wider sense, discourse analysis aims at examining the structure and the function of language in various contexts and/or at revealing patterns of belief and habitual action, as well as social roles and power relations (Critical Discourse Analysis). Since translation can be characterised as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries, with source text and target text representing language in use, concepts and methods of discourse analysis have been found useful for Translation Studies. The paper will provide some examples of such research.

Keywords: *discourse, discourse analysis, genre conventions, translation quality, ideology.*

1. Introduction

Translation has often been characterised as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In this process, what is normally called a source text (ST) is transferred into a target text (TT). The most obvious difference between ST and TT is the language in which the two texts are written. However, the transfer process is also characterised by omissions, additions, structural changes and other shifts which a translator has made in respect of the translation's purpose (its *Skopos*, Vermeer 1996), the addressees of the TT, and other factors such as genre conventions or ideological considerations. Translators are faced with texts whose content and linguistic structure depend on the specific aim for which they have been produced, in short, they represent language in use. The investigation of language in use is the domain of Discourse Analysis, a sub-area of Applied Linguistics. In this paper, concepts and methods of discourse analysis will be introduced with a special focus on how they have been made useful for Translation Studies. The paper will start with definitions of discourse, followed by some examples to illustrate how methods of discourse analysis have been applied in translation research, and concluding with some implications for future research.

2. What is discourse?

The term 'discourse' is essentially linked to Applied Linguistics and refers to investigations of language in use, which can be both written and spoken interaction. Language in use is always socially situated, contextualised

[1] This paper builds on and expands the description in Schäffner (2013).

in time, space, and culture, and fulfilling specific communicative purposes. Whereas the traditional structural linguistics focused on language as a system, studying language in use thus also implies consideration of the concrete situation, the communicative partners, as well as the wider sociocultural context.

As is frequently the case in the humanities, there is not one generally agreed definition of 'discourse'. As argued by van Dijk (1997: 1), the notion of discourse is "essentially fuzzy" despite the "ubiquitous presence of the term 'discourse' in the humanities, the social sciences and even in the mass media". This view is shared by Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 14) when they say that many academic disciplines "now see discourse as an important theoretical and empirical focus for them". The fuzziness of 'discourse' is reflected in diverse definitions and also in a variety of analytical methods. 'Discourse' has been defined in a wider or a narrower sense. In a narrower sense, the term has been used to describe oral communication, for example, teacher-student or doctor-patient interaction. In this sense, 'discourse' is set apart from the term 'text' which is reserved for written communication. In fact, 'discourse' and 'text' are sometimes used as synonyms, with both referring to anything beyond the sentence, which contributes to the fuzziness of both notions. In a wider sense, 'discourse' has been used as an umbrella term for both text and talk to signal commonalities beyond one individual text. Such common features can be related to text typologies and genres (e.g. common features of the genre of recipes), or to a specific author (e.g. the discourse of Barack Obama), or to a specific field (e.g. the discourse of education), or to a common topic or ideology (e.g. the discourse of feminism, the discourse of the far-right). In this last respect, discourse usually includes various genres. For example, the discourse of feminism can include academic publications, promotional leaflets, newspaper articles, letters. Moreover, it can include written documents, transcripts of oral talk, audio- or videotaped material, on-line communication, etc., thus integrating written and oral communication. In this view, which is also informed by sociolinguistics, texts are instances of discourse.

Other scholars build on the work by Foucault (e.g. 1972) for whom discourse is the way in which knowledge is organised, talked about and acted upon in different institutions. In this tradition, 'discourses' are defined as "conventional ways of talking that both create and are created by conventional ways of thinking. These linked ways of talking and thinking constitute ideologies (sets of interrelated ideas) and serve to circulate power in society" (Johnstone 2002: 3). In this broad sense, discourse analysis goes beyond the linguistic aspect and aims at revealing patterns of belief, patterns of habitual action, and social roles and power relations. Such aspects are also the focus of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA, e.g. Fairclough 1995) which sees discourse as a form of social practice. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 81) argue that within CDA, 'discourse' can also refer to "signification as an element of the social process" and they suggest to use the term 'semiosis' for this most general sense of 'discourse'. As a consequence, discourse analysis would also be "concerned with various 'semiotic modalities' of which language is only one (others are visual images and 'body language')" (ibid). In this view, 'discourse' is understood in a very broad view beyond 'language in use'.

3. How can discourse be analysed?

The notion of 'discourse' scholars adhere to as well as their specific research aims influence the way they go about analysing discourse. Jaworski and Coupland (1999:14) argue for a "broad and inclusive perspective on the concept of discourse", adding that "discourse, however we define it, has focally to do with language use." Discourse analysis is thus essentially an investigation of the structure and function(s) of text and discourse as they occur in context. Although van Dijk (2008: 2) argues that "discourse analysis is not a method but rather a domain of scholarly practice", suggesting to speak of Discourse Studies rather than of Discourse Analysis, Discourse Analysis is more widely used and scholars frequently speak of methods of discourse analysis (e.g. Wood and Kroger 2000, Wetherell et al. 2001). Within this domain, a variety of methods have been used, depending on the aims of investigation. Titscher et al (2000), for example, compare twelve different methods of text and discourse analysis, among them content analysis, functional pragmatics, ethnomethodologically oriented methods, and CDA approaches. Principal traditions of discourse studies are also covered in *The Discourse Reader* (Jaworski and Coupland 1999), and the various methods and approaches are regularly illustrated in the journals *Discourse Studies* and *Discourse & Society*.

As Johnstone (2002: 8) says, "the basic question a discourse analyst asks is 'Why is this text the way it is? Why is it no other way? Why these particular words in this particular order?'" Such questions focus both on structural and discursive characteristics of texts and on the social motivations and conditions. A CDA perspective, by extension, would add questions such as 'What does the structure of an individual text reveal about the wider discourse? How do texts and discourse reflect social structures and power?' etc.

Research which is interested more in the structure of texts as actual instances of discourse has made use of concepts (e.g. cohesion, coherence, speech act, rhetorical purpose) that have their origin in other sub-disciplines of Applied Linguistics, such as text linguistics, pragmatics, systemic functional linguistics, stylistics, rhetorics. CDA approaches which are committed to studying discourse as text and talk in and as social practices also draw on concepts (e.g. identity, power, ideology, hegemony) from disciplines such as sociology, critical theory, political studies, cultural studies).

Since texts are instances of discourse, methods of text linguistics and discourse analysis often overlap. Texts too are examples of language in use, and this understanding is clearly obvious in de Beaugrande and Dressler's definition of text as a "communicative occurrence" (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3). They specify further that a text has to meet seven standards of textuality, and if "any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative" (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3). The seven standards (explained in de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3—13) are cohesion ("the ways in which the components of the surface text […] are mutually connected within a sequence"), coherence ("the ways in which the components of the textual world […] which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant"), intentionality ("concerning the text pro-

ducer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions"), acceptability ("concerning the text receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver"), informativity ("the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain"), situationality ("the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence"), and intertextuality ("the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts"). Cohesion and coherence are text-centred notions, intentionality and acceptability are user-centred notions, but all seven standards are mutually related. Intertextuality can be seen as directly linked to discourse, and the knowledge of previously encountered texts can relate to an overarching theme (e.g. environmental protection) or to characteristic features of a text type, or genre (e.g. job offer, instruction for use).

Another large area of discourse analysis has been informed by Halliday's work on systemic functional linguistics (SFL, e.g. Halliday 1978), which is based on a view of language as social semiotic. Halliday's main interest is in investigating language as communication, studying how language is used to construe meaning as people interact in a specific situational and cultural context. Meaning is evident in the linguistic choices made by an author. The language used, and thus the features of a text, are derived from the features of the situation in which it is used (this is similar to the standard of situationality). Key concepts in this model are discourse, genre and register. Discourse is enacted by conventionalized genres of which texts are individual instantiations. Genres are understood as "the conventional text type that is associated with a specific communicative function" (Munday 2012a: 138). That is, they are defined through the overall communicative purpose of the interaction and are thus super-ordinate to register features. Register links the variables of the situational context to language variation and choice. It is described by three areas of contextual activity: what is actually taking place, the event and subject matter (field), who is taking part, the type of interpersonal role interactions (tenor), and the form of communication, e.g. written or spoken (mode). Field, tenor and mode collectively make up the register membership of a text, and they are related to three meta-functions, or discourse semantics: field to the ideational function, tenor to the interpersonal function, and mode to the textual function. The expression of content constitutes the ideational function, the way language is used to encode and (re)present our experience of the world (lexico-grammatically realized, for example, in specific terminology, nominalisation, transitivity). The role relationship between the communicative partners (status, level of formality) as influencing language choice constitutes the interpersonal function (realized for example in pronouns, modality). The textual function refers to the linguistic realisation of mode, and comprises aspects of textuality such as cohesion, thematic organisation, text types (e.g. expository, argumentative).

Since social practices construct power and ideologies, CDA approaches, as a "problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement" (Fairclough et al. 2011: 357) have a special interest in revealing the discursive (re)produc-

tion of power and social inequality. In Fairclough's model of CDA, discourse analysis comprises "(a) interdiscursive analysis, and (b) language analysis" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 85). Interdiscursive analysis identifies the genres, discourses and styles that are drawn upon. Genres are "semiotic ways of acting and interacting", discourses are "ways of representing aspects of the world", and styles are "ways of being, social identities, in their semiotic aspect" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 82). In his analysis of the discourse of New Labour, Fairclough (2000) identified a hybrid discourse, and also a representation of the world as involving change. He noticed that in a speech by Tony Blair, 'change' is "metaphorically represented as a force of nature, […] as an entity with causal powers" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 87). This can be seen in the use of 'change' as a nominalization and in the subject position of sentences (e.g. 'change that sweeps the world). This example reminds of the ideational function in SFL.

4. Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies

Translation as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries, as text-production for addressees in a new cultural context, typically involves two texts in two languages, which represent language in use and in context. Translation itself is a form of language in use. Based on this view, concepts and methods of discourse analysis have been found useful for Translation Studies. For translation purposes, scholars (predominantly those who work with linguistics-oriented approaches) have referred to concepts from discourse analysis as a toolkit for investigating textual structure and meaning. There is thus also a variety in the ways discourse analysis has been incorporated in Translation Studies. Only in a few publications is a systematic discourse analytical model presented in more detail (especially Hatim and Mason 1990, 1997, Trosborg 1997, 2002, House 1977, 1997, Munday 2012b). These models, despite minor differences, draw on Halliday's SFL and combine the concept of discourse with the concepts of register, genre, and text. Neubert and Shreve's textual model (1992) which builds on de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) can be given as another example. Other scholars have used concepts and methods of discourse analysis for identifying culture-specific genre conventions, for conducting a detailed pre-translational source text analysis, for comparing STs and TTs with a view of assessing their appropriateness and quality, and for uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation. Some examples of such research will now be provided for illustration.

4.1. Translation-oriented discourse analytical models

Neubert and Shreve's approach (1992, also Neubert 1985) is explicitly built on the text linguistic model of de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) with its standards of textuality. They mainly speak of 'text' and hardly of 'discourse'. Translation is defined as a text-induced activity, more specifically as source text induced target text production (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 43). The text is treated as the unit of translation. They argue that translation in-

volves the displacement of texts (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 37), a retextualisation of the ST in a new environment. Both ST and TT need to meet the seven standards of textuality, and they give illustrative examples of how these standards can be made useful for translation, especially for ST analysis and assessing the appropriateness of the TT. Since STs and TTs are located in different contexts, translators need to apply various strategies to adjust the TT to its new situation. The situationality of a text in its L1 context and the corresponding translation in the L2 context can be shared (as in the case of users of instruction manuals) or displaced (as in the case of a political speech). The standard of intertextuality is presented as probably the "most important aspect of textuality for the translator" (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 117). They argue that translations having "double intertextuality". Not only is there a relationship between ST and TT, but the "source text has intertextual relationships with other source-language texts. The translation will establish new relationships with existing L2 texts" (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 118). The translator is thus expected to produce "an L2 text approached by L2 users as if it were a naturally occurring instance of their communicative culture" (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 119). The authors also acknowledge that translation can be instrumental in introducing genres to a culture and can result in changes of genre conventions. Translation is thus characterized as "mediated intertextuality" (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 123).

The work by Hatim and Mason, Trosborg, House, and Munday is informed by SFL. For these scholars, the unit of discourse analysis is the text as an individual, concrete occurrence, and 'discourse' indicates a higher level which involves regular patterns in the use of language by social groups in areas of socio-cultural activity. Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) presented an elaborate analytical framework for textual and contextual variables, essentially building on Halliday's model but also incorporating standards of textuality, speech act theory, and politeness theory. Their main aim is to develop a unifying approach by which all the diverse forms, modes, and fields of translating and interpreting can be explained. They use 'discourse' in a wider sense as "modes of speaking and writing which involve social groups in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of sociocultural activity (e.g. racist discourse, bureaucratese, etc.)" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 216). An essential element of their model is register analysis, i.e. an analysis of field, tenor and mode through the realizations of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions in STs and TTs. The application of their discourse analytical model is illustrated with various examples, addressing, among others, cross-cultural differences in generic structures. As a case in point, they show differences in argumentative text types in English and Arabic. English texts are usually characterised by a pattern of counter-argumentation, in contrast to Arabic discourse which shows a preference for through-argumentation. A paragraph starting with 'of course' could thus lead to a different interpretation if it were translated literally. As they argue, "[t]he lexical token 'of course' is conventionally associated with text-initial concession in English but its token-for-token equivalent in these other languages [i.e. Eastern languages as Arabic and Farsi] often introduces not a concession to be countered but a case to be argued through" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 152). In their

1997 book, they illustrate the impact of factors of cultural asymmetry and ideology on translation. One telling example is an English translation of a Spanish text on ancient Mexicans. Analysing the discourse features of lexical choice, cohesion, transitivity and presupposition as an important component of intentionality, they note that as a result of the systematic shifts in the language used, the "different text world of the target text relays a different ideology" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 153). They argue that cumulatively, all the features analysed "relay discourses which point to two fundamentally opposed ideologies: destiny as personal commitment in the source text and history as passive observation in the target text" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 158, see also. Mason 2009).

Halliday's SFL has also been used as a framework for training purposes and for translation quality assessment (e.g. by Trosborg and House), sometimes in combination with contrastive genre and text type analysis. Such research will now be illustrated.

4.2. Pre-translational source text analysis

Trosborg (2002) presents her approach, mainly based on Halliday's register analysis and on Swales' genre analysis (e.g. Swales 1990), as a model of pre-translational text analysis in a training context. For Swales, a "genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. […] In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience." (Swales 1990: 58). Trosborg's model is very complex, covering extra-textual parameters (situational aspects, genre) and intra-textual parameters. All these parameters are presented in detail. She uses field, tenor and mode for a description of the speech situation, and the three meta-functions (ideational, interpersonal, textual function) to investigate how the text unfolds. On the basis of a concrete ST, she illustrates how these three functions are realized in features of the language used, such as lexical chains or metaphors for the ideational function, the level of formality or grammatical complexity for the interpersonal function, and cohesion or thematic progression for the textual function. Although her model is primarily based on SFL, she also incorporates speech act theory, semantic theory, text typology, frame semantics, etc. She argues that an "eclectic approach has been chosen, as the aim has been to bring in theoretical aspects that contribute to a deeper understanding of the text regardless of a strict adherence to one particular theory" (Trosborg 2002: 10). The didactic application is indeed her main aim, using the model to help students "to create a deep understanding of the source text (ST) by means of a detailed analysis of it. Understanding the text in full gives the translator a thorough overview and a possibility of maintaining or adapting the ST in a conscious way to meet the demands of the target text (TT) skopos when producing the TT" (Trosborg 2002: 9).

Didactic aims are also evident is other publications which illustrate how discourse analysis can be made useful for the teaching of translation (e.g. Kim 2007, Colina 1997). The comparative analysis of genres has been partic-

ularly prominent in this respect. Genres as conventionalised communicative events are culture-specific, and translators need to be aware of potential differences in the genre conventions. Colina (1997), for example, makes use of contrastive rhetoric in addition to concepts from text linguistics, genre analysis, and discourse analysis, to investigate differences in the recipe genre in English and Spanish. Characteristic features of English recipes are, among others, absence of prepositions in the list of ingredients, omission of definite articles (e. g. 'heat oil in a pan'), imperative as the most common mood to give instructions. Spanish recipes, in contrast, make use of prepositions and articles, and imperatives or the se-passive are the dominant tense and mood. Colina illustrates how familiarising the students with the genre conventions has resulted in fewer cases of direct transference of ST textual features into the TT. She argues that "a significant improvement in the work of students exposed to explicit instruction is indicative of the benefit of pedagogical intervention" (Colina 1997: 335).

4.3. Translation shifts analysis

In addition to research into genres and genre conventions, there are also investigations into more specific features of texts, often conducted in a descriptive way for reflecting on implications of cultural differences for translation. Such studies include the investigation of the functioning of speech acts (e. g. requests, apologies) or politeness phenomena across languages and cultures (e. g., House 1998), or of discourse markers (e. g. House 2015 on linking constructions), rhetorical devices, lexical repetition, etc. (e. g. the chapters in the edited volume by Trosborg 1997). Some such descriptive research was aimed at identifying patterns in actual translation practices, e. g. shifts in coherence and cohesion (Blum-Kulka 2004), or shifts in transitivity which can cause a shift in the ideational function of the text (Calzada Pérez 2001, Mason 2004). Calzada-Pérez (2001) analysed speeches presented in both Spanish and English in the European Parliament. For example, she identified cases where ST material processes were rendered in the TT as non-material processes, as illustrated in the following quote where the material process expressed by 'castigar' (literally: punish) is rendered as a mental process:

> Spanish Source text: … *en dos regiones especialmente <u>castigadas</u> con otras dos reestructuraciones …*
>
> English Target text: … *in two regions that have already <u>suffered</u> particularly heavy from …*

Calzada-Pérez also argues that the translations in her corpus often sound natural and do not normally stay close to the transitivity patterns in the TT.

Also focusing on transitivity shifts, Mason (2004) compared translations of speeches produced in the European Parliament and of articles in the UNESCO *Courier* (English, French, and Spanish). He identified examples of shifts of transitivity in both cases, and also noted that the translations of the speeches to the European Parliament "stay relatively close to the transitivity patterns observable in the source texts" (thus not confirming the findings by Calzada-Pérez) whereas "UNESCO *Courier* translators display greater lati-

tude" (Mason 2004: 475). Mason sees the political sensitivity of the speeches on the one hand and the ease of processing in the field of journalism on the other hand as the main reason for this difference. Such more or less subtle differences in the findings of research (here in respect of the European Parliament speeches) also indicate that more empirical research involving a variety of texts and genres, language pairs, and communicative settings are required to understand the complexity of language in use, i.e. discourse, in translation.

4.4. Translation quality assessment

One of the first publications to argue for the relevance of SFL for translation quality assessment is House (1977, with a revised model in 1997). She uses Halliday's register analysis with its categories of field, tenor and mode as well as his notion of genre for a comparative analysis of originals and translations. As a first step, a profile of the ST register is produced on the basis of a detailed analysis. This is followed by a description of the ST genre as realized by the register and a statement of function. The same process is carried out for the TT, and then the profiles of ST and TT are compared in order to identify mismatches or errors. On the basis of the profile comparison, a statement of quality is made for the translation which can then be categorised as overt or covert translation (for a summary of the model see also Munday 2012a:140–144). House views equivalence as "the fundamental criterion of translation quality" (House 1997: 31), and her original model was rather rigid in its invariance requirements. In her revised model, overt and covert translation are seen as a cline, and more attention is paid to the translation brief and socio-cultural constraints as influencing the translation strategy. In a covert translation, i.e. "a translation which enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture" (House 1997: 69), equivalence needs to be achieved at the level of genre and the individual text function, which may require changes on the level of text and register to account for culture-specific discourse preferences.

4.5. Uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation

Since every text is embedded in a discursive context, as well as in wider socio-historical, sociopolitical, ideological and institutional contexts, social aspects of discourse have recently seen more attention, also in translation research. As already illustrated above, Hatim and Mason (1997) address the impact of factors of ideology and agency on translation. In their recent work, they have extended this focus of their discourse analytic approach. For example, Hatim (2009: 37) argues that "situational appropriateness established by registers, together with textual well-formedness, generic integrity and a discourse perspective, may more helpfully be seen as layer upon layer of 'socio-textual practice'". Speaker's attitudes are conveyed in and through discourse, and texts thus become vehicles for the expression of ideology and power relations. Or, "[f]eatures of texts thus conspire with discursive practices and collectively act on society and culture" (Hatim 2009: 49). Textual

features concern ideational choices (e. g. in the linguistic system of transitivity, passivisation), interpersonal choices (e. g. in the linguistic systems of mood and modality), and in the way the text is structured through mode (e. g. suppressed agency).

Also in respect of agency, Munday (2012b) investigates the linguistic signs of a translator's intervention and evaluation shifts. His discourse analytical model is amended by the addition of appraisal theory (Martin and White 2005), which, as an extension of Halliday's work on the interpersonal meta-function, describes components of a speaker's attitude, the strength of that attitude (graduation), and speaker's engagement. Munday (2012b) focused on attitudinal meanings, whereas Munday (2015) "explores the potential for the use of engagement resources and graduation as a means of determining translator/interpreter positioning" (Munday 2015: 406). This is illustrated with the effect of shifts in reporting verbs in political documents. For example, rendering 'claim' in the English source text as 'afirmar (affirm) in the Spanish translation means that the Spanish text "could be read either neutrally as a statement of fact or even positively as an affirmation of appropriate ethical behaviour" (Munday 2015: 414). Munday argues that such an approach can uncover values inserted into a text by the translator and identify those points in a text that have most evaluative potential. Appraisal theory has also been used for translation analysis by Rosa (2013) and Manfredi (2018) for analysing literary and news translation, respectively.

Some work in Translation Studies has been informed by CDA. For example, based in Fairclough's model of discourse combined with corpus linguistics, Baumgarten (2009) analysed various English translations of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The work by Daghigh et al (2018) too is inspired by CDA. Specifically making "use of the linguistic tools of different CDA frameworks" (Daghigh et al 2018: 200) applied to a corpus of Persian translations of English opinion articles, they propose a typology of manipulative strategies and a typology of manipulation techniques which are related to the strategies. They argue that such a typology "could help researchers investigate the manipulations that translators perform to meet the socio-political expectations of the target community" (Daghigh et al 2018: 198).

5. Implications for future research

As this paper has tried to illustrate, discourse analysis in its variety has been used in translation research for several purposes. In particular, linguistics-oriented translation researchers have found it useful for investigating the structure and meaning of a text. In evaluating Hatim and Mason's work, Munday (2012a: 152) argues that they deal with a large number of concepts but that it "is not clear that their approach constitutes a model that can be 'applied' in the conventional sense of the word." He suggests that "[a]lternatively, the authors' proposals can be taken as a list of elements to be considered when examining translation." (Munday 2012a: 152). Both Translation Studies and discourse analysis have developed further in the last years, which also provides scope for exploring synergies. The evolution of

the use of discourse analysis in Translation Studies and current research is presented in a special issue of the journal *Target* (Munday and Zhang 2015). For future research, using discourse analysis and CDA for uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation is a particularly promising area which also fits the growing interest in power, ideology and agency in Translation Studies. The analysis of a variety of texts as discourse, including multimodal texts, can also contribute to a critical reflection on the explanatory power of the concept of 'discourse' and the value of specific analytical methods. As Zhang and Pan (2015: 387) argue in respect of their own study, "the application of concepts from SFL in detailed text analysis and from CDA in the overall discussion may better reveal how different models of discourse analysis can supplement each other and be applied to translation studies." And finally, a combination of the more traditional linguistically oriented discourse analysis with sociological perspectives can provide deeper insights into the complexity of discourse and translation as language in use.

References

Baumgarten, S., 2009. *Translating Hitler's "Mein Kampf.". A corpus-aided discourse-analytical study*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr Müller.

Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler, W., 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S., 2004. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. pp. 290—305.

Calzada Pérez, M., 2001. A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies. *Target,* 13(2), pp. 203—239.

Colina, S., 1997. Contrastive Rhetoric and Text-Typological Conventions in Translation Teaching. *Target,* 9(2), pp. 335—353.

Daghigh, A.J., Sanatifar, M.S. and Awang, R., 2018. A taxonomy of manipulative operations in political discourse translation. A CDA approach. *Forum,* 16(2), pp. 197—220.

Fairclough, N., 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N., 2000. *New Labour. New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J. and Wodak, R., 2011. Critical Discourse Analysis. In: T. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, London: Sage. pp. 357—378.

Fairclough, I. and Fairclough, N., 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M., 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on language* (tr. S.S. Smith). New York: Harper.

Halliday, M.A.K., 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hatim, B., 2009. Translating text in context. In: J. Munday, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 36—53.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I., 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. London/New York: Longman.

Hatim B. and Mason, I., 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

House, J., 1977. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Narr.

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

House, J., 1998. Politeness and Translation. In: L. Hickey, ed. *The Pragmatics of Translation*, Clevedon: Avon. pp. 54—71.

House, J., 2015. Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts. *Target,* 27(3). pp. 370—386.

Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. eds., 1999. *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge.

Johnstone, B., 2002. *Discourse Analysis.* Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.

Kim, M., 2007. Using Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education. An Illustration with a Focus on Textual Meaning. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer,* 1(2). pp. 223—246.

Manfredi, M., 2018. Investigating ideology in news features translated for two Italian media. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 19(2). pp. 185—203.

Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R., 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave.

Mason, I., 2004. Text parameters in translation: transitivity and institutional cultures. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*, New York and London: Routledge. pp. 470—481.

Mason, I., 2009. Discourse, ideology and translation. In: M. Baker, ed. *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge. pp. 83—95.

Munday, J., 2012a. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and applications*. 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Munday, J., 2012b. *Evaluation in translation. Critical points of translator decision-making*. London and New York: Routledge.

Munday, J., 2015. Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning. *Target,* 27(3). pp. 406—421.

Munday, J. and Zhang, M. eds., 2015. Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies. *Target,* 27(3).

Neubert, A., 1985. *Text and Translation.* Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Neubert, A. and Shreve, G.M., 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent and London: Kent State University Press.

Rosa, A.A., 2013. The power of voice in translated fiction. Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies. In: C. Way, S. Vandepitte, R. Meylaerts and M. Bartłomiejczyk, eds. *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 223—245.

Schäffner, C., 2013. Discourse Analysis. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Vol. 4. pp. 47—22.

Swales, J., 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E., 2000. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Trosborg, A., 1997 Text typology: Register, genre and text type. In: A. Trosborg, ed. *Text typology and translation*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 3—23.

Trosborg, A., ed., 1997. *Text typology and translation.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Trosborg, A., 2002. Discourse Analysis as Part of Translator Training. In: C. Schäffner, ed. *The role of discourse analysis for translation and translator training,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 9—52.

van Dijk, T.A., 1997. The Study of Discourse. In: T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction,* London: Sage. Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process. pp. 1—34.

van Dijk, T.A., 2008. *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vermeer, H.J., 1996. *A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against).* Heidelberg: TEXTconTEXT.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., Yates, S.J., 2001. *Discourse Theory and Practice. A Reade*r. London: Sage.

Wood, L. and Kroger, R.O., 2000. *Doing Discourse Analysis. Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zhang, M. and Pan, H., 2015. Institutional power in and behind discourse. A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao. *Target*, 27(3). pp. 387—405.

The author

Dr Christina Schäffner, Aston University, Birmingham, UK.
E-mail: c.schaeffner@aston.ac.uk

To cite this article:
Schäffner, Ch. 2019, Translation and Discourse Analysis, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 28—42. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2.

ПЕРЕВОД И ДИСКУРС-АНАЛИЗ

К. Шеффнер

Астонский университет
B4 7ET, Великобритания, Бирмингем,
Астон Трайангл
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2

Проанализировано использование методов дискурс-анализа в переводоведении. Дискурс-анализ зародился в прикладной лингвистике и традиционно применяется для выполнения широкого спектра лингвистических исследований. В зависимости от того, понимается ли термин 'дискурс' в узком или широком смысле, дискурс-анализ имеет целью изучение структуры и функции языка в различных контекстах его употребления и / или выявление закономерностей, убеждений, действий, а также социальных ролей и властных отношений (критический дискурс-анализ). Поскольку перевод можно трактовать как акт коммуникации, преодолевающей лингвистические и культурные границы, а исходный текст и текст перевода есть акт использования языка, то концепции и методы дискурс-анализа могут с успехом применяться в переводоведении. Даны примеры использования дискурс-анализа для проведения подобного рода исследований.

Ключевые слова: *дискурс, дискурсивный анализ, характеристики жанра, качество перевода, идеология.*

Список литературы

Baumgarten S. Translating Hitler's "Mein Kampf.". A corpus-aided discourse-analytical study. Saarbrücken : VDM Verlag Dr Müller, 2009.

Beaugrande R. de, Dressler W. Introduction to Text Linguistics. L. : Longman, 1981.

Blum-Kulka S. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: L. Venuti, ed. The Translation Studies Reader. L. : Routledge, 2004. P. 290—305.

Calzada Pérez M. A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies // Target. 2001. Vol. 13, №2. P. 203—239.

Colina S. Contrastive Rhetoric and Text-Typological Conventions in Translation Teaching // Target. 1997. Vol. 9, №2. P. 335—353.

Daghigh A. J., Sanatifar M. S., Awang R. A taxonomy of manipulative operations in political discourse translation. A CDA approach // Forum. 2018. Vol. 16, №2. P. 197—220.

Fairclough N. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. L. : Longman, 1995.

Fairclough N. New Labour. New Language? L. : Routledge, 2000.

Fairclough N., Mulderrig J., Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis // T. van Dijk (ed.). Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. L. : Sage, 2011. P. 357—378.

Fairclough I., Fairclough N. Political Discourse Analysis. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012.

Foucault M. The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on language / tramsl. S.S. Smith. N. Y. : Harper, 1972.

Halliday M.A.K. Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. L. : Edward Arnold, 1978.

Hatim B. Translating text in context // Munday J. (ed.). The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. Abingdon : Routledge, 2009. P. 36—53.

Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the translator. L. ; N. Y. : Longman, 1990.

Hatim B., Mason I. The Translator as Communicator. L. : Routledge, 1997.

House J. A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Tübingen : Narr, 1977.

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

House J. Politeness and Translation // Hickey L. (ed.). The Pragmatics of Translation. Clevedon : Avon, 1998. P. 54—71.

House J. Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 370—386.

Jaworski A., Coupland N. (eds.). The Discourse Reader. L. : Routledge, 1999.

Johnstone B. Discourse Analysis. Malden ; Oxford : Blackwell, 2002.

Kim M. Using Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education. An Illustration with a Focus on Textual Meaning // The Interpreter and Translator Trainer. 2007. Vol. 1, №2. P. 223—246.

Manfredi M. Investigating ideology in news features translated for two Italian media // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19, №2. P. 185—203.

Martin J.R., White P.R.R. The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. Basingstoke ; N. Y. : Palgrave, 2005.

Mason I. Text parameters in translation: transitivity and institutional cultures // Venuti L. (ed.). The Translation Studies Reader. N. Y. ; L. : Routledge, 2004. P. 470—481.

Mason I. Discourse, ideology and translation // Baker M. (ed.). Critical Readings in Translation Studies. L. : Routledge, 2009. P. 83—95.

Munday J. Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and applications. 3rd ed. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012a.

Munday J. Evaluation in translation. Critical points of translator decision-making. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012b.

Munday J. Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 406—421.

Munday J., Zhang M. (eds.). Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3.

Neubert A. Text and Translation. Leipzig : Enzyklopädie, 1985.

Neubert A., Shreve G.M. Translation as Text. Kent ; L. : Kent State University Press, 1992.

Rosa A.A. The power of voice in translated fiction. Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies // Way C., Vandepitte S., Meylaerts R., Bartłomiejczyk M. (eds.). Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2013. P. 223—245.

Schäffner C. Discourse Analysis // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2013. Vol. 4. P. 47—22.

Swales J. Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Titscher S., Meyer M., Wodak R., Vetter E. Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis. L. : Sage, 2000.

Trosborg A. Text typology: Register, genre and text type // Trosborg A. (ed.). Text typology and translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1997. P. 3—23.

Trosborg A. (ed.). Text typology and translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1997.

Trosborg A. Discourse Analysis as Part of Translator Training // Schäffner C. (ed.). The role of discourse analysis for translation and translator training. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 2002. P. 9—52.

van Dijk T.A. The Study of Discourse // van Dijk T.A. (ed.). Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction. L. : Sage, 1997. Vol. 1 : Discourse as Structure and Process. P. 1—34.

van Dijk T.A. Discourse and Power. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Vermeer H.J. A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against). Heidelberg : TEXTconTEXT, 1996.

Wetherell M., Taylor S., Yates S.J. Discourse Theory and Practice. A Reader. L. : Sage, 2001.

Wood L., Kroger R.O. Doing Discourse Analysis. Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text. Thousand Oaks : Sage, 2000.

Zhang M., Pan H. Institutional power in and behind discourse. A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 387—405.

Об авторе

Кристина Шеффнер, профессор, Университет Астон, Бирмингем, Великобритания.

E-mail: c.schaeffner@aston.ac.uk

Для цитирования:

Schäffner C. Translation and Discourse Analysis // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, № 3. С. 28—42. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2.

TEXTUAL, MORAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL VOICES OF TRANSLATION

K. Taivalkoski-Shilov[1]

[1] School of Languages and Translation Studies
University of Turku
Koskenniemenkatu 4, 20014 Turku, Finland
Submitted on April 30, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-3

The concept of voice has engendered a growing amount of research in translation studies in the last decades, especially regarding literary translation. Voice is typically used in studies that investigate stylistic or structural characteristics of translated texts, intertextuality and other forms of multivocality and ethical questions related to agency, ideology and power in translation and interpreting. The first part of this article defines two essential concepts related to voice in translation — voice and text — and describes the state of the art of research in this field. The second part aims to deepen the discussion on voice in translation studies by introducing the notion of the voice of conscience from philosophy and political science and the notion of inner voices from psychology.

Keywords: *translation, interpreting, voice, text, ethics, voice of conscience, inner voice.*

1. Voice as a concept in translation studies

In the last three decades the notion of 'voice' has become a productive concept and tool for text analysis especially in research on literary translation. Ever since the seminal texts written by Mossop (1983), Folkart (1991), Hermans (1996) and Schiavi (1996), this notion and its neighboring concepts (e. g., Lefevere's 1992 idea of translation as 'rewriting') have enabled translation scholars to pinpoint textual and social phenomena of translation that had escaped earlier researchers, not only in the field of translation studies but also in literary and cultural studies (see, e. g., Schiavi 1996, 2, 9—16, Susam Sarajeva 2006, 7—8, 15).

Folkart (1996, 127) has defined voice as 'a cluster of textual features that gives the impression of being attributable to a single source of enunciation' (Taivalkoski-Shilov's (2018, 7) translation). Voice is then part of a 'text' that could be defined as a "part or result of an act" that has "a purpose in communicating in a concrete context" and has material existence in some per-

[1] I am very much indebted to Annjo K. Greenall who participated in writing the discussion on the voice of conscience in an earlier version of text that was added to this article, but who does not want to be mentioned as a co-author (see also footnote 7). Many thanks also to Hanne Jansen, Cecilia Alvstad and Roberto Valdeón for their input. Last but not least, thanks to Yves Gambier for inviting me to contribute to this volume and to Turo Rautaoja for correcting my English.

ceivable form (see Johansen & Larsen 2002, 118)[2]. According to my interpretation, the textual features that are the components of voice can appear in several modes; most typically they appear in oral or written form, but also other visual, auditive, as well as tactual forms are possible since texts may consist of sounds, writing, numbers, symbols, images, graphs, gestures (e.g., sign language) and material that is perceivable also to the touch (e.g., tactile interpreting, drumming).[3] This is especially true of texts studied within translation and interpreting studies, which go far beyond printed texts and are often multimodal. Furthermore, the textual features of voice emanate — or have been created to make believe that they emanate — from the same identity, as if they had the same textual DNA, so to say. Consequently, a voice can be traced by searching for recurring patterns expressing a "semantic and axiological belief system" (see Bakhtin [1981]2004, 304—305) in a text.

Empirical research on voice in translation does not only involve analysis of translated texts, their originals and parallel texts (non-translated texts in the same genre, written in the target language). Research can also be conducted on the 'contextual voices' of translation, that is, voices that "arise in the context around the translated text, and not as part of the translated text in its strictest sense" (Alvstad & Assis Rosa 2015, 4). In such cases the object of analysis often comprises voices of real people who "produce, promote and write about translations" (Alvstad & Assis Rosa 2015, 4): translators, interpreters, editors, publishers, authors, critics, readers, journalists, teachers, translation scholars, translator and interpreting trainers and so forth. Contextual voices can yield valuable information about the "complex machinery in motion behind every single translation" (Alvstad, Greenall, Jansen & Taivalkoski-Shilov 2017b, 3), not only during the translation process but also related to the reception of translated texts.

The concept of 'voice' has traveled to translation studies from several origins: general language, the theory of enunciation, narratology, stylistics, feminist theory, and linguistics, among others. Consequently, it is a polysemous, complex concept which has both metaphorical and non-metaphorical meanings (Alvstad 2013; Taivalkoski-Shilov & Suchet 2013, 1—2). The majority of studies published on voice in translation studies are related to the following phenomena,[4] which are partly overlapping and often interrelated:

[2] My definition of 'text' comes from semiotics since most glossaries and dictionaries of translation studies do not include a definition of text (naturally most have a definition of 'source text' and 'target text', but not of text alone). Johansen & Larsen (2002, 118) write: "In short, a *text* is a part or result of an act, whereas *signs* are potential conveyors of meaning which can be actualized (activated) in a text or as a text. Texts are not simply locatable results of acts; they have material existence — even if only sound frequencies — and they can therefore be perceived in their distinctiveness and variety in relation to other phenomena and to other texts, or as individual copies of the same text. And they can be perceived by a single or practically unlimited number of receivers." Furthermore, Johansen & Larsen (2002, 119) point out that "any object can function as a text, i.e. be included as a conveyor of meaning in a sign-process, a semiosis."

[3] In theory, a text can also consist of olfactory and gustatory material. Such texts do not, however, (yet) belong to the domain of translation studies.

[4] My estimation is based on the following sources: Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography on-line and BITRA: Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation.

— style in translation
— narrative structure and point of view in translation
— quality in translation and interpreting
— translation/interpreting and ideology
— textual ownership, visibility and audibility in translation/interpreting
— social roles in translation/interpreting
— power relations in the production or reception of translated/interpreted text
— intertextuality and influence in translation
— the impact of translated/interpreted texts on translators, interpreters and readers
— multimodal and -semiotic aspects of voice
— theoretical considerations

It should be noted that the above-mentioned phenomena may be discussed without explicit reference to the term 'voice' even within what could be called the 'voice paradigm', under headings such as 'style', 'multilingualism', 'hybridity', 'agency', 'visibility' and so forth (Taivalkoski-Shilov & Suchet 2013, 2). The common denominator between studies that either explicitly or implicitly refer to the term 'voice' is that they often deal with the overarching themes of identity, social roles and power in translation and interpreting and discuss how they materialize as textual traces.

An essential element in applying the notion of voice to translation studies is to highlight the subjectivity of any type of human communication, including translation and interpreting. This helps, on the one hand, in rectifying uninformed assumptions about translation and interpreting and, on the other hand, in empowering translators and interpreters, who for centuries have been accused of being traitors. Translated and interpreted texts cannot be identical copies of their originals because they are always mediated and received in a different cultural, geographical, or at least temporal[5] context. Studies that have likened translating and interpreting to quoting and reported discourse (see Mossop 1983 and 1998; Folkart 1991; Taivalkoski-Shilov 2006; Hermans 2007, among others) have pointed out that modalities of reception and reframing affect all forms of reported utterances (Folkart 1991, 15, see also Chesterman & Baker 2008, 16, 19). In spite of the fact that translations are not identical copies of their originals, they usually mediate the message of the source text sufficiently well; translation is a matter of similarity, not absolute sameness (see Chesterman 2007).

Power is another central issue related to the notion of voice in translation. Folkart (1991) introduced the idea of translation as a conflict of enunciations. For Folkart (1991, 393—394) the main conflict in translation was between the translator and the author of the original text. Studies that have succeeded her book have stressed that the conflict concerns more agents of translation: co-translators, ghost translators, copy editors, publishers, critics and even ordinary readers (see Alvstad, Greenall, Jansen & Taivalkoski-Shilov 2017a). Jansen & Wegener (2013) coined the term 'multiple translator-

[5] In the case of simultaneous interpreting, the temporal context is almost the same, but still not identical.

ship' to draw attention to the agency of other parties in translation processes and their impact on translational products. The idea of multiple translatorship has helped to envisage translation and interpreting as a matter of constant circulation and confrontation between voices. Literary translations and their paratexts, as well as non-literary translations to a certain extent, involve several kinds of voices that reveal the "tangle of subjectivities" inherent in the production and reception of any translated text (Alvstad et al. 2017b, 3—4). The tangle of subjectivities does not only relate to textual phenomena such as hybridity or polyphony in translated fictional texts, where the 'translator's voice'[6] often adds into the multiplicity of voices of different characters, narrators and points of view (see Taivalkoski-Shilov & Suchet 2013, 3—9). Real persons engaging in translation matters can also become tangled, owing to conflicting interests, cultural differences and varying standards of what is good and bad practice (see Greenall, Alvstad, Jansen & Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2019, 641). Consequently, voice is closely related to the ethics of translation and interpreting because it is from the circulation and confrontation of voices and multiplicity of points of view that the necessity of an ethics of translation emerges in the first place.

In spite of the fact that research on voice in translation often addresses issues that have important ethical dimensions (see Greenall et al. 2019) and even though translation ethics discusses dilemmas between personal ethical convictions and professional ethical guidelines (see Chesterman & Baker 2008, 20—21) that are good examples of clashing voices within the individual mind, considerations on inner voices have been scarce in translation studies. The remainder of this article discusses these voices by investigating how the notion of voice has been addressed by some scholars in political science, philosophy and psychology. As we shall see, the inner, moral and psychological voices of translation are related to the textual and contextual voices of translation that have so far been the focus of the 'voices paradigm'.

2. The moral dimension of voice in translation

Van Wyke (2010, 111) writes that the ethics of translation "addresses what is considered the morally correct manner in which one should practice the task of rewriting a text in another language." Ethics of translation can be seen in a larger scope to embrace interpreting, aspects of research on translation and interpreting (conducting research, publishing, peer reviewing etc.) as well as translator and interpreter training. As Koskinen (2000, 14) points out, the ethics of translation presupposes a multiplicity of choice: there are several options for translating or interpreting a given text as well as for doing research on translation and interpreting. If this were not the case, there

[6] "For Barbara Folkart the translator's voice manifests itself as deviations and interventions when the translator does not totally manage to hide her/his presence in the text. […] Theo Hermans defines voice as a discursive presence but for him, too, the translator's discursive presence, *or* voice only becomes discernible when contextual factors oblige the translator to reveal her/himself." (Taivalkoski-Shilov & Suchet 2013, 5.)

would be no need for ethical considerations, which are necessary only when one has to choose between more than one option. And when a decision has been made, other parties — and the introspecting self (see below) — can judge the choice from the point of view of ethics and morality (Koskinen, 2000, 14). Making choices always involves responsibility (*ibid*.).

Ethical[7] considerations emanate from both collective and individual sources. Put differently, two kinds of voices seem to guide translatorial action: on the one hand, collective, external voices, which are nevertheless internalized, that is, mediated through the individual's socialized consciousness, and which articulate norms and common guidelines give relief in the abundance of possible choices (see Koskinen 2000, 15—16). As an example of an articulation of this kind of a collective, external voice one can mention the Translator's Charter published by FIT ([1963/1994] 2011), which lists general obligations of the translator, rights of the translator and also guidelines concerning the economic and social position of the translator as well as translators' associations on the national and international levels. On the other hand, there are inner voices that monitor the translator's behavior from an ethical point of view. In particular, there is the 'voice of conscience', which is a common metaphor both in general language and in Western ethico-political thought. This voice is an "internal voice of a moral injunction, the voice which issues warnings, commands, admonishments, the voice which cannot be silenced if one has acted wrongly […]" (Dolar 2006, 83). The voice of conscience can be understood as the more or less solidified outcome of an individual's dialogical[8] interactions with external voices to reach their own, personal conclusions regarding right or wrong, good or bad. The influence of this voice may become especially perceptible in the situations mentioned above, where personal moral convictions clash with professional guidelines. For instance, I hypothesize that Katharine Gun, a British government translator, who was tried for treason because she had leaked to the newspapers an American top-secret request to bug United Nations (UN) diplomats with the aim to win a UN resolution that would authorize the invasion of Iraq (see Chesterman & Baker 2008, 20), was more influenced by the voice of her conscience than translators' professional codes that strictly prohibit divulging clients' secrets (see, e.g., FIT, Translator's Charter section I, 10). Gun reportedly commented on the case: "I didn't feel at all guilty about what I did, so I couldn't plead guilty even though I would get a more lenient sentence" (*The Guardian* 26 February 2004, Chesterman & Baker 2008, 20). She won her case thanks to the pleas of many international celebrities (Chesterman & Baker 2008, 20).

[7] From this paragraph onwards until the concluding remarks the text had been initially written by myself and edited and amended by Annjo Klungervik Greenall. That version has been partly rewritten and completed with examples to make the text fit the whole argument of this article. I am very grateful to Greenall for her contribution.

[8] This formulation and the thoughts it represents are, of course, in no small measure inspired by the so-called 'dialogism' of M.M. Bakhtin (e.g. Bakhtin 1981).

Ethical reflection in the socialized individual can in fact be understood as "hearing voices" (Dolar, 2006, 83), or as an internalized dialogue between external suggestions and inner principle(s), between differing points of view. It was Socrates who outlined the main principles of Western ethics of conscience, on the basis of the notion of conscience found in Greek tragedies (Ojakangas, 2013, 213—218). In Plato's Socratic dialogues *Apology* and *Hippias Major*, Socrates talks about voices that later philosophers have interpreted as voices of conscience: the voice of "a divine or spiritual sign" and that of a "close relative" that had rightfully guided his actions (Dolar, 2006, 83—84; Ojakangas, 2013, 214).

In the course of history there have been many shifts and reinterpretations in the understanding of the notion of conscience and its vehicle, voice. The Church fathers and other theologists, philosophers from antiquity to modern times, and psychoanalysts such as Freud and Lacan have all discussed the voice of conscience from different perspectives. Interestingly, the translation of this term has also had an impact on the way the concept has been understood: for instance, the influence of Saint Jerome on Western discussions on conscience is well known (Ojakangas, 2013, 3, 8, 41—42, 228—229). In spite of differing views on the locus and nature of conscience, the general consensus seems to be that the voice that speaks within us and guides our actions is not ours, but the voice of the "other"; it does not grown from within, but is molded by external influences. As to what this "other" is, opinions are divided: "is it God, nature, tradition, freedom, pure practical reason, parents, society, a crack in the ontological edifice of the universe, or what?" asks Ojakangas (2013, 8).

Furthermore, conscience has generally been regarded as the precondition of essential moral concepts such as duty, obligation, and responsibility, and even freedom, resoluteness, and faith. The fundamental dogma of Occidental ethics draws a parallel between virtue and the voice of conscience: the highest authority for a 'man of virtue' is his inner voice that makes him disregard public opinion or self-interest and primarily seek the benefit of the whole world. This again brings to mind the example of Katharine Gun, mentioned above, as well as all the martyrs of translation and interpreting, such as the Bible translator William Tyndale, who lost his life at the stake. Taking notice of the voice of conscience then implies closing oneself off from the world. According to the Occidental dogma, those who hear the call of consience are few and far between; the majority obey the rules and norms mechanically, and when they transgress them, they do so out of recklessness (Ojakangas, 2013, 3, 8, 228—229).

Not all inner voices, even those attributed to conscience, are altruistic in nature and lead to good actions. Even some enemies of humanity, such as national socialist thinkers, seem to have genuinely believed that the notions of conscience and inner truth constituted the basis of their ideology (perhaps surprisingly, even Hitler mentions conscience several times in *Mein Kampf*). For Ojakangas (2013, 28; see also Haffner, 2002, 286—287), the paradox between the idea of the voice of conscience and Nazi ideology might be explained by the fact that the young adherents of National Socialism were molded into an unthinking and irresponsible mass entity. Conditions where

adherents of certain ideologies are molded into an unreflecting mass and where there is no room for the personal, individual voice of conscience might explain why communities of translators and interpreters have at some points of history behaved immorally. Post-colonial studies on translation have pointed out sinister cases of translation history where translation and interpreting were systematically used as a means of colonization (see, e.g., Cheyfitz 1991, Niranjana 1992, to mention just a few).

The voice of conscience can thus lead to actions that benefit the whole world or, in some conditions, its false appearances can lure individuals and masses to crimes against humanity, other living beings, and cultural heritage. In the end, ethics is essentially an affair of distinguishing righteous voices from evil ones, whether emanating from collective or individual sources. The idea of a constant battle between beneficial and malign forces over the human soul is very old and perceptible in the visual arts. For instance, in medieval depictions of the patron saint of Paris, Saint Genevieve, we can see an angel and the devil fighting in the background (Ross 1996, 101). In contemporary comics and cartoons the figures of the 'shoulder angel' and 'shoulder devil' (Kowalski 2012, 68), which appear near a character's ears in an ethical dilemma, represent the voices of conscience and temptation, respectively. The shoulder angel urges the character to 'do the right thing',[9] while the shoulder devil suggests a more egotistical course of action. Here, the shoulder angel and devil are personifications of the inner voices that influence decision-making.

3. From the voice of conscience to psychological voices

In the definition of text given at the beginning of this article, one of the defining characteristics was that texts have a material existence in some perceivable form. Since voice is a cluster of textual features, voices must also assume a perceptible form. How does this suit the notion of inner voices? Do they have a material existence? As Dolar (2006, 83) asks regarding the voice of conscience: "Is it the voice that one actually hears, or is the internal voice still a voice, or is a voice that has no empirical manifestation perhaps the voice in the proper sense, closer to the voice than the sounds one can physically hear?" According to empirical research on psychology, voices may actually appear as quasi-perceptual experiences within a human consciousness. In fact, these inner voices, or "imagined speech production", materialize to a certain extent. According to Tian and Poeppel (2012, 1), neuroimaging studies have shown that mental imagery and the corresponding perceptual processes, such as those in the visual, auditory, somatosensory, and olfactory domains, are mediated by common neural substrates. Furthermore, the tangibility and force of normally functioning inner speech have been shown in research, which demonstrates that the imagined voice has the

[9] The same goes for derivatives of the shoulder angel, such as Jiminy Cricket in Disney's version of *Pinocchio*. Many thanks to Hanne Jansen for the reference to Jiminy Cricket, which led me to the idea of the shoulder angel and devil as personifications of moral and immoral voices.

power to attenuate the perception of co-occurring, identical external sounds. This is normally a technique the brain uses to help the self distinguish between the external sounds of one's own voice and those of others, but experiments have shown that inner imaginings can also attenuate co-occurring, identical sounds spoken by others (Scott, 2013).

Inner voices have been amply discussed and analyzed in the field of psychology and related disciplines. Since Freud, psychologists have, similarly to philosophers and theologians, claimed that our inner voice, the one that helps us stay on the straight and narrow, is intimately related to outer voices. In psychoanalytic terms, the voice of the 'superego' (Freud) is the voice of a psychic structure that "is the depository of parental injunctions and prohibitions" which causes inner guilt in case of transgressions (Akhtar, 2009, 285, 835). This voice represents an internalization of the rules of society or of professional norms, such as those formulated by collective translational voices, which were mentioned above. More recent psychological research also stresses the social, yet autonomous, nature of inner voices, relating them to self-regulation, on the one hand, and to pathological cases — schizophrenia, hallucinations — on the other (illnesses that in ancient times were seen as the workings of the devil).

In his book *The Voices Within*, Fernyhough (2017, 99—101) presents a so-called Dialogic Thinking model, which takes as its point of departure that children, as they grow, internalize conversations with others, thus forming the basis for their own inner dialogues with themselves. According to Fernyhough, our internalization of dialogues with others "means that the thinking we do in words will share some of the features of the conversations we have with others, which are in turn shaped by the interactional styles and social norms of our culture" (Fernyhough, 2017, 14—15). Furthermore, this thinking "guides our actions" (Fernyhough, 2017, 18). Consequently, "the voices within" have very similar functions as the voice of conscience as described above.

The difference between healthy and pathological voice-hearing, according to Fernyhough (2017, 96—97, 239—240), is that in the case of the former, the "voices in the head", despite the fact that they often contain or are influenced by others' perspectives and points of view, are perceived as coming from oneself, while in the case of the latter, the voices are perceived as belonging to someone else and not recognized as coming from oneself. In fact, there may seem to be reason to believe that the pathological cases are due to some kind of malfunction of this inner speech, one that causes a wrong attribution of voices (see also Tian & Poeppel, 2012, 6—7).

The reality of mental voices in those who are healthy as well as those who are ill has been confirmed by neurological research, which shows that the brain has the capacity to produce a mental copy of external speech, either as the given individual is actually speaking, or if he or she is not (Scott, 2013). Other studies have shown that it is possible to lose inner speech without losing other parts of consciousness or other, non-verbal forms of thinking. This can happen, for example, as a result of left-hemisphere hemorrhage (Tononi et al. 2016, 409). Consequently, voice does not seem to be the very foundation of human consciousness, but it is nevertheless an essential part of it.

4. Concluding remarks

The purpose of this article was to contribute to research on voice in translation in two ways. On the one hand, my aim was to clarify the notions of voice and text, which have not yet been defined explicitly enough within this discipline. One the other hand, I wanted to open new avenues for research on voice in translation and interpreting by putting forward the notions of the 'voice of conscience' and 'inner voices'. The voice of conscience has explanatory power in investigating ethical aspects of translating and interpreting, especially in cases where social rules and professional norms are at odds with the outcome of a translation or interpreting event. It is also a useful concept in translator and interpreter training. Inner voices and the way they are interconnected with outer voices help explaining the way norms of translation are interiorized. The notion of inner voices might also be useful in empirical studies on interpreting, since they might be a factor that affects the interpreter's concentration in some circumstances. The idea of the interconnectedness of inner and outer voices may also help analyzing phenomena where translators and interpreters become uneasy or even traumatized by textual voices they have to mediate through their own voice, for instance in cases where they have to use the first person pronoun when interpreting in court testimonies of victims who have experienced extreme violence (see Hermans 2007; Taivalkoski-Shilov & Suchet 2013, 6—7).

References

Alvstad, C., 2013. Voices in Translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Vol. 4. pp. 207—210.

Alvstad, C., Assis Rosa, A., 2015. Voice in Retranslation: An Overview and Some Trends. *Target. Special iss.: Voice in Retranslation*, 27(1), pp. 3—24.

Alvstad, C., Greenall A.K., Jansen H. and Taivalkoski-Shilov K., eds., 2017a. *Textual and contextual voices of translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. BTL 137.

Alvstad, C., Greenall A. K., Jansen H. and Taivalkoski-Shilov K., 2017b. Introduction: Textual and contextual voices of translation. In: C. Alvstad, et al., eds. *Textual and contextual voices of translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. BTL 137. pp. 3—17.

Akhtar, S., 2009. *Comprehensive dictionary of psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M.M., 2004. *The dialogic imagination*. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Chesterman, A., 2007. Similarity analysis and the translation profile. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 21(1.1), pp. 53—66.

Chesterman, A. and Baker, M., 2008. Ethics of renarration. (Interview with Mona Baker). *Cultus*, 1(1), pp. 10—33.

Cheyfitz, E., 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dolar, M., 2006. *A voice and nothing more*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Fernyhough, C., 2017. *The voices within: The history and science of how we talk to ourselves*. London: Profile books / Wellcome [sic] collection.

FIT Translator's Charter, https://www.fit-ift.org/translators-charter/, 2011.

Folkart, B., 1991. *Le conflit des énonciations: Traduction et discours rapporté*. Montreal: Balzac.

Folkart, B., 1996. Polylogie et registres de traduction: Le cas d'Ulysses. *Palimpsestes*, 10, pp. 125—140.

Greenall, A.K., Alvstad, C., Jansen, H. and Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. 2019. Introduction: Voice, Ethics and Translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*. Special iss.: Voice, Ethics and Translation, 27(5), pp. 639—647.

Haffner, S., 2002. *Defying Hitler*. Translated by O. Pretzel. New York: Picador.

Hermans, T., 1996. The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target*, 8(1), pp. 23—48.

Hermans, T., 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Jansen, H. and Wegener, A., 2013. Multiple Translatorship. In: H. Jansen and A. Wegener, eds. Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation. *Vita Traductiva*, 2(1). Montreal: Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre. pp. 1—39.

Johansen, J.D. and Larsen, S.E., 2002. *Signs In Use. An Introduction to Semiotics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kolwalski, D.A., 2012. *Moral theory at the movies: An introduction to ethics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Koskinen, K., 2000. *Beyond ambivalence: Postmodernity and the ethics of translation*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. Available at: http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:951-44-4941-X [accessed 17 March 2019].

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

Mossop, B., 1983. The Translator as Rapporteur: A Concept for Training and Selfimprovement. *Meta*, 28(3), pp. 244—278.

Mossop, B., 1998. What is a Translating Translator Doing? *Target*, 10(2), pp. 231—266.

Niranjana, T., 1992. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ojakangas, M., 2013. *The voice of conscience: A political genealogy of Western ethical experience*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Ross, L., 1996. *Medieval art: A topical dictionary*. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

Schiavi, G., 1996. There Is Always a Teller in a Tale. *Target*, 8(1), pp. 1—21.

Scott, M., 2013. Corollary discharge provides the sensory content of inner speech. *Psychological Science*, 24 (9), pp. 1824—1830.

Susam-Sarajeva, Ş., 2006. *Theories on the Move: Translation's Role in the Travels of Literary Theories*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, K., 2006. *La tierce main: Le discours rapporté dans les traductions françaises de Fielding au XVIIIe siècle*. Arras: Artois Presses Université.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. 2019. Ethical issues regarding machine(-assisted) translation of literary texts. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 27 (5), pp. 689—703. https:// doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1520907.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. and Suchet, M., 2013. Voice in the Field of Translation Studies / De questionnement en questionnement. In : K. Taivalkoski-Shilov and M. Suchet, eds. *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles/Intratextual Voices in Translation. Vita traductiva*. Vol. 1. Montreal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre. pp. 1—30.

Tian, X. and Poeppel, D., 2012. Mental imagery of speech: linking motor and perceptual systems through internal simulation and estimation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6. pp. 1—11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00314.

Tononi, G., Boly, M., Gosseries, O. and Laureys, S., 2016. The neurology of consciousness: An overview. In: S. Laureys, O. Gosseries and G. Tononi, eds. *The Neurology of Consciousness: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuropathology*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Elsevier. pp. 407—461.

Wyke, B. van, 2010. Ethics and translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 111—115.

The author

Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, Professor, School of Languages and Translation Studies, PhD, University of Turku, Finland.
E-mail: kristiina.taivalkoski-shilov@utu.fi

To cite this article:
Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. 2019, Textual, moral and psychological voices of translation, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 43—55. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-3.

ТЕКСТОВЫЕ, МОРАЛЬНЫЕ И ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ГОЛОСА ПЕРЕВОДА

К. Тайвалкоски-Шилов[1]

[1] Школа языков и перевода, Университет Турку
20014, Финляндия, Турку, Коскеннименкату, 4
Поступила в редакцию 30.04.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-3

В последние десятилетия концепция голоса привлекла внимание многих ученых, специализирующихся в области исследований перевода, в особенности литературного. Понятие 'голос' обычно используется для анализа стилистических или структурных характеристик текстов перевода, интертекстуальности и других форм мультивокальности, а также вопросов этики, касающихся свободы воли, идеологии и власти. Первая часть данной статьи характеризует два основных концепта теории голоса в переводоведении (голос и текст) и современное состояние исследований в данной области. Вторая часть статьи представляет собой более глубокое осмысление понятия 'голос' в переводческих исследованиях в контексте соотнесенных понятий «голос совести» в философии и политологии и «внутренний голос» в психологии.

***Ключевые слова**: перевод, устный перевод, голос, текст, этика, голос совести, внутренний голос.*

Список литературы

Alvstad C. Voices in Translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2013. Vol. 4. P. 207—210.

Alvstad C., Assis Rosa A. Voice in Retranslation: An Overview and Some Trends // Target. 2015. Special iss.: Voice in Retranslation. Vol. 27, №1. P. 3—24.

Alvstad C., Greenall A.K., Jansen H., Taivalkoski-Shilov K. (eds.). Textual and contextual voices of translation. Amsterdam : John Benjamins. BTL 137, 2017a.

Alvstad C., Greenall A. K., Jansen H., Taivalkoski-Shilov K. Introduction: Textual and contextual voices of translation // Alvstad C. et al. (eds). Textual and contextual voices of translation. Amsterdam : John Benjamins. BTL 137, 2017b. P. 3—17.

Akhtar S. Comprehensive dictionary of psychoanalysis. L. : Routledge, 2009.

Bakhtin M.M. The dialogic imagination / transl. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin, TX : The University of Texas Press, 2004.

Chesterman A. Similarity analysis and the translation profile // Belgian Journal of Linguistics. 2007. Vol. 21, №1.1. P. 53—66.

Chesterman A., Baker M. Ethics of renarration (interview with Mona Baker) // Cultus. 2008. Vol. 1, №1. P. 10—33.

Cheyfitz E. The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1991.

Dolar M. A voice and nothing more. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 2006.

Fernyhough C. The voices within: The history and science of how we talk to ourselves. L. : Profile books / Wellcome [sic] collection, 2017.

FIT Translator's Charter. 2011. URL: https://www.fit-ift.org/translators-charter/ (дата обращения: 01.04.2019).

Folkart B. Le conflit des énonciations: Traduction et discours rapporté. Montreal : Balzac, 1991.

Folkart B. Polylogie et registres de traduction: Le cas d'Ulysses // Palimpsestes. 1996. №10. P. 125—140.

Greenall A.K., Alvstad C., Jansen H., Taivalkoski-Shilov K. Introduction: Voice, Ethics and Translation // Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice. 2019. Vol. 27, № 5. P. 639—647.

Haffner S. Defying Hitler / transl. by O. Pretzel. N. Y. : Picador, 2002.

Hermans T. The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative // Target. 1996. Vol. 8, №1. P. 23—48.

Hermans T. The Conference of the Tongues. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2007.

Jansen H., Wegener A. Multiple Translatorship // Jansen H., Wegener A. (eds.). Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation // Vita Traductiva. Montreal : Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, 2013. Vol. 2, №1. P. 1—39.

Johansen J.D., Larsen S.E. Signs In Use. An Introduction to Semiotics. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2002.

Kolwalski D.A. Moral theory at the movies: An introduction to ethics. Lanham : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012.

Koskinen K. Beyond ambivalence: Postmodernity and the ethics of translation. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2000. URL: http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:951-44-4941-X (дата обращения: 17.03.2019).

Lefevere A. Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame. L. : Routledge, 1992.

Mossop B. The Translator as Rapporteur: A Concept for Training and Self-improvement // Meta. 1983. Vol. 28, №3. P. 244—278.

Mossop B. What is a Translating Translator Doing? // Target. 1998. Vol. 10, №2. P. 231—266.

Niranjana T. Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context. Berkeley : University of California Press1992.

Ojakangas M. The voice of conscience: A political genealogy of Western ethical experience. N. Y. : Bloomsbury, 2013.

Ross L. Medieval art: A topical dictionary. Westport, Connecticut ; L. : Greenwood Press, 1996.

Schiavi G. There Is Always a Teller in a Tale // Target. 1996. Vol. 8, №1. P. 1—21.

Scott M. Corollary discharge provides the sensory content of inner speech // Psychological Science. 2013. Vol. 24, №9. P. 1824—1830.

Susam-Sarajeva Ş. Theories on the Move: Translation's Role in the Travels of Literary Theories. Amsterdam : Rodopi. 2006

Taivalkoski-Shilov K. La tierce main: Le discours rapporté dans les traductions françaises de Fielding au XVIIIe siècle. Arras : Artois Presses Université, 2006

Taivalkoski-Shilov K. Ethical issues regarding machine(-assisted) translation of literary texts // Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice. 2019. Vol. 27, №5. P. 689—703. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1520907.

Taivalkoski-Shilov K., Suchet M. Voice in the Field of Translation Studies / De questionnement en questionnement // Taivalkoski-Shilov K., Suchet M. (eds.). La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual Voices in Translation. Vita traductiva. Vol. 1. Montreal : Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre, 2013. P. 1—30.

Tian X., Poeppel D. Mental imagery of speech: linking motor and perceptual systems through internal simulation and estimation // Frontiers in Human Neuroscience. 2012. №6. P. 1—11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00314.

Tononi G., Boly M., Gosseries O., Laureys S. The neurology of consciousness: An overview // Laureys S., Gosseries O., Tononi G. (eds.). The Neurology of Consciousness: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuropathology. Amsterdam : Elsevier, 2016. Vol. 2. P. 407—461.

Wyke B. van. Ethics and translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 111—115.

Об авторе

Кристина Тайвалкоски-Шилов, профессор, Школа языков и перевода, Университет Турку, Финляндия.

E-mail: kristiina.taivalkoski-shilov@utu.fi

Для цитирования:

Taivalkoski-Shilov K. Textual, moral and psychological voices of translation // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 43—55. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-3.

EMBEDDING IMAGOLOGY IN TRANSLATION STUDIES (AMONG OTHERS)[1]

L. van Doorslaer[1]

[1] University of Tartu
Lossi 3, 51003 Tartu, Estonia
Other affiliations: KU Leuven, Belgium
Stellenbosch University, South Africa
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-4

Imagology, the study of national and cultural images as represented in textual discourse, is a fruitful approach for disciplines dealing with textual change, such as translation studies. Both imagology and translation studies have gradually extended their area of research, which has revealed growing commonalities. Journalistic texts have for instance been included in research that was previously almost exclusively dealing with literary discourse. Moreover interest in imagological research, sometimes related to the distribution of a promoted national or cultural self-image, has now also grown in countries outside of Europe. Future perspectives for findings on image spread through translation are offered through collaboration with existing research in sociology and psychology.

Keywords*: national and cultural images, rewriting, (travel) journalism, author/translator.*

Over the past decades, the view on translation has developed from a traditional linguistic activity based on the concept of equivalence, to a much broader and dynamic process. The discipline of translation studies is not only studying traditional interlingual translation or 'translation proper', but its object has extended to a broader range of text-modifying practices, such as intralingual rewriting, interpreting, intersemiotic adaptation, localization, etc. (see for instance Gambier 2016 or van Doorslaer 2018). Translation nowadays is studied as an instrument with societal, cultural and/or linguistic impact, and translators themselves have become a prominent object of sociological research, conceptualized as agents developing their own political, cultural or linguistic agenda (see Heilbron & Sapiro 2007, Sapiro 2016). Both source and target culture actors (besides translators also authors, publishers, cultural policy agents, reviewers, etc.) are involved in the processes of gatekeeping, representation, and national and cultural image-building.

Distributing information potentially also includes the spread of 'images', both in a general and a more specific sense — such as nationally or culturally marked mental images. Every concrete act of text production is also necessarily preceded by different stages of selection and decision procedures, including framing and formulation choices. Because of the central societal

[1] This article combines new insights and examples with others that were already included in earlier or partly differently oriented contributions: van Doorslaer (2012) and van Doorslaer (forthcoming).

function of nation states especially since the 19th and 20th centuries, also the related construction of national and cultural identities was foregrounded. Therefore many texts include choices that might be, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by national and cultural image-building. When such choices, perspectives or frames are transferred to a new target text, as in the act of translation or similar text-modifying practices, an additional selection and decision process about these choices is unavoidable. The background knowledge and perception will be different according to the source and target audience, which is taken into account when transferring information about national and cultural images. This may lead to changes of perspective, the use of stereotypes, omissions or additions, and manipulations. Such changes make the study of national and cultural image-building a highly interesting field for translation studies, as "translation is one of the ways in which works of literature are 're-written', and these re-writings are the primary way in which cultures construct 'images' and 'representations' of authors, texts and entire periods of history" (Marinetti 2011: 27).

1. What exactly is Imagology?

Over the past decades such forms of representation and image-building in (mainly literary) texts have been studied by 'imagology'. The word is slightly alienating for English speakers, but is related to the origin of the research in the German and French language areas. There this type of research is called *Imagologie* (German) or *imagologie* (French). Moreover, the term 'imagology' avoids confusion with 'image studies', an approach concentrating mainly on visual instead of mental images. The roots of imagology lie in literary studies, as a specialization of comparative literary research (see e. g. Beller in Beller & Leerssen 2007: 7). Imagology studies and theorizes national and cultural stereotypes from a transnational and comparative point of view. It is important to note that it is not a theory of national or cultural identity. Imagology does not study what nations or nationalities *are*, but rather how they are *represented*. History has charged terms such as 'nation', 'people' or 'identity', therefore imagological approaches concentrate on more constructionist models, away from essentialist definitions. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that a considerable part of our views on the world is dominated by national and cultural categorizations. As such it would be strange to deny this reality from a researcher's point of view. This stance is important: imagology is descriptive, rather than explanatory, for "it is the aim of imagology to describe the origin, process and function of national prejudices and stereotypes, to bring them to the surface, analyse them and make people rationally aware of them" (Beller in Beller & Leerssen 2007: 11—12).

It is exactly these descriptive and diachronic viewpoints that allow imagology to register and examine contradictions and gradual changes in perception, thus also allowing it to deal with hybrid and fluid images. An example can illustrate this: Ruth Florack has explored the different image(s) of France and the French. It exists a repertoire of stereotypes that can carry both positive and negative connotations, depending on the stance or the

viewpoint: perceiver A can experience civilized behavior, verbal eloquence and refined social manners, whereas perceiver B experiences arrogance, showiness and vanity. The characteristics are very similar, nevertheless they are perceived in an almost opposite way. Because of the French cultural hegemony in Europe in the 18th and 19th century, many French stereotypes have been defined as hierarchically superior. However, such hierarchical difference includes features that once were considered positive, but can now be perceived as rather negative (Florack in Beller & Leerssen 2007: 155).

Some researchers consider imagology a (sub)discipline. The study of national and cultural images and ethnotypes undeniably could have the potential of being a discipline or sub-discipline. But disciplines are also characterized by a certain degree of institutionalization, which is lacking for imagology. Sometimes it is called a "working method" (Leerssen 2016: 19). However, handbooks of methodology never specifically mention imagology. Though an imagological approach complies with the classical features of adopting a method (systematicity of investigation, a mode of procedure, etc.), it is never put at a similar level with methods such as discourse analysis, corpus gathering, keystroke logging, eye tracking, interviews or surveys. Maybe it is more realistic to rather consider imagology a selection principle, a lens through which the material is studied, a perspective functioning as a criterion for selecting the imagologically relevant material. Such a lens can be adopted with the help of several methods. An imagological lens can be applied through text analysis or interviews, a relevant selection is possible with corpora or eye tracking. From a methodological point of view, imagological analysis is always an interplay between textual (narratology, discourse analysis), contextual (situatedness of a text, reception history, incl. the importance of paratexts) and intertextual (textual dissemination history) analysis — see also Leerssen 2016.

2. Beyond literature, beyond Europe

The study of national and cultural mental images and stereotypes as offered in textual representations, another possible description of imagology, has recently extended its object of research to non-literary texts as well — such as political or journalistic discourse, touristic brochures, audiovisual material, etc.; see for instance van Doorslaer, Flynn & Leerssen (2015). Despite that extension of the research scope in imagology, literature — because of its canonical potential — still plays an undisputed role in the distribution of images. Especially in smaller countries or cultures who seek to valorize their cultural potential, "translation is a form of capital acquisition" as well as "a key aspect of the international circulation of literature which is often neglected in accounts of cultural globalization that stress processes of homogenization" (Bielsa 2013: 160, also referring to Pascale Casanova). Bielsa illustrates how the boom of the Latin American novel in the 1970s for instance, was linked to the image of an exotic Latin America. Particularly the seminal works of Gisèle Sapiro on translation flows show the importance of literary translation in power relations between cultures and countries. "For a nation-state, exporting its literature in translation is a sign of its symbolic

recognition on the international scene" (Sapiro 2016: 84). Here she also explicitly includes the justification of public subvention of such translations, as they "would help improve the image of the country" (ibid.).

Some fields have presented themselves as more prolific than others, particularly textual transfers whereby aspects of (cultural context) adaptation are more evident. Children's literature is a case in point: Frank (2007) studied the images of Australia spread in translated French children's literature. The book deals with interpretive choices and how they work when texts are moved from one culture to another, with the way images of a nation, locale or country are constructed. Several issues are examined, like the selection of books for translation, the packaging of translations, the linguistic and stylistic features specific to translating for children, intertextual references, the function of the translation in the target culture, etc. Another example is Seifert's work on the images of Canada in German juvenile literature (Seifert 2005). A modern, urban version of Canada is totally absent in the German target texts; the patterns of perception are bound to very traditional images and clichés, such as crystal-clear rivers and lakes, bears and moose: "the Canadian wilderness is safeguarded and idealized as a haven of innocence, beauty, and human values, a physical and mental healing place, a spiritual and ecological sanctum, a paradise untouched by the destructive effects of civilization" (Seifert in Beller & Leerssen 2007: 116).

Interestingly, imagology is no longer the sole academic territory of Western European researchers as it used to be the case in the 1970s or 1980s. In recent years, several conferences with an explicit imagological approach, also recognizing the importance of translation in that process, have taken place in countries such as Turkey ("Transferring Cultural Images: Parallels between Stereotyping and Globalising", Istanbul 2014; or "Extranslation in Theory and Practice: Representation of Turkish Culture through Translation", Ankara 2015) or China ("Images as Translational Fictions", Guangzhou 2017). This is also shown in publications such as Li (2016) or Demirkol-Ertürk (2013) and Kuran-Burçoğlu (2009). A recent example of a colloquium not concentrating on the own national image, but rather focusing on heteroimages through translation is 'Translating Images of Canada' (Tartu, Estonia, 2019). Despite the modern focus on transnational and cross-national thinking in a globalizing world, recent history clearly shows that ethnic, national and cultural categories "are perhaps the most ingrained way of pigeonholing human behavior into imputed group characteristics" (Leerssen 2016: 14). Therefore, it may be no coincidence that apparently re-emerging nations such as Turkey and China have a particular interest in image dissemination and in the related academic research.

The already mentioned extension of imagological research to journalistic discourse may surprise us because of the literary roots of imagology, on the other hand there are also reasons making it obvious. Journalism studies have produced a huge amount of research on representation that has quite some aspects in common with the study of stereotypes. One example explicitly connecting representation with discourses of identity and Self-Other rhetoric is Le (2006). As translation studies is a discipline that over the past decades has also developed from a main focus on literary discourse to a diversity of

discourses, it is flexible enough to include research on image-building in several types of discourse. On the other hand imagology's focus on the function of literary and cultural transfer in ethnotyping, in combination with its attention for diachrony, shows a much more specific object and approach. The origins of imagological research in literary studies have also contributed to an emphasis on the richness of literary discourse in this regard, in combination with the importance of literary canonicity strengthening the perception of ethnotypes. Yet, in our modern media world the omnipresence of journalistic discourse also plays an important role. The feature of constant repetition of certain (national and cultural) stereotypes in the media may achieve an effect similar to canonization. Looking at it from this perspective, it might be worthwhile addressing the relative underrepresentation of journalistic discourse in imagology.

3. Examples from (travel) journalism

Yet, underrepresentation does not equal absence. Several studies have already shown the potential imagological relevance of journalistic sources. An example is Fowler (2007), who investigates the role of journalism in the development of British ideas about Afghanistan. Interestingly, Fowler shows how the journalists copied — and as such also confirmed — centuries-old clichés that were transmitted through journalistic accounts and travel narratives.

> Casting its net deep into the nineteenth century, the study investigates how British travellers and journalists continue to inherit the paranoias and prejudices of their nineteenth-century predecessors and why, in British imaginations, Afghans tend to remain warlike, medieval, murderous and unruly. (Fowler 2007: 4f.)

Particularly in historical research it is not necessarily a coincidence that travelers and journalists are mentioned on equal footing. Travel writing and travel journalism form a productive mixed genre for clichés as well as for national or cultural stereotyping, as they register otherness and explore "individual and national identity. […] travel writing is almost invariably about Self and Other" (Coenen 2013: 8). Lily Coenen's study (2013) on the image of Spain in Dutch travel writing is an example showing the development and variety of such image-building over a century of time, and how the authors were intertextually influenced by the readings of literary fiction. Intertextuality is mainly studied in literary sources, but it obviously also appears in journalistic discourse. Discursive reflections of otherness, or at least of the way otherness is perceived, is the heart of the matter of imagological research.

In her study on the images of Sicily, Smecca (2009) has shown how tourist guidebooks can be changed, sometimes even manipulated by editors and translators in order to meet target readers' expectations. Such changes clearly appeal to culture-bound prejudices and stereotypes. Dimitriu (2012) is an interesting account of two 'Western' travel books about Romania that were translated into…Romanian. The mirroring exercise made the preliminary stereotyping as well as the cultural filtering, both in the writing in English

and in the translation into Romanian, doubly visible. At the same time it shows to what extent the translator is the actual author, and translation is an intercultural exercise.

> This highly formative exercise would first entail a relativization of the Western perspective from which the books were written. After all, if the trip had been undertaken by an Eastern/Oriental traveller, the cultural filtering and translation of Romania would have been considerably different. Such an approach would help the target readers to (gradually) give up their unproductive, 'small peripheral culture' inferiority complex and thus de-hegemonize their intercultural relations. (Dimitriu 2012: 326)

All this illustrates that more journalistic types of discourse such as travel writing — "a type of text or genre that has received much more attention than earlier and has moved from the periphery much closer to the centre of current academic discourse" — enable and facilitate a media-oriented extension of the research object in imagology (Zacharasiewicz 2009: 26). This would also reflect the crucial role mass media in modern societies has in the expression of cultural identities: "it is uncontested that radio and television […] have played a central role in the dissemination of national culture, national values and national stereotypes" (Göttlich 2007: 356).

Interdisciplinary connections are also possible between imagology and some of the journalism studies research on representation and stereotyping. An example would be the research by Lasorsa and Dai (2007) on (intentional or unintentional) default stereotyping as well as the "overabundance of nationality-related stereotypes" (292) in the writing of deceptive news stories. According to their study, the less journalists are informed, the more they stereotype. When gaps have to be filled in — a daily practice in journalistic production — it regularly happens that stereotypes are taken over from hear-say or from earlier news items.

> All these perspectives suggest that in the presence of a mass of potential facts, stereotyping tends to occur to streamline work and ease the perceiver's discrepancy between what is expected and observed. Unless a perceiver is able and motivated not to stereotype, stereotyping is likely to function by default, a process psychologists call *automaticity.* (Lasorsa & Dai 2007: 281)

This interesting phenomenon of the automaticity of stereotyping in journalism, as an element in the journalistic process of streamlining work and content in the chaos of facts, reminds us of imagological insights such as the oppositionality of ethnotyping or the ways in which Self-Other oppositions are implied or invoked.

4. The author's position

All the above mentioned interrelated examples linking up travel writing, literary travel journalism or the automaticity of stereotyping, have the determining position of the author as their missing link. "One of the basic in-

sights in image studies is that the mechanism of the representation of foreign nations can only be analysed properly if we take the attitude of the author into account" (Leerssen, s. d.). Translation studies and imagology have several elements in common, such as the descriptive and diachronic viewpoints or the centrality of change and hybridity. Yet, also the role of the author in the discursive variation of representation is a fundamental common feature. A translator is a cultural mediator, an informant transferring cultural knowledge, and as such also authoring a new text. The literary publishing world creates the illusion that we read Thomas Mann when we read 'Buddenbrooks' in English or Russian, but in reality the English or Russian 'Buddenbrooks' is a text of which Mann has not written one single word, but is a re-creation of the respective translator. The illusion is based on the obsolete model that languages are equivalent structures as well as on the romantic concepts of originality, the unique authority of the source text ('original') and the source text author.

Exactly this hybridity and complexity of the author status is also important from an imagological perspective. Interlingual translation, and even more so intralingual and intersemiotic translation (the three types of translation already distinguished in Jakobson 1959), offers the author-translator an extra filter in the rewriting or re-conveying of images. When translation is no longer traditionally looked at in terms of non-change, but as an element in a chain of textual, contextual and intertextual change, it contributes to the diversification of stereotyping as well. This potential power of translation for the distribution of images can be illustrated by the discussion in China about the 'correct' dissemination of Chinese culture through English translations, including the question whether this can be executed better by English native translators or by native Chinese (see for instance Hu 2015). This Chinese case of auto-image-building illustrates the use of translation for selecting and highlighting certain features, a well-known principle in the rhetoric of ethnotyping. A notorious historical example about the double-sidedness or power of translating mediators is that of La Malinche or Doña Marina, the (among other things) local interpreter of Spanish conquistador Hernán Cortés (see for instance Valdeón 2013).

5. Imagological constants

Constants that regularly return in imagological research are oppositions such as North-South (for instance strongly present in a country like Italy, but also within Europe as a continent) or center-periphery (an example would be France: Paris and the rest). Although they are geographical at first sight, at the same time they mainly include stereotypical mental representations, such as the hard working Northerner vs. the easy going Southerner. The third constant clearly overcomes the geographical disposition and is interestingly hybrid: the fact that there are contradictory stereotypes available for more or less each country, showing the relativity of typicality. Is the typical Englishman the gentleman or the hooligan? Is it typically French to be fash-

ionable or to have jocular humor? Is it typically Spanish to relate to a Mediterranean holiday feeling as Erasmus student or rather to expansionist violence as in colonial or dictator Franco times? These oppositional examples show that every author, journalist or otherwise text producer (including translators) can to a certain extent make use of a range of existing stereotypes. Some of them are more present in certain periods than others, but seldom disappear. Over the past century the most obvious example illustrating that is probably the case of Germany. Until the beginning of the 20th century, the stereotypical German was walking through the woods while making poetry and philosophizing. Under the influence of only a few decades, but with the rise of Germany as an economic powerhouse and with two World Wars, the dominant German stereotype became one of violence and/or economic efficiency.

Through the centuries there also have been many oppositional representations of the East and the West within the Eurasian framework. Oriental peoples and cultures were sometimes valorized as cruel, expansionist or despotic, but just as well as mysteriously attractive, inventive or mythical. Since the Cold War period, an intra-European East-West categorization can be discerned. It is a productive trope, as it also lends itself to reinforcement by the use of dichotomous categories. An oppositional, occasionally black and white presentation belongs to the toolbox of every communicator who has to present a complex situation to a larger audience. What is true for North-South or center-periphery also goes for East-West. If such a simplified presentation is successful, it can become ingrained and difficult to correct at a later stage. An example is the division of Europe in two categories: Eastern vs. Western Europe, referring to the Cold War era and the Iron Curtain. It is a distinction that is frequently, almost automatically made in journalistic discourse. This is remarkable, taking into consideration that the Iron Curtain doesn't exist anymore for three decades. Nevertheless it still seems to be the determining element for a simplified division of the European continent, including the connotations of East and West that also refer to Cold War commonplaces.

A more nuanced, trans-dichotomous, but also fuzzier concept such as 'Central Europe' is hardly used. The fuzziness is also illustrated by the fact that similar terms in other languages are not necessarily equivalent, but have a partly different cultural and mental frame of reference, such as *Mitteleuropa* in German or *Europe médiane* in French. Central Europe does not have clear borders marked by an Iron Curtain, but is a term with a combination of historical, cultural and political content. It is mainly the fuzziness of the borders that makes the concept of Central Europe much less attractive for journalistic use than the bi-polarity of Eastern vs. Western Europe. Despite the stereotypical potential of bordering based on wind directions, the arbitrariness of such separations is also shown by other examples. In the north of Europe, the term 'Central Europe' is often used as part of a north-south presentation, meaning the central part between north and south. And the Baltic Sea is called 'Ostsee' [Eastern Sea] in German, but 'Läänemeri' [Western Sea] in Estonian. Assigning intra-European ethnotypical characteristics becomes almost a haphazard exercise in such cases.

6. Conclusion and prospects

National and cultural categories have all but disappeared in our perception, interpretation and categorization of real world phenomena. For that reason, imagological approaches will probably remain fruitful for future research on all types of text modification, including translation. With the growing awareness of textual change, ethical aspects may become more prominent in research, both regarding the author/translator and the researcher. It would also add value to the existing interconnections between (sub) disciplines, if findings of social psychology could also be integrated in imagological research. Up to now, the findings on stereotyping and ethnotyping have not really been connected to related research in personality and cross-cultural psychology, where important work on national character stereotyping has been done. The textual dimension of ethnotyping has great potential of connecting with the shared beliefs of personality traits typical to people of a particular nation (for instance Realo & Allik 2017). Although imagological material illustrates that ethnotypes are "by no means historical constants" (Leerssen 2016: 18), psychological research has also shown that the national character stereotypes are surprisingly stable over time and that even significant political or economic events do not radically change their content, at least not in the short term (for instance Hřebíčková & Graf 2014). Relating this type of research to imagology would undoubtedly also be fruitful for the centrality of transfer in translation studies.

References

Beller, M. and Leerssen, J. eds., 2007. *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters – a critical survey*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Bielsa, E., 2013. Translation and the international circulation of literature. A comparative analysis of the reception of Roberto Bolaño's work in Spanish and English. *The Translator,* 19(2), pp. 157—181.

Coenen, L., 2013. *The Image of Spain in Dutch Travel Writing (1860 – 1960)*. PhD Thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Demirkol Ertürk, Ş., 2013. Images of Istanbul in translation: a case study in Slovenia. *Across Languages and Cultures,* 14(2), pp. 199—220.

Dimitriu, R., 2012. When 'we' are 'the other'. Travel books on Romania as exercises in intercultural communication. *Perspectives*, 20(3), pp. 313—327.

Fowler, C., 2007. *Chasing Tales. Travel Writing, Journalism and the History of British Ideas about Afghanistan*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Frank, H.T., 2007. *Cultural Encounters in Translated Children's Literature: Images of Australia in French Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Gambier, Y., 2016. Rapid and radical changes in translation and translation studies. *International Journal of Communication,* 10, pp. 887—906.

Göttlich, U., 2007. Mass Media. In: M. Beller and J. Leerssen, eds. *Imagology. The cultural construction and literary representation of national characters*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi. pp. 354—357.

Heilbron, J. and Sapiro, G., 2007. Outline for a sociology of translation: current issues and future prospects. In: M. Wolf and A. Fukari, eds. *Constructing a sociology of translation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 93—107.

Hřebíčková, M. and Graf, S., 2014. Accuracy of national stereotypes in Central Europe: Outgroups are not better than ingroup in considering personality traits of real people. *European Journal of Personality, 28,* pp. 60—72.

Hu, D., 2015. Translation into Other Languages as a Cultural Disseminator in China. *Translation Review,* 91, pp. 54—61.

Jakobson, R., 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: R.A. Brower, ed. *On Translation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp. 144—151.

Kuran-Burçoglu, N., 2009. *Reflections on the Image of the Turk in Europe*. Istanbul: Isis.

Lasorsa, D. and J. Dai, 2007. When News Reporters Deceive. The Production of Stereotypes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), pp. 281—298.

Le, E., 2006. *The Spiral of 'Anti-Other Rhetoric': Discourses of Identity and the International Media Echo*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Leerssen, J., 2016. Imagology. On Using Ethnicity to Make Sense of the World. *Iberic@l*, 10, pp. 13—31.

Leerssen, J., n.d. A Summary of Imagological Theory. Available at: http://imagologica. eu/theoreticalsummary [Accessed 14 August 2018].

Li, W., 2016. A systematic approach to manipulation in translation — a case study of Ye Junjian's 1958 translation of H. C. Andersen's tales. In: L. D'hulst, C. O'Sullivan and M. Schreiber, eds. *Politics, Policy and Power in Translation History*. Berlin: Frank & Timme. pp. 95—112.

Marinetti, C., 2011. Cultural approaches. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies.* Vol. 2. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 26—30.

Realo, A. and Allik, J., 2017. National character. In: V. Zeigler-Hill and T.K. Shackelford, eds. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Sapiro, G., 2016. How do literary works cross borders (or not)? A sociological approach to world literature. *Journal of World Literature,* 1, pp. 81—96.

Seifert, M., 2005. The image trap: The translation of English-Canadian children's literature into German. In: E. O'Sullivan, K. Reynolds and R. Romøren, eds. *Children's Literature Global and Local. Social and Aesthetic Perspectives*. Oslo: Novus Press. pp. 227—239.

Smecca, P.D., 2009. Tourist guidebooks and the image of Sicily in translation. *Perspectives,* 17(2), pp. 109—119.

Valdeón, R.A., 2013. Doña Marina/La Malinche. A historiographical approach to the interpreter/traitor. *Target*, 25(2), pp. 157—179.

van Doorslaer, L., 2012. National and cultural images. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds., *Handbook of Translation Studies.* Vol. 3. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 122—127.

van Doorslaer, L., 2018. Bound to Expand. The Paradigm of Change in Translation Studies. In: H.V. Dam, M. Nisbeth Brøgger and K. Korning Zethsen, eds. *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge. pp. 220—230.

van Doorslaer, L., (in press) Stereotyping by Default in Media Transfer. In: J. Barkhoff and J. Leerssen, eds. *National Stereotyping & Cultural Identities in Recent European Crises*. Leiden: Brill.

van Doorslaer, L., P. Flynn and Leerssen, J., eds., 2015. *Interconnecting Translation Studies and Imagology*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zacharasiewicz, W., 2009. The Theory of Climate and the North in Anglophone Literatures. In: S. Jakobsson, ed. *Images of the North: Histories – Identities – Ideas*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi. pp. 25—49.

The author

Luc van Doorslaer, Chair Professor for Translation Studies, University of Tartu (Estonia); KU Leuven (Belgium); Stellenbosch University (South Africa), Vice President of the European Society for Translation Studies.
E-mail: luc.vandoorslaer@ut.ee

To cite this article:
Van Doorslaer, L. 2019, Embedding Imagology in Translation Studies (among others), *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, № 3, p. 56—68. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-4.

ВНЕДРЕНИЕ ИМАГОЛОГИИ В ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИЕ

Л. ван Доорслер[1]

[1] Тартуский университет
51003, Эстония, Тарту, Лосси, 3
Католический университет Лёвена, Бельгия
Университет Стелленбош, Южная Африка
Поступила в редакцию 27 мая 2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-4

Разнообразные подходы, предлагаемые имагологией — научной дисциплиной, изучающей национальные и культурные образы, могут быть с успехом использованы в рамках других наук, связанных с созданием текстов, прежде всего в переводоведении. Имагология и переводоведение постепенно расширяют области своих исследований, демонстрируя возрастающую общность проблематики. Тексты газетных публикаций анализируются в аспекте создания образов так, как это ранее делалось исключительно на материале художественной литературы. Во многих странах, в том числе за пределами Европы, растет интерес к имагологическим исследованиям, связанным с продвижением национального или культурного имиджа стран и народов. В статье описываются перспективы синергетического развития имагологии и перевода с привлечением достижений социологии и психологии.

***Ключевые слова**: национальный и культурные образы, рерайтинг, путешествия, журналистика, автор / переводчик.*

Список литературы

Beller M., Leerssen J. (eds.). Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters — a critical survey. Amsterdam ; N. Y. : Rodopi, 2007.

Bielsa E. Translation and the international circulation of literature. A comparative analysis of the reception of Roberto Bolaño's work in Spanish and English // The Translator. 2013. Vol. 19, №2. P. 157—181.

Coenen L. The Image of Spain in Dutch Travel Writing (1860—1960) : PhD thesis. University of Amsterdam, 2013.

Demirkol Ertürk Ş. Images of Istanbul in translation: a case study in Slovenia // Across Languages and Cultures. 2013. Vol. 4, №2. P. 199—220.

Dimitriu R. When 'we' are 'the other'. Travel books on Romania as exercises in intercultural communication // Perspectives. 2012. Vol. 20, №3. P. 313—327.

Fowler C. Chasing Tales. Travel Writing, Journalism and the History of British Ideas about Afghanistan. Amsterdam ; N. Y. : Rodopi, 2007.

Frank H.T. Cultural Encounters in Translated Children's Literature: Images of Australia in French Translation. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2007.

Gambier Y. Rapid and radical changes in translation and translation studies // International Journal of Communication. 2016. Vol. 10. P. 887—906.

Göttlich U. Mass Media // Beller M., Leerssen J. (eds.). Imagology. The cultural construction and literary representation of national characters. Amsterdam ; N. Y. : Rodopi, 2007. P. 354—357.

Heilbron J., Sapiro G. Outline for a sociology of translation: current issues and future prospects // Wolf M., Fukari A. (eds.). Constructing a sociology of translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2007. P. 93—107.

Hřebíčková M., Graf S. Accuracy of national stereotypes in Central Europe: Outgroups are not better than ingroup in considering personality traits of real people // European Journal of Personality. 2014. Vol. 28. P. 60—72.

Hu D. Translation into Other Languages as a Cultural Disseminator in China // Translation Review. 2015. Vol. 91. P. 54—61.

Jakobson R. On linguistic aspects of translation // Brower R. A. (ed.). On Translation. Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1959. P. 144—151.

Kuran-Burçoglu N. Reflections on the Image of the Turk in Europe. Istanbul : Isis, 2009.

Lasorsa D., Dai J. When News Reporters Deceive. The Production of Stereotypes // Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly. 2007. Vol. 84, №2. P. 281—298.

Le E. The Spiral of 'Anti-Other Rhetoric': Discourses of Identity and the International Media Echo. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2006.

Leerssen J. Imagology. On Using Ethnicity to Make Sense of the World // Iberic@l. 2016. Vol. 10. P. 13—31.

Leerssen J., n.d. A Summary of Imagological Theory. URL: http://imagologica.eu/theoreticalsummary (дата обращения: 14.08.2018).

Li W. A systematic approach to manipulation in translation — a case study of Ye Junjian's 1958 translation of H. C. Andersen's tales // D'hulst L., O'Sullivan C., Schreiber M. (eds.). Politics, Policy and Power in Translation History. Berlin : Frank & Timme, 2016. P. 95—112.

Marinetti C. Cultural approaches // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Vol. 2. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2011. P. 26—30.

Realo A., Allik J. National character // Zeigler-Hill V., Shackelford T.K. (eds.). Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences. Cham : Springer International Publishing, 2017.

Sapiro G. How do literary works cross borders (or not)? A sociological approach to world literature // Journal of World Literature. 2016. №1. P. 81—96.

Seifert M. The image trap: The translation of English-Canadian children's literature into German // O'Sullivan E., Reynolds K., Romøren R. (eds.). Children's Literature Global and Local. Social and Aesthetic Perspectives. Oslo : Novus Press, 2005. P. 227—239.

Smecca P.D. Tourist guidebooks and the image of Sicily in translation // Perspectives. 2009. Vol. 17, №2. P. 109—119.

Valdeón, R. Doña Marina/La Malinche. A historiographical approach to the interpreter/traitor // Target. 2013. Vol. 25, №2. P. 157—179.

van Doorslaer L. National and cultural images // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Vol. 3. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2012. P. 122—127.

van Doorslaer L. Bound to Expand. The Paradigm of Change in Translation Studies // Dam H.V., Nisbeth Brøgger M., Korning Zethsen K. (eds.). Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies. Abingdon ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2018. P. 220—230.

van Doorslaer L. Stereotyping by Default in Media Transfer // Barkhoff J., Leerssen J. (eds.). National Stereotyping & Cultural Identities in Recent European Crises. Leiden : Brill (в печати).

van Doorslaer L., Flynn P. and Leerssen, J. (eds.). Interconnecting Translation Studies and Imagology. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2015.

Zacharasiewicz W. The Theory of Climate and the North in Anglophone Literatures // Jakobsson S. (ed.). Images of the North: Histories — Identities — Ideas. Amsterdam ; N. Y. : Rodopi, 2009. P. 25—49.

Об авторе

Люк ван Доорслер, профессор кафедры перевода, Университет Тарту (Эстония); Католический университет Лёвена (Бельгия); Университет Стелленбоша (Южная Африка); вице-президент Европейского общества переводческих исследований.

E-mail: luc.vandoorslaer@ut.ee

Для цитирования:

Van Doorslaer L. Embedding imagology in Translation Studies // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 56—68. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-4.

HOW TRANSLATIONS ARE WILLED INTO EXISTENCE

U. Stecconi[1]

[1] European Commission P.O. Box 1049 Brussels, Belgium
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-5

This paper will argue that translations are willed into existence in three conceivable ways: pull, push and shuffle. Pull is the most intuitive form. It corresponds, for example, to a publishing house that decides to translate a foreign novel. Here, the initiative to invest in a new translation project is almost entirely located on the target side. The push mode, in contrast, can be exemplified by a company that decides to localise its website to cater for foreign markets. Here the decisions to make translation happen are mostly located on the source side. The shuffle mode corresponds to those rare cases in which the process is located neither on the source nor on the target side, but straddles the semiotic barriers or folds that make acts of translating possible or necessary in the first place.

The discussion affirms the status of translators as active players, or agents, of communication. If it is true that in real life translators rarely determine whether a sign will cross a semiotic fold or have much say in the process, in principle nothing prevents them from bringing their desires, motives, and strategies to the table. Translators can — and should — have a larger say on why, whether, and how new translated texts appear in the target environment.

Keywords: *Cognitive approaches, relevance Theory, semiotics and translation, status of translators.*

1. Intentions

I will share a concern to set this paper in motion. It sometimes seems to me that a pestilence has struck the human race in its most distinctive faculty — that is, the use of words. It is a plague afflicting language, revealing itself as a loss of cognition and immediacy, an automatism that tends to level out all expression into the most generic, anonymous, and abstract formulas, to dilute meanings, to blunt the edge of expressiveness, extinguishing the spark that shoots out from the collision of words and new circumstances.

The two sentences after 'It sometimes seems to me' are a comment to a danger of the digital age; a loss of exactitude. As you were reading them, you attributed the comment to the person referred to by the pronoun *me*. Because there is no indication to the contrary — and this is not fiction — you probably inferred that I, Ubaldo Stecconi, am such person. At the same time, you may have suspected the passage was too good to be true. "How can Ubaldo write this well", you may have wondered. You would have been right. In fact, the two sentences are from Patrick Creagh's translation of the last manuscript written by Italo Calvino before he passed away. The opening paragraph was an experiment.

Here are Calvino's original passage and its translation in canonical format:

Alle volte mi sembra che un'epidemia pestilenziale abbia colpito l'umanità nella facoltà che più la caratterizza, cioè l'uso della parola, una peste del linguaggio che si manifesta come perdita di forza conoscitiva e di immediatezza, come automatismo che tende a livellare l'espressione sulle formule più generiche, anonime, astratte, a diluire i significati, a smussare le punte espressive, a spegnere ogni scintilla che sprizzi dallo scontro delle parole con nuove circostanze (Calvino 1988a: 58).

It sometimes seems to me that a pestilence has struck the human race in its most distinctive faculty — that is, the use of words. It is a plague afflicting language, revealing itself as a loss of cognition and immediacy, an automatism that tends to level out all expression into the most generic, anonymous, and abstract formulas, to dilute meanings, to blunt the edge of expressiveness, extinguishing the spark that shoots out from the collision of words and new circumstances. (Calvino 1988b: 56).

Now that you know you were reading a translation, you will no longer attribute the opening words and thoughts to me. But to whom can you attribute the intention to utter and share those bitter remarks: to Creagh or Calvino? More generally, what happens when an audience interprets translated communication? We know that at least two people are behind the text — a translator and an author — so can we attribute intentions to both[2]?

The question is fraught with difficulties, starting with what we may mean by 'intentions'. The most comprehensive and compelling account I know is given in Relevance theory. Here is how its founders describe their core research strategy:

Relevance theory may be seen as an attempt to work out in detail one of Grice's central claims: that an essential feature of most human communication, both verbal and non—verbal, is the expression and recognition of intentions […]. In developing this claim, Grice laid the foundations for an inferential model of communication, an alternative to the classical code model (Sperber and Wilson 2004: 607).

Intentions and inference are central to Relevance theory, which draws on people's ability to make inferences on the basis of signs[3] produced by a communicator. In relevance-theoretic terms, it all starts with a communicator who intends to convey information to an audience. To do so, the communicator produces a sign designed to alter the cognitive environment of their audience in certain ways. Thanks to this stimulus, the audience will recognise the speaker's intention to communicate and will identify the information to be interpreted. In this sense, the stimulus is ostensive: ie, it results from a behaviour that would be unexplainable if it were not a signal to communicate. In essence, communicators give evidence that they want the

[2] 'Author' and 'translator' are nothing more than convenient labels here. Some non-translated texts are the product of teamwork and we know that translated texts typically involve teams including project managers, translators proper, revisors, etc. I will continue to use the terms as *partes pro toto*.

[3] I will use 'sign' as a superordinate term for all verbal and nonverbal communication, including utterances, written texts, winks, hand gestures, etc.

audience to make a certain inference. The audience need only attribute two intentions to the communicator: an informative intention and a communicative intention. Informative intention is "[t]he intention to inform the audience of something" (Sperber and Wilson 2004: 611). Communicative intention involves "[making] it mutually manifest to audience and communicator that the communicator has this informative intention" (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 61, full discussion at pages 46—64). In successful communication we infer information and meaning from signs that modify our cognitive horizons. When we recognise these signs as ostensive stimuli, we use the evidence provided by them to attribute beliefs and desires to the communicator — ie, we engage in mind-reading. "Recognising these two intentions requires theory of mind abilities — ie, being able to attribute mental states to other individuals" (Padilla Cruz 2016:1).

2. Intentions and translating

How does all this play out in translating? First, we have to agree that translating is a form of sign production, or semiosis, in its own right, distinct from other forms of communication behaviour. Following the theory of signs of Charles S. Peirce (cf. Peirce 1992—1998 and 1931—1958), I have argued that it is possible to identify translating as a specific form of sign-action; we can call it translation semiosis or T-semiosis for short. More accurately, "it is possible to state the logico-semiotic conditions of translation — the conditions that set it apart from non-translation. These are *similarity*, *difference* and *mediation*" (Stecconi 2009: 262. See Stecconi 2010 and 2004 for a fuller treatment). Piercean semiotics and Relevance theory overlap in one important respect: both move from inference. This is crucial for the present paper, because "[d]escribing translating as a necessarily inferential form of sign-action brings to the fore translator's creativity and agency" (Stecconi 2018: 93). If there exists a specific form of semiosis for translation, it follows that translating is a deliberate and fully fledged act of communication. As such, T-semiosis gives evidence of beliefs and desires that can be attributed to (at least) two minds at the same time: the source author's and the translator's. The next step is finding out who is responsible for what in T-semiosis and to what degree.

2.1. Reading the translator's mind

I will argue that three states of mind can be generally inferred from the verbal and nonverbal signs that reach us as products of T-semiosis: a desire to play *interpres,* certain motives behind individual translation projects, and strategies to respond to historically and culturally determined norms that regulate T-semiosis.

The target audience can attribute to all translators the desire to make source signs accessible or more accessible to them. I will call this the desire to play ***interpres***. *Interpres* is a Latin term of uncertain etymology used to denote translators (*inter-pres* can be either 'between parties' or 'between prices', cf. Folena 1991). I chose it because it also meant 'middleman, negoti-

ator, and broker', suggesting that all translators act like mediators who want to close a deal between buyer and seller. *Interpres* highlights translators' position as focus points of the negotiation that T-semiosis always involves (cf. Eco 2003a, b).

The *interpres* intention is an abstract notion that applies to T-semiosis in general, but it must be embodied in actual acts of translating to manifest itself. Every translation project has its own motivations. So, the audience can use translations, paratext and collateral information to attribute a second set of particular intentions to the translator. I will call these the **motives** for a T-semiosis event (cf. Toury 1986: 1116 for a similar view). For example, the audience may wonder why those responsible for the translation event thought that this particular text would be worth translating and why they would expect that introducing the new text in the target environment would be worth the effort. They may ask themselves such questions as: Why this text and not another? Why was it done here and not elsewhere? Why now and not at another time?

Finally, one can read the mind of a translator focussing on textual and other evidence to find out *how* T-semiosis was used to negotiate the differences between the source and target sides. I would call this a translator's **strategy**. In most cases, this is for fairly sophisticated audiences. One should be familiar with source and target contextual implications, the two sign systems, issues and topics as they are represented in the signs that have been the object of T-semiosis, etc. This kind of audience is very small but fairly influential. For instance, it includes translation students, critics, and scholars. In publishing houses, localisation firms, and multilingual institutions it would include revisers, managers and other figures who have a say on how translators should go about their business. When this audience includes the source author the story becomes interesting. You may have the relaxed attitude Umberto Eco recorded in many of his writings on translation (eg. Eco 2001, 2003b) in which he related the open dialogue and cooperation he established with his translators. Or you may have terrifying accounts like the one Milan Kundera included as a preface to the 'definitive' version of his novel *The Joke* in English (Kundera 1992).

Paratextual information may help us infer a translator's strategy. The most famous such paratext must be Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum*, which is a preface to his translation of two Greek speeches. In it, Cicero included indications that allow us to reconstruct both his motives and his strategy (and he actually called himself an *interpres*). Rita Copeland identified his motives in the context of a rhetorical debate (Copeland 1991, esp. 9—36). As to his strategy, his famous statement juxtaposing the styles of translators and orators is exactly what I mean by a translator's strategy. When Cicero said that he had weighed words as opposed to counting them, he gave us a penetrating trope to describe his translation strategy.

One can attribute these three states of mind to whoever is actively engaged in T-semiosis. A desire to play *interpres* is a precondition for anyone who wants to do T-semiosis; motives factually correspond to translation events; and successful strategies tend to become translatorial habits. These states of mind should be regarded as three parts of a single continuum. An

exclusive focus on strategies, for instance, would produce incomplete accounts. Also, if one would only look at motives, it would be difficult to tell translations from non translations. People may legitimately wonder 'why this text and not another?', 'why here and not elsewhere?', and 'why now and not at another time?' also when a new novel is published. In sum, what counts in T-semiosis is the *interpres*-motives-strategy triad. It is the series, and not its parts, that helps us approach a theory of translatorial agency.

3. Who wills translations into existence?

I have tried to show that translators have informative and communicative intentions of their own and that these specific states of mind can be inferred on the evidence provided by T-semiosis. However, the wish to play *interpres*, a motive like — say — making a poetological statement through translation, or the strategies employed to mediate between source and target environments are necessary but insufficient conditions for T-semiosis to happen. The triad ultimately refers to people's intentions as they engage in actual translation projects. But these must be willed into existence by sentient agents. The 'agents of translation' topic is recurrent in the literature (cf. Milton and Bandia 2009, Buzelin 2011, Khalifa 2014 and Solum 2017). In this final section, I will bring the discussion to a close and add my semiotic approach to the list by advancing a general theory of agency for T-semiosis. T-semiosis occurs close to what we could picture as *folds* in the semiosphere. The most intuitive folds are those created by mutually incomprehensible natural languages. Hermans, for instance, refers to a similar concept as he defines translation "as a verbal representation of an anterior text across an intelligibility barrier" ("The second debate" in Schäffner 1999: 79). But folds need not arise only between natural languages and they need not result only in utter incomprehensibility. "Translation-like operations are also required to overcome other folds in the fabric of communication, such as those created by the participants' perceptions or attitudes, by semiotic systems other than verbal language, by the materiality of communication channels, etc." (Stecconi 2004: 10).

T-semiosis occurs across such folds, often involving several people. In fact, there may be quite a crowd around translated communication: communicators and an audience on the source side, translators and other figures in between, more communicators and audiences on the target side, etc. However, not all these figures have the same say on the *birth* of a translation. American viewers watching *Game of Thrones* contributed little to the series being exported to France. Executives from HBO and Orange had much bigger roles in bringing to life this large—impact translation event. I will collectively call 'agents' those who are responsible for a new strain of T-semiosis.

I believe agents can be divided in three classes:

1. Agents on the target side that **pull** a text over a fold;
2. Agents on the source side that **push** a text over a fold; and
3. Agents at some interculture that **shuffle** texts on their own initiative.

The term 'agent' is essentially a function and does not necessarily correspond to individuals. Often, it corresponds to large groups; think of a board

of directors that decides to localise a company's website. Very rarely, it corresponds to very small groups. Perhaps self-translation is the best example; such Beckett into French (cf. Steiner 1975: 473), Tagore into English (cf. Sengupta 1990), and Joyce into Italian and French (cf. Eco 2003a: 303—312). I am not presenting the three classes as mutually exclusive. It is altogether possible that the interests of agents from both sides of the fold converge on a single translation project as would be likely — for example — for a corporate website that gets localised because of a trans-national merger.

3.1. Pull

Descriptivist scholars (eg. Toury 1995) stress that translations are facts that belong with the receiving culture. They have a point, especially when it comes to locating where the longing, the need, or the demand for translation arises most often. Translating — when done well and by humans — is expensive, time consuming and hard work. Therefore the wish for translation is likely to turn into reality where one expects a large enough return — monetary or otherwise. When this comes to pass translation projects are pulled by agents that lie on the receiving end of semiotic folds that translation projects are supposed to overcome.

An agent pulling a text-sign across a semiotic fold is the most intuitive setting for T-semiosis. The mind goes to a publisher who attends the Frankfurt Book Fair; eyes a promising foreign title; and secures the translation right for his company. I would like to give you a different story to exemplify what one may mean by 'pull'. I collected it from an official of the Inter—American Development Bank (IADB) in the year 2000. I had noticed that the portal of the IADB offered a surprising choice of languages: English, French, Portuguese and Spanish — which are the institution's working languages — plus Japanese. I asked Mr Ortiz of the IADB Department of Information Technology to explain the presence of Japanese. This is part of his reply:

> Our publication section has a newsletter called *El Bid*, written in English, French, Portuguese and Spanish. […] A few years ago, our organisation opened an office in Tokyo, and we realised that most of our publications were delivered but not read, so this office created a new version in Japanese of *El Bid*. Because the creation of pages in Japanese does not incur in any type of major expense for us other than converting them to PDF files, we have a link to pages in Japanese (Ortiz 2000, personal communication).

Since then, things have changed. The site has been properly localised and structured around the organisation's four main languages (http://www.iadb.org/). But back in 2000, the desire to jump over the fold originated in the target environment. I chose this story because it helps us isolate the desire to trigger T-semiosis. The source text *El Bid* was pulled by the Tokyo office from Washington D.C., where the institution has its headquarters, because an agent put themselves in the shoes of a potential target audience and realised that a fold hindered the growth of a strand of semiosis they really cared for.

3.2. Push

Not everybody is happy with the idea that translations are *only* facts of the receiving culture. The rise of the localisation industry since the turn of the century tells a different story. I will use the term 'localisation' in its most commercial sense: a company's strategy to make its goods and services available to several locales in the global market in the terms of these locales (cf. Esselink 2000, Pym 2004a and Jiménez-Crespo 2013). Localisation has taken the world of professional translation by storm, especially in the United States at the turn of the century. U.S. companies had been running operations in foreign markets for a long time, but most products would be marketed abroad as made in the U.S.A. With the advent of the internet it became very easy to adapt products and corporate images to foreign locales. More importantly, corporate America was struck by the epiphany that in the new economy serious money could be made by trading in information. But information must reach foreign customers in familiar forms. I will leave the economic and social implications to the specialists; here I intend to present localisation as a large, collective, source-side movement that pushes signs across semiotic folds. Imagine our agent is a manufacturing company based in St. Louis, Missouri that decides to go global. Because of the main markets in which it sells, it would translate its website into French, Italian, German and Spanish; set up sales offices and distribution networks in Europe and Latin America; launch an international advertising campaign; perhaps merge with or acquire foreign companies. Its management sees a globalisation strategy, what I see instead is an attempt at pushing a highly organised set of signs over the edge that delimits the company's existing semiotic systems. These systems would include at least technology, language, corporate culture, brand management, business practices, standards and regulations and legal systems. Translation—like forms of semiosis are required to negotiate every one of these folds. Some would be traditional — such as translating the verbal content of web pages. Others would not — such as adapting the corporate website's color palette to match expectations in certain locales or internationalising operations. In this respect, localisation can be considered as a large, coordinated movement willed into being by push agents.

3.3. Shuffle

Let me recall that 'pull' refers to a desire by a target-side agent while 'push' belongs to agents on the source side. How about agents who cannot be clearly located on either side? Of all the spatial metaphors that may give a home to this third category, I will borrow the space Anthony Pym called 'interculture'. According to Pym, an interculture is a space created by the overlap of at least two cultures and is delimited by two restrictive notions — professional status and 'secondariness'. These notions are linked as follows: "Sec-

ondariness here defines professional intercultures in that the main business of such groups is to work on communication between cultures perceived as primary" (Pym 2004b: 18). Although secondary and subaltern to their principals, intercultural agents do enjoy a relative degree of autonomy that Pym described "as the degree to which they can make decisions concerning cross-cultural communication without explicit authorization from other parties or institutions" (Pym 2004b: 20). In my scheme of things, one manifestation of this autonomy is the power to start a fresh strand of T-semiosis.

Here the illustration will be autobiographical. It's the story of *Balikbayan*, an anthology of Philippine short stories I edited and translated for Italian readers (VV. AA. 1999). It all started in via Veneto, Rome in the spring of 1997, when I overheard a conversation between two ladies. One said "Luisa, did I tell you I hired a Mexican Filipina?" I was shocked. I had been living in Manila for five years then and while I was away 'Filipina' had become synonymous to 'household help' or 'maid' among Italian speakers. My fellow country people were building an image of the Philippines as a place where domestic help came from — an image that still prevents them from forming a broader and fairer idea of the country and its people. On that day in Rome I saw the economic, geo—political and ideological fold rise before my eyes, and I didn't like it a bit. After I returned home in Manila, I began to circulate the story among writers, scholars and intellectuals. During those conversations, someone suggested that I translate Filipino stories and had them published in Italy. This would give evidence "that there are excellent maids in Manila, and excellent writers as well" (Id.: 13, my translation) and this is a feature the city has in common with — say — Lisbon and Rome. So, my desire to poke a hole in the fold took a definite shape in 1997. I spent the next three months collecting and selecting the originals, a couple more to write first drafts, and two years infecting enough people in Italy with the desire to see the book in print. As a proof that the 'intercultural agent' was a collective subject, let me tell you that the acknowledgment page eventually listed fourteen people, including only those 'without whom this book would not have been possible' as the formula goes. Even factoring in poor introspection and weak memory, never for a moment did I have the feeling we were on either side of the fold. Speaking for myself, I am quite convinced I was on both — or neither. I probably reacted to the phrase 'Mexican Filipina' as an Italian (shame, surprise), as a Filipino (rage, resignation), and as a cultural mediator ("what can be done about it?"). Looking for a label for this third and final class of translatorial agency, I propose shuffle. I chose the term because it does not imply any definite sense of direction. In effect, only three years earlier I had been part of the team that brought out *Daydreams and Nightmares*, a selection of Italian short stories for the Philippine market (VV. AA. 1996). The fact that I was an Italian living in Manila was a crucial qualification for the rest of the team. Intercultural agents straddle semiotic folds; source and target are much weaker notions to them.

4. Close

I am aware that projects such as *Balikbayan* make up a very small proportion of all translations actually produced around the world, so why bother with 'shuffle' and all that? My answer is that they can help produce useful descriptive and predictive narratives. In a phenomenology of translating, they may take us to neglected places and complete the present discussion of intention and agency. What can we gain from the discussion? Firstly, we can confirm the claim that there is such thing as T-semiosis. Translation events and the texts they produce are communicative acts in themselves and can be legitimately used as evidence of beliefs and desires different from those that can be inferred from nontranslated communication. Secondly, discussions about agency help put translators firmly among communication players. If it is true that a translator rarely determines whether a text will cross a semiotic fold, it is equally true that in principle nothing prevents translators from bringing their *interpres* desires, their motives, and their strategies all the way up to a project's conception and design stages — and make it count. As Theo Hermans once wrote to me "all you need is i) something that is available for translation, ii) an assumed benefit; and iii) an enabler that knows how to let the text-sign grow across the fold (ie, an agent with relevant expertise)" (Hermans 2005, private communication). Translators have all it takes to become these professional enablers; they can and should have a say on why, whether, and how translations are made. If this is almost never the case, it is because people — including translators themselves — are not aware of what translators can do. Or perhaps this is almost never the case because of a deliberate downplaying of translation. Either way, I hope the present study will help researchers and practitioners recognise this state of affairs and fight back.

References

Buzelin, H., 2011. Agents of translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 6–12.

Calvino, I., 1988a. *Lezioni americane*. Milan: Garzanti.

Calvino, I., 1988b. *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*. Translated by P. Creagh. New York: Vintage.

Copeland, R., 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*, *Cambridge studies in medieval literature*. Vol. 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eco, U., 2001. *Experiences in Translaton*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

Eco, U., 2003a. *Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione*. Milan: Bompiani.

Eco, U., 2003b. *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Esselink, B., 2000. *A Practical Guide to Localization*. Rev. ed. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Folena, G., 1991. *Volgarizzare e tradurre*. Turin: Einaudi.

Jiménez-Crespo, M.A., 2013. *Translation and Web Localization*. London and New York: Routledge.

Khalifa, A-W, ed., 2014. *Translators have their say? Translation and the power of agency*. Zurich: LIT Verlag.

Kundera, M., 1992. *The Joke: Definitive Version*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Milton, J. and Bandia, P. eds., 2009. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Padilla Cruz, M., 2016. "Introduction: Three decades of relevance theory". In: M. Padilla Cruz, ed. *Relevance Theory: Recent Developments, Current Challenges and Future Directions*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Peirce, C.S., 1931—1958. *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vol. VIII. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Peirce, C.S., 1992—1998. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Vol. II. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

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

Pym, A., 2004b. "Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation". *Target,* 16(1), pp. 1—28.

Schäffner, C., ed., 1999. *Translation and Norms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sengupta, M., 1990. "Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds". *Translation, History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter.

Solum, K., 2017. "Translators, editors, publishers, and critics: Multiple translatorship in the public sphere". *Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 39—60.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D., 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D., 2004. "Relevance Theory". In: L.R. Horn and G. Ward, eds. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 607—632.

Stecconi, U., 2004. "Interpretive Semiotics and Translation Theory: The Semiotic Conditions to Translation". *Semiotica,* 150, pp. 471—489.

Stecconi, U., 2009. "Semiotics". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 260—263.

Stecconi, U., 2010. "Semiotics and Translation". In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 314—319.

Stecconi, U., 2018. "Semiotics". *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 91—94.

Steiner, G., 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toury, G., 1986. "Translation. A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective". *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1111—1124.

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

VV. AA., 1996. *Daydreams and Nightmares: A Fearless Anthology of Italian Short Stories*. Translated by U. Stecconi, C. Bautista and L. Venuti. In: U. Stecconi, ed. *Salin*. Pasig City (Manila): Anvil.

VV. AA., 1999. *Balikbayan: racconti filippini contemporanei*. Translated by U. Stecconi. Milan: Feltrinelli.

The author

Ubaldo Stecconi, European Commission, Brussels.
E-mail: ubaldo.stecconi@gmail.com

To cite this article:
Stecconi, U. 2019, How translations are willed into existence, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 69—80. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-5.

КАК ПЕРЕВОДЫ ОБРЕТАЮТ СУЩЕСТВОВАНИЕ

У. Стеккони[1]

[1] Европейская комиссия, Брюссель
Бельгия, Брюссель, P.O. Box 1049
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-5

Создание текста перевода может быть инициировано тремя способами. Иногда перевод осуществляется по инициативе реципиента (pull mode), что интуитивно кажется очевидным. Например, издательский дом принимает решение о переводе нового романа. Инициатива инвестировать в переводческий проект практически полностью зависит от реципиента перевода и будущего спроса на текст. Примером второго типа инициативы (push mode) может выступать компания, локализующая свой веб-сайт для иностранных рынков. В данном случае инициатива по созданию текста перевода принадлежит самой компании. Третий тип (shuffle) соответствует тем редким случаям, в которых инициатива по созданию текста перевода не принадлежит ни одной из указанных сторон. Перевод осуществляется с целью преодоления семиотических барьеров, будучи вызванным к жизни возможностью или необходимостью. Особое внимание в статье уделено статусу переводчика как активному участнику коммуникации. В реальной жизни переводчики редко имеют право голоса в инициировании перевода. Однако ничто не мешает им открыто выражать свое мнение, говорить о мотивах и стратегиях создания текста перевода. Переводчики могут и должны играть более активную роль в инициировании переводов, в определении того, как и какие тексты появляются и функционируют в принимающей среде.

***Ключевые слова**: когнитивные подходы, теория релевантности, семиотика и перевод, статус переводчика.*

Список литературы

Buzelin H. Agents of translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 6—12.

Calvino I. Lezioni americane. Milan : Garzanti, 1988a.

Calvino I. Six Memos for the Next Millennium / transl. by P. Creagh. N. Y. : Vintage, 1988b.

Copeland R. Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts, Cambridge studies in medieval literature. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. Vol. 11.

Eco U. Experiences in Translaton. Toronto ; Buffalo ; L. : University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Eco U. Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione. Milan : Bompiani, 2003a.

Eco U. Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation. L.: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003b.

Esselink B. A Practical Guide to Localization. Rev. ed. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2000.

Folena G. Volgarizzare e tradurre. Turin : Einaudi, 1991.

Jiménez-Crespo M.A. Translation and Web Localization. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2013.

Khalifa A.-W. (ed.). Translators have their say? Translation and the power of agency. Zurich : LIT Verlag, 2014.

Kundera M. The Joke: Definitive Version. N. Y. : HarperCollins Publishers, 1992.

Milton J., Bandia P. (eds.). Agents of Translation. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2009.

Padilla Cruz M. Introduction: Three decades of relevance theory // Padilla Cruz M. (ed.). Relevance Theory: Recent Developments, Current Challenges and Future Directions. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2016.

Peirce C.S. The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Cambridge (Mass.) : Harvard University Press, 1931—1958. Vol. 8.

Peirce C.S. The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings. Bloomington : Indiana University Press, 1992—1998. Vol. 2.

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

Pym A. Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation // Target. 2004b. Vol. 16, №1. P. 1—28.

Schäffner C. (ed.). Translation and Norms. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 1999.

Sengupta M. Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds. Translation, History and Culture. L. ; N. Y. : Pinter, 1990.

Solum K. Translators, editors, publishers, and critics: Multiple translatorship in the public sphere // Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2017. P. 39—60.

Sperber D., Wilson D. Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass. : Blackwell, 1995.

Sperber D., Wilson D. Relevance Theory // Horn L.R., Ward G. (eds.). The Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford : Blackwell, 2004. P. 607—632.

Stecconi U. Interpretive Semiotics and Translation Theory: The Semiotic Conditions to Translation // Semiotica. 2004. Vol. 150. P. 471—489.

Stecconi U. Semiotics // Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2009. P. 260—263.

Stecconi U. Semiotics and Translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 314—319.

Stecconi U. Semiotics // A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2018. P. 91—94.

Steiner G. After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1975.

Toury G. Translation. A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective // Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics. Berlin ; N. Y. : Mouton de Gruyter, 1986. P. 1111—1124.

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

VV. AA. Daydreams and Nightmares: A Fearless Anthology of Italian Short Stories / transl. by U. Stecconi, C. Bautista, L. Venuti // Stecconi U. (ed.). Salin. Pasig City (Manila) : Anvil, 1996.

VV. AA. Balikbayan: racconti filippini contemporanei / transl. by U. Stecconi. Milan : Feltrinelli, 1999.

Об авторе

Убальдо Стеккони, Европейская комиссия, Брюссель, Бельгия.
E-mail: ubaldo.stecconi@gmail.com

Для цитирования:
Stecconi U. How translations are willed into existence // Слово. ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 69—80. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-5.

AMBIGUITY MATTERS IN LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION[1]

E. Boyarskaya[1]

[1] Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad
Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow
Submitted on May 28, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-6

Ambiguity implies that there are at least two distinct senses ascribed to one sign. It is inherent to language and speech. In this article, I reflect on the types of ambiguity, its typology, production and effect and propose an algorithm for tackling ambiguity in translation. I posit that the choice of a translation strategy and the need for disambiguation in general depend on the type of ambiguity, its sources and character, i.e. whether ambiguity is intended or not. Intended ambiguity occurs when the speaker intentionally does not follow the logic of conceptual clues (primes) and opts for a set of communicative strategies and linguistic means, which allow him/her to offer several possible interpretations of one event or even refer to several different events. I explore a rarely analyzed event-referential ambiguity, which requires additional conceptual information for disambiguation and, consequently, may pose a problem for translation. I argue that problems in disambiguation may occur for a variety of reasons: the translator and\or the recipient may have a wrong reference, have insufficient background knowledge to resolve the ambiguity or make wrong inferences since each recipient bears a different combination of cognitive, axiological, social, professional and gender attributes.

Keywords: *ambiguity, polysemy, translation, decision-making, disambiguation.*

1. Introduction

To start a discussion on why ambiguity matters (the phrase, which is ambiguous in itself), I would like give a quote from Umberto Eco*:*

> 'It sometimes happens that one of my translators will ask me the following question: "I am at a loss as to how to render this passage, because it is ambiguous. It can be read two different ways' (*Confessions of a Young Novelist,* 2011:33).

Translators face the challenge of ambiguity and its resolution in their daily work since ambiguity is inherent to human communication though often described as a problem, a 'disease of language' (Graham 2001). Unlike most language users, who are usually unaware of the presence of ambiguity, translators have to decide how to tackle the problem of simultaneous existence of two (or more) discrete senses or two (or more) possible interpretations when rendering the meaning in the process of intralingual and interlingual translation.

In this article, I will look into the phenomenon of ambiguity, its sources and types, resolution and translation decision-making patterns. More specif-

[1] The work on this article has been supported by the grant from the National Research Foundation №17-78-30029.

ically, I will analyse ambiguity from the point of view of its a) production and typology; b) perception and effect; c) disambiguation and translation decision-making. I will also offer a Q&A algorithm for tackling ambiguity in translation.

2. Production and typology

The study of ambiguity and its sources began in Antiquity. It was Aristotle, who wrote:

> 'There are three varieties of ambiguities and amphibolies: (1) When either the expression or the name has strictly more than one meaning… (2) when by custom we use them so; (3) when words that have a simple sense taken alone have more than one meaning in combination; e.g. 'knowing letters'. For each word, both 'knowing' and 'letters', possibly has a single meaning: but both together have more than one — either that the letters themselves have knowledge or that someone else has it of them (Sophistical Refutations, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2016).

Since then, the study of the 'obscurity of meaning' has never stopped. The problem of ambiguity has been addressed in philosophy (Athrton 1993; Camp 2006; etc.), logic (Black 1937), lexical and cognitive semantics (Apresjian, Bach 1982; Chomsky 2000; Cruse 1986; Dunbar 2001; Fodor 1998; Greenough 2003; Lakoff 1970; Nunberg 1995; Saka 2007; Tuggy 1993, Zwicky&Sadock), pragmatics (Grice 1975; Recanati 2004; Zabotkina 2018), psychology (Barsalou 1982), automated text analysis and natural language processing (NLP) for artificial intelligence (AI) (Degani et al. 2016; Giammarresi, Salvatore & Guy Lapalme 2016), etc. It shows a ubiquitous interest in ambiguity despite its seemingly confusing character. Unfortunately, there have been very few research works in Translation Studies devoted exclusively to ambiguity proper. In the *Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography*, out of 214 ambiguity search hits only separate works explore the problem (Benjamin 2012; Gishti et al. 2013; Hendwerker 2004; Pym&Bei 2018; Quiroga 2003; Fougner 2003; etc.). The majority of the articles explore the problem of ambiguity in the translation of literary texts and machine translation.

Yet, there are numerous articles, published recently, focusing on translation ambiguity (which, certainly, does not mean 'ambiguity in translation' but ambiguity as a process of sense identification in NLP and AI) and its consequences for lexical processing and language learning (see Natasha Tokowicz and Tamar Degani 2016).

Following Yu. Apresjan (Apresjan 1974), in Russian linguistics, ambiguity is referred to as *neodnoznachnost'* (not-single-meaningness); it is differentiated from *mnogoznachnost'* (polysemy) and *neopredelennost'* (vagueness) (Zaliznyak 2007). There have been numerous attempts to distinguish polysemy, ambiguity and vagueness. However, there is no evidence that the proposed tests give reliable results, since participants of the tests largely rely on their individual perception of the difference between the three phenomena (Kilgariff 2011).

In common parlance, ambiguity implies more than two interpretations, more than two senses of a word. However, some of the latest lexicographic definitions (for instance, Prinston University's *WordNet* 3.1) provide some food for thought on the difference between ambiguity and vagueness: ambiguity is defined as 1) an expression whose meaning cannot be determined from its context 2) unclearness by virtue of having more than one meaning, whereas vagueness implies 1) unclearness by virtue of being poorly expressed or not coherent in meaning) "*the Conservative manifesto is a model of vagueness*"; "*these terms were used with a vagueness that suggested little or no thought about what each might convey*" 2) indistinctness of shape or character) "*the scene had the swirling vagueness of a painting by Turner*"

From the cognitive and pragmatic points of view, the definitions above present a rather interesting approach to the analysis of ambiguity and vagueness: vagueness is clearly perceived as a negative phenomenon (by virtue of being poorly expressed and not coherent) whereas ambiguity proper is regarded with somewhat greater tolerance (unclearness by virtue of having more than one meaning).

Researchers traditionally distinguish language ambiguity and speech ambiguity (Tuggy 1993). Language ambiguity is the capacity of a word or phrase to have distinct senses, i.e. the property of linguistic units, whereas speech ambiguity is the realisation of this property in an utterance (Zaliznіak 2007). Some languages are notoriously famous for being polysemous and, consequently, have a much higher potential for ambiguity. According to some authors, over 40 % of English words are polysemous (Traxler, 2012:117). Given the fact that most words in natural languages are likely to be polysemous, i.e. having more than one meaning, ambiguity is not a rarity in language and speech. This brings us to the need to reflect on the types of ambiguity, some of which were also described in (Zabotkina et al. 2017, 2018).

From the point of view of language mechanisms, there are lexical, morphological and syntactical ambiguities. The most common, but nevertheless, challenging type of ambiguity is lexical ambiguity. It occurs when ambiguous senses are either a result of polysemy (for instance, words having a metonymic or a metaphoric sense extensions), or a result of homonymy.

The translator has to be aware of the words, which are not only polysemous but intrinsically ambiguous. In linguistic literature, they are called different names — auto-antonyms, or Janus words. They are polysemous words having contrasting and seemingly unrelated meanings, for instance:

(Eng.) apparent

1. An apparent situation, quality, or feeling seems to exist, although you cannot be certain that it does exist. *There is at last an apparent end to the destructive price war.*

2. If something is apparent to you, it is clear and obvious to you. *It has been apparent that in other areas standards have held up well.*

The presence of a star is already apparent in the early film.

(Cobuild English Language Dictionary)

Auto-antonyms are known to exist in most languages, including Russian:

(Rus) Он запустил проект (*On zapustil projekt*)
He has started (launched) a project (translated by the author)
1. Начал реализацию (*Nachal realizaciju*) — 'has started to implement the project'
2. Довел до состояния, грозящего полной остановкой (*Dovel do sostojanija, grozjashhego polnonim provalom projekta*) — 'has almost failed to implement the project'.

Auto-antonyms pose a problem for both translation and interpreting, particularly when they occur at the beginning of a sentence and the interpreter, unlike the translator, has to identify and process contextual clues for disambiguation during a fairly short period of time and without having the context necessary for disambiguation. Consider, for instance, a piece of transcript of a business meeting and reflect on the scanty conceptual information available for the interpreter\translator preceding and following the auto-antonym *apparently* as well as the general ambiguity of the excerpt:

'I think one of the things we discussed in the branch action group meeting is actually, weren't quite sure what the (pause) cos (laughing) we'd been sending out (unclear) for quite less than ten of the branches because (pause) to (pause) do something to them which was (pause) mm (pause) *apparently* lots of them in but erm (pause) well they keep disappearing so that the (pause) what we've been talking about is to try and get some points (pause) erm (pause) health and safety station (pause) within the branch, which actually just has all this stuff for it (Available at https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/).

Idioms provide numerous examples of lexical ambiguity, especially those having a lower use frequency. They pose a problem since they can be easily mistaken for their literal readings, for instance, *she is in the driver's seat* may easily by interpreted as *somebody has taken the front seat opposite the steering wheel* or *somebody who is in control*. One may jump to conclusions without realizing the sentence is ambiguous as both interpretations are plausible ones.

Syntactic (structural) ambiguity develops from an ambiguous structure of an utterance. All types of texts offer numerous examples of structural ambiguity including excerpts from the Bible: "And all the people saw the thundering, and the lightning, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it, they removed, and stood afar off" (The Bible). The pronoun *it* may refer to either of the three events *thundering/lightning/noise* or the whole situation. This type of ambiguity is often referred to scope ambiguity. This type is is closer on the gradient scale to vagueness, since the scope of conceptual information activated is ample, non-homogenous and changeable depending on the presented stimuli. However, this type is a frequent occurrence and poses relatively little difficulty for translation.

Another type of ambiguity is a morphological one when one part of speech can be used instead of another (see the title of this article). In the

phrase, *no road works* 'works' can morphologically be interpreted as a plural noun or a verb. Consequently, the sentence can be interpreted as *there is no repair works* or *none of the roads is in good condition to be used.*

Transformational ambiguity, introduced by J. Lyons (Lyons 1975) and reflected on by N. Chomsky (Chomsky 1957), is a type of ambiguity that exists, in most cases, only out of context, for instance, 'the shooting of the hunters' (ibid).

The translator is to be aware of another type of ambiguity, which is seldom analysed in linguistic literature — event-referential ambiguity. I hold there are at least two types of it. The first one is a possible reference to two or more events in one context resulting from insufficient or poor conceptual stimuli:

(Eng.) *Since I gave up hockey, I have lost my goal,* which may be understood as
1) I cannot play well any longer;
2) I see no goal in life;
(Rus.) *Я иду на посадку (Ja idu na posadku),* which may mean
1. I am walking to my departure gate at the airport;
2. I am boarding the aircraft;
3. The aircraft where I am is landing.

Event-referential ambiguity may also result in another scenario — several possible interpretations of one single event depending on the point of view:

Re-election of the chairman — 1) election of the same person for another term or 2) election of another person;

In the case described above, the event is the same — that of the election (or re-election) of the chairman. However, there could be two different interpretations of one event. This type of ambiguity occurs due to a variety of reasons, ranging from conceptual, semantic (polysemy proper) to purely pragmatic ones — prevalence of individual pragmatic factors in the process of disambiguation.

Event-referential ambiguity may be generated by separate words (polysemy and homonymy), ambiguous morphological and syntactic structures. It may occur due to the poverty of conceptual stimuli, or appear as ambiguity of the whole sentence or text as is the case of scope and transformational ambiguity.

From the pragmatics point of view, the translator has to differentiate between intended and unintended ambiguity. Intended ambiguity is aimed at creating a specific pragmatic effect. It has its bearing on the way the source text is understood, interpreted and perceived by the recipient. The translator has to differentiate between the intended ambiguity of the speaker (author) and that of the translated text as such.

There are certain types of discourse that are particularly demonstrative of intended ambiguity: advertising, politics, minority issues and diplomacy. The latter is notoriously famous for ambiguities as one can see from a much quoted aphorism: when a diplomat says *yes*, he means *perhaps*; when he says *perhaps*, he means *no*; when he says *no*, he is not a diplomat.

Depending on the intention of employing ambiguity in the above-mentioned types of discourse, one can identify two subtypes of ambiguity — strategic or 'constructive' and manipulative. However, broadly speaking, any kind of intended ambiguity can be considered manipulative since the speaker when generating an utterance aims at achieving a particular goal or effect. Yet, strategic ambiguity can be defined as a deliberate choice of words or language structures allowing the freedom to alter interpretations, which, however, may produce the most positive effect in pursuing a positive goal:

> 'The U.S. policy towards the unification of China and Taiwan has been described as a policy of 'strategic ambiguity', one that allows the U.S. to be non-specific in its assertions about the status of Taiwan (British National Corpus).

Lately, strategic ambiguity has been more and more often considered as a communicative strategy whether it is for better or for worse:

> 'As a strategy, constructive ambiguity sounds like an ornate euphemism for "sitting on the fence", but this is the label some have applied to the Brexit position of the UK's opposition Labour party…… Of course, the party itself is not openly calling it constructive ambiguity, as it tiptoes around the increasingly desperate negotiations between Theresa May's government and the EU, and time rapidly runs out before the UK's deadline to leave the union in six months' time (https://www. thenational. ae/opinion/comment/how-the-uk-labour-party-has-turned-brexit-ambiguity-into-a-clear-advantage-1.776666).

Interestingly enough, there is a difference between being ambiguous and being strategic about ambiguity**.** Take, for instance, the following example of scope ambiguity from business discourse and think of its possible meaning and translation options:

> "Well, we don't want to *limit ourselves*, so we're going to try to be *all things* to *all people*" (https://www. marshallstrategy. com/think-big-understanding-the-value-of-strategic-ambiguity/).

Manipulative ambiguity proper is aimed at achieving a goal, which is not morally or otherwise right. One of the most common techniques of achieving manipulative ambiguity is a deliberate choice of an 'ambiguous' communicative strategy and the corresponding lexical units. The analysis of numerous examples shows that one of such strategies is averaging and generalisation, for example:

> 'The increase in secondary school enrolments in DET schools has far outstripped the rate of population increase. Despite some expansion of the system, classes are still very large, on average forty or more, and facilities are overstretched' (British National Corpus).

Deliberate use of lexical means as the ones in the sentence above — 'On average forty or more', 'far outstripped' and 'some' — leaves the recipient certain space for a conceptual manoeuver, which was obviously the intention of the speaker.

On the one hand, the use of the generalisation and averaging strategies results in pragmatic hedging used to protect the speaker from possible criticism concerning the use of unverified or inaccurate data. Naturally, these strategies lead to multiple interpretations of the event depending on the interlocutor's pragmatic attitude.

A similar effect is achieved by the use of linguistic means of expressing modality since some types of modality (for instance, probability) provide an ample opportunity for conceptual and interpretive options, as shown in the examples below:

> 'So it's *hardly likely* they're going to write off their star when the ink is barely dry on his $50 million contract!' (https://corpus.byu.edu/iweb/).

All strategies and techniques of achieving intended ambiguity create an opportunity for manipulating public opinion since ambiguity provides several reference points. The multiplicity of reference points for the formation of a judgment creates a favourable environment for the emergence of ambiguity.

Unintended ambiguity can be a result of the speaker's unawareness of the effect produced. However, from a textual point of view, this lack of clarity, uncertainty is 'rich in connotations and innuendos that are very fruitful for the overall textual strategy' (Eco 2011:34).

Unintended ambiguity may result from a low degree of language proficiency since non-native speakers often use words either in a wrong context, or in a wrong meaning. It definitely poses a problem for the translator, especially if the translator is asked to 'proofread the text' written in a foreign language, which is often the case.

3. Perception and effect

From the point of view of perception and effect, ambiguity can 1) complicate the understanding of a message or 2) can be enjoyed by the recipient.

A fairly recent research work by a team of German psychologists proves that people do not need to fully understand a painting or any artwork to like it. Their experiments showed that "the higher the subjectively perceived degree of ambiguity within an artwork, the more participants liked it, and the more interesting and affecting it was for them." The most striking result: "The higher participants assessed the ambiguity of a stimulus, the more they appreciated it" (Jacobs 2017). This might be also true of different types of discourse other than that of visual art. Ambiguity may have a positive effect on the recipient as he/she may enjoy the elegance of expression or its wit.

However, many researchers promote the principle of avoidance of polysemy and, hence, ambiguity. One of Grice's maxims also advises to avoid ambiguity at all costs (Grice, 1975), meaning the translator has to disambiguate since ambiguity may result in a communication failure. I argue that this may happen for a variety of reasons: having come across an ambiguous word (phrase, sentence, etc.), the translator and\or the recipient may:

1) have a wrong reference;

2) have insufficient background knowledge to resolve it;

3) make wrong inferences since each recipient bears a different combination of cognitive, axiological, social, professional and gender attributes.

Ambiguity can be perceived and not perceived. In other words, the translator or the recipient may remain unaware of the presence of ambiguity. When generating an utterance, the speaker chooses words according to his/her communicative and pragmatic intention. Polysemy (or homonymy, for that matter), as it may seem, is a problem for the recipient only (as it was shown above) since the recipient has to adequately infer the intended sense of the ambiguous word in a given context.

In everyday discourse, both the speaker and the listener are unaware of the presence of polysemy. They do not realize the complexity of the structure of polysemous words and the entire scope of conceptual information encoded by them. The identification of the meaning of a polysemous word occurs so effortlessly that polysemy is perceived as monosemy (Zabotkina et al. 2017). Consequently, ambiguity may go unnoticed.

Another interesting kind of ambiguity is the one induced by cultural traditions, for instance, in some Asian countries, where it is easier to be ambiguous to 'save face' rather than to simply say no or give a straightforward negative reply.

The translator is to be aware of ambiguity, its effects and the possible difficulties of its resolution. The choice of strategy obviously depends on whether ambiguity is intended or not and on the availability of translation means in the target language.

4. The problem of disambiguation

In this section, I will look into the problem of the resolution of ambiguity. The prevailing point of view in traditional semantics and in translation is that ambiguity needs to be resolved one way or another. However, language being an effective tool for communicating ideas, emotions etc. often plays practical jokes and easily shifts meanings.

Having faced the puzzle of ambiguity, the translator has two options. He\she can either disambiguate polysemous words or exploit them for conversational (meaning pragmatic) profit, and this is in spite of the fact that keeping multiple meanings in mind has some cognitive cost (Nerlich 2003).

Disambiguation is triggered by context. Broadly speaking, by 'context' I understand any type of conceptual, linguistic and extralinguistic information available at the moment of translation decision-making. If ambiguity occurs as a result of polysemy, then the presence of clues of one meaning or the absence of clues (primes) of a different meaning (or meanings) is a tool of disambiguation. Conceptual primes facilitate the process of disambiguation. Each word is associated with a set of dynamic cognitive contexts that store a significant amount of conceptual information, referring to any number of conceptual domains that are relevant to the identification of a particular sense of the word. Consider, for instance, the following example:

1. "While a central bank-backed digital currency could pose a disruptive threat to current bank operations, Citi views this as an improbable "long-tail" risk" (https://corpus. byu. edu/bnc/).

2. The Premier's success in his role as President of the European Community came as America prepared to carry out threats of trade sanctions on EC imports (https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/).

Two different conceptual primes in (1) and (2) — *pose* a disruptive threat and *prepared to carry out* threats — facilitate the process of disambiguation between the two senses of the noun: something that is a source of danger (1) and a warning that something unpleasant is imminent (2).

However, there are contexts, which are intrinsically ambiguous since they are not informative enough about their meaning in general or the meaning of the word in question:

(1) 'We attended the same school' may mean, for instance, 'we were classmates' or 'we studied in the same school but were not classmates';

(2) 'She is plain' may be interpreted as ' she is ugly' or 'she is simple';

(3) 'The empirical data sources are included alongside the other references in alphabetical order' is definitely confusing since 'alongside' means both 'next to' and 'together' (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/alongside). Example — Lege Artis Journal. Guidelines for authors. Available at https://lartis.sk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/LArtGuidelines_for_authors.pdf).

The examples given above demonstrate that insufficient context or poor cognitive stimuli may result in translation errors. Hence, this topic requires further research employing methods of the cognitive paradigm.

5. Conclusions

The main point I attempted to argue is the need to be aware of ambiguity as a phenomenon of language and speech as well as the rich variety of its types leading to numerous options in the translation decision-making process. There are at least ten questions the translator has to answer before deciding on what to do about ambiguity: 1. What type of ambiguity is it? 2. How it is achieved? 3. Is the ambiguity intended or not? 4. If the ambiguity is intended, is it constructive or purely manipulative? 5. Is it intended ambiguity of the author or intended ambiguity of the text as a whole? 6. Is the whole text ambiguous or are there only separate elements, which are perceived as ambiguous? 7. If the ambiguity is unintended, why does it occur? 8. Does the unintended ambiguity need disambiguation? 9. Are there linguistic means in the target language to express the source language ambiguities? 10. What conceptual, linguistic and extralinguistic information is needed to approach the problem?

In the majority of cases, speakers are aware of ambiguity provided it is intended. Intended ambiguity occurs when the speaker intentionally does not follow the logic of priming since each meaning of a polysemous word is primed differently.

The multiplicity of interpretations created by event-referential ambiguity may present a problem for translation and requires a broader cognitive context for its successful disambiguation. Poor cognitive stimuli, insufficient cognitive context available at the moment of disambiguation may result in translation errors.

Further research into ambiguity should combine a variety of traditional linguistic and novel cognitive and psycholinguistic approaches for a deeper understanding of its sources, functions, mechanisms and effect.

References

Apresjan, Yu., 1974. *Leksicheskaya semantika: sinonimicheskie sredstva yazyka* [Lexical semantics: synonymous means of language]. Russia, Moscow: Nauka (in Russ.).

Aristotle, 2016. *Sophistical Refutations*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ambiguity/ [accessed 12 May 2019].

Atherton, C., 1993. *The Stoics on Ambiguity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bach, K., 1982. Semantic Nonspecificity and Mixed Quantifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 4, pp. 593—605.

Barsalou, L., 1982. Context-independent and context-dependent information in concepts. *Memory & Cognition,* 10, pp. 82—93.

Benjamin, A., 2012, Translation and ambiguity: towards a reformulation. *Australian Association for Literary Translation Review,* 5, pp. 39—46.

Black, M., 1937. Vagueness: An exercise in logical analysis. *Philosophy of Science,* 4, pp. 427—455.

Camp, E., 2006. Metaphor and That Certain 'Je Ne Sais Quoi'. *Philosophical Studies*, 129, pp. 1—25.

Chomsky, N., 1957. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N., 2000. *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D., 1986. *Lexical Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dunbar, G., 2001. Towards a Cognitive Analysis of Polysemy, Ambiguity and Vagueness. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12, pp. 1—14.

Eco, U., 2011. *Confessions of a young novelist*. Harvard University Press.

Graham, R., 2001. *Statutory interpretation: Theory and Practice*. Toronto: Emond Publishing.

Fodor, J., 1998. *Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fougner, R., 1998. La notion d'ambiguïté en traduction. *TradTerm,* 5(1), pp. 11—40.

Giammarresi, S. and Lapalme, G., 2016. Computer science and translation: natural languages and machine translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Border Crossings: Translation Studies and other disciplines*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. pp. 205—224.

Gishti, E. and Fjoralba, D., 2013. Les ambiguïtés sémantiques dans la langue de spécialité: les "jeux" du sens de l'équivalence — un défi pour le traducteur. *Atelier de Traduction,* 19, pp. 115—126.

Greenough, P., 2003. Vagueness: A Minimal Theory. *Mind,* 112, pp. 235—81.

Grice, H., 1975. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole and Morgan, eds. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. pp. 45—47.

Handwerker, B., 2004. Übersetzung und sprachliche Mehrdeutigkeit. In: H. Kittel et al., eds. *Übersetzung Translation Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung (HSK).* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 362—369.

Jacobs, T., 2017. *The appeal of ambiguity in art: German researchers find people don't need to fully "get" a work to enjoy it*. Available at: https://psmag.com/social-justice/the-appeal-of-ambiguity-in-art [accessed 14 May 2019].

Kilgariff, A., 2011. *I do not believe in word senses, Polysemy: Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York. pp. 361—392.

Lakoff, G., 1970. A note on vagueness and ambiguity. *Linguistic Inquiry,* 1, pp. 357—359.

Lyons, J., 1975. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.* Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Nerlich, B., 2003. *Polysemy and flexibility, Polysemy: Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language.* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin New York, p. 13.

Nunberg, G., 1995. Transfers of Meaning. *Journal of Semantics,* 12, pp. 109—32.

Quiroga, C., 2003. Language ambiguity: a curse and a blessing. *Translation Journal,* 7 (1), pp. 57—61.

Pym, A. and Hu, B., 2018. Constructive ambiguity in foreign-affairs translation. The case of "One China". Available at: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/2018_trust_hubris.pdf [accessed 14 May 2019].

Recanati, F., 1989. The Pragmatics of What is Said. *Mind and Language*, 4, pp. 295—329.

Anon, 2004. *Literal Meaning,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saka, P., 2007. *How to Think About Meaning*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Traxler, M., 2011. *Introduction to Psycholinguistics: understanding language science*. Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tuggy, D., 1993. Ambiguity, Polysemy and Vagueness. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4, pp. 273—290.

Zabotkina, V. and Boyarskaya, E., 2017. On the Challenge of Polysemy in Contemporary Cognitive Research: What is Conscious and what is Unconscious. Psychology. *Russia: State of the Art*, 10(3), pp. 28—39.

Zalizniak, A., 2007. The Phenomenon of Polysemy and Ways to Describe it, the Cognitive Basis of Polysemy. *Metalinguistica,* 19, pp. 93—97.

Zwicky, A. and Sadock, J., 1975. Ambiguity Tests and How to Fail Them. In: Kimball, ed. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press. pp. 1—36.

The author

Dr Elena Boyarskaya, Associate Professor, the Institute of the Humanities; head of the Translation and Interpreting Unit, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia.

E-mail: EBOYARSKAYA@kantiana.ru

To cite this article:

Boyarskaya, E. 2019, Ambiguity matters in linguistics and translation, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent,* Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 81—93. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-6.

НЕОДНОЗНАЧНОСТЬ В ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ И ПЕРЕВОДЕ

Е. Боярская

Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Российский государственный гуманитарный университет, Москва
Поступила в редакцию 28.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-6

Неоднозначность подразумевает наличие по крайней мере двух различных смыслов, приписанных одному знаку. Она в полной мере присуща языку и речи. В статье рассмотрена типология неоднозначности, ее механизмы и создаваемый эффект, а также предложен алгоритм устранения неоднозначности в переводе. Выбор стратегии перевода и необходимость устранения неоднозначности в целом зависят от типа неоднозначности, ее источников, природы и характера. Намеренная неоднозначность возникает в том случае, когда говорящий осознанно не следует логике концептуальных

праймов и выбирает такие коммуникативные стратегий и средства языка, которые создают несколько возможных интерпретаций одного события или отсылают к нескольким различным событиям. Особое внимание уделено референциальной неоднозначности события, которая требует дополнительной концептуальной информации для устранения неоднозначности и, следовательно, может представлять проблему для перевода. Проблемы в разрешении неоднозначности могут возникать по разным причинам: переводчик и / или реципиент могут иметь разные точки референции, обладать недостаточными фоновыми знаниями для разрешения неоднозначности или совершить ошибку при инференции, поскольку каждый коммуникант обладает различными когнитивными, аксиологическими, социальными, профессиональными и гендерными характеристиками.

Ключевые слова: *неоднозначность, полисемия, перевод, принятие решений, разрешение неоднозначности.*

Список литературы

Апресян Ю. Лексическая семантика: синонимические средства языка. М. : Наука, 1974.

Anon. Literal Meaning. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Aristotle. Sophistical Refutations. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2016. URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ambiguity/ (дата обращения: 12.05.2019).

Atherton C. The Stoics on Ambiguity. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bach K. Semantic Nonspecificity and Mixed Quantifiers // Linguistics and Philosophy. 1982. №4. P. 593—605.

Barsalou L. Context-independent and context-dependent information in concepts // Memory & Cognition. 1982. №10. P. 82—93.

Benjamin A. Translation and ambiguity: towards a reformulation // Australian Association for Literary Translation Review. 2012. №5. P. 39—46.

Black M. Vagueness: An exercise in logical analysis // Philosophy of Science. 1937. №4. P. 427—455.

Camp E. Metaphor and That Certain 'Je Ne Sais Quoi' // Philosophical Studies. 2006. Vol. 129. P. 1—25.

Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague : Mouton de Gruyter, 1957.

Chomsky N. New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Cruse D. Lexical Semantics. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Dunbar G. Towards a Cognitive Analysis of Polysemy, Ambiguity and Vagueness // Cognitive Linguistics. 2001. Vol. 12. P. 1—14.

Eco U. Confessions of a young novelist. Cambridge MA : Harvard University Press, 2011.

Graham R. Statutory interpretation: Theory and Practice. Toronto : Emond Publishing, 2001.

Fodor J. Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998.

Fougner R. La notion d'ambiguïté en traduction // TradTerm. 1998. Vol. 5, №1. P. 11—40.

Giammarresi S., Lapalme G. Computer science and translation: natural languages and machine translation // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Border Crossings: Translation Studies and other disciplines. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 2016. P. 205—224.

Gishti E., Fjoralba D. Les ambiguïtés sémantiques dans la langue de spécialité: les ″jeux'' du sens de l'équivalence — un défi pour le traducteur // Atelier de Traduction. 2013. №19. P. 115—126.

Greenough P. Vagueness: A Minimal Theory // Mind. 2003. Vol. 112. P. 235—281.

Grice H. Logic and Conversation // Cole and Morgan (eds.). Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts. N. Y. : Academic Press, 1975. P. 45—47.

Handwerker B. Übersetzung und sprachliche Mehrdeutigkeit // Kittel H. et al. (eds.). Übersetzung Translation Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung (HSK). Berlin ; N. Y. : Walter de Gruyter, 2004. S. 362—369.

Jacobs T. The appeal of ambiguity in art: German researchers find people don't need to fully "get" a work to enjoy it. 2017. URL: https://psmag.com/social-justice/the-appeal-of-ambiguity-in-art (дата обращения: 14.05.2019).

Kilgariff A. I do not believe in word senses, Polysemy: Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language. Berlin ; N. Y. : Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. P. 361—392.

Lakoff G. A note on vagueness and ambiguity // Linguistic Inquiry. 1970. №1. P. 357—359.

Lyons J. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Nerlich B. Polysemy and flexibility, Polysemy: Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language. Berlin ; N. Y. : Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.

Nunberg G. Transfers of Meaning // Journal of Semantics. 1995. №12. P. 109—132.

Quiroga C. Language ambiguity: a curse and a blessing // Translation Journal. 2003. Vol. 7, №1. P. 57—61.

Pym A., Hu B. Constructive ambiguity in foreign-affairs translation. The case of "One China". 2018. URL: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/2018_trust_hubris.pdf (дата обращения: 14.05.2019).

Recanati F. The Pragmatics of What is Said // Mind and Language. 1989. №4. P. 295—329.

Saka P. How to Think About Meaning. Dordrecht : Springer, 2007.

Traxler M. Introduction to Psycholinguistics: understanding language science. Boston : Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Tuggy D. Ambiguity, Polysemy and Vagueness // Cognitive Linguistics. 1993. №4. P. 273—290.

Zabotkina V., Boyarskaya E. On the Challenge of Polysemy in Contemporary Cognitive Research: What is Conscious and what is Unconscious. Psychology // Russia: State of the Art. 2017. Vol. 10, №3. P. 28—39.

Zalizniak A. The Phenomenon of Polysemy and Ways to Describe it, the Cognitive Basis of Polysemy // Metalinguistica. 2007. Vol. 19. P. 93—97.

Zwicky A., Sadock J. Ambiguity Tests and How to Fail Them // Kimball (ed.). Syntax and Semantics. N. Y. : Academic Press, 1975. Vol. 4. P. 1—36.

Об авторе

Елена Боярская, кандидат филологических наук, доцент Института гуманитарных наук, руководитель группы переводческого обеспечения, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта; Российский государственный гуманитарный университет, Россия.

E-mail: EBoyarskaya@kantiana.ru

Для цитирования:

Boyarskaya E. Ambiguity matters in linguistics and translation // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 81—93. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-6.

TRANSLATION OF SOCIOLECT TEXTS

E. Kharitonova[1]

Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University,
14 Nevskogo Str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia
Submitted on May 24, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-7

A moment's reflection suffices to convince one that no language is homogeneous, being represented by a set of language variants or language existential forms, reflecting the heterogeneous character of the national culture. Notwithstanding variable nature of language, linguistic theorizing has been mostly based on standardized languages forms, rather than on natural speech dialects. The present research addresses the fundamental issue of variability within a language and aims at studying the specific fragment of the Russian language of the XXth century – Soviet camp sociolect within the frameworks of contrastive sociolectology. Sociolect nature of the source text is viewed as one of the factors increasing the degree of text untranslatability. The author dwells on the nature of adaptation interventions, which a translator needs to perform to render the specificity of the Soviet camp social dialect in English. The analysis of the ways in which translators processed the source texts under consideration reveals the twofold strategy aimed at maintaining a proper balance between replicating the sociolect text specificity and making the translation readable to the target recipients. Combining explanatory translation, loose translation, occasional equivalents with loan translation translators achieve clarity of the translation, preserving at the same time apparent non-nativeness of the target text, which helps to avoid leveling the sociolect nature of the source texts.

Keywords*: sociolect, translation, untranslatability, camp jargon, adaptation.*

1. Introduction

Overcoming language and culture barriers in translation has long been an overriding concern for practitioners and interpreting researchers alike. Studies of the 'ethnos – language – culture' triad led to the emergence of diametrically opposite points of view on the objective possibility of translation: from proclaiming the dogma of untranslatability (translation is nothing more than an approximation to the original) to ultimate translatability, based on the idea of the existence of a certain universal language. Later attempts were made to synthesize both of these approaches, in the result of which such concepts as "relative translatability", "partial translatability", "decreasing translatability", etc. were introduced (Koller 1997, 164–167). Without going into the details of the discussion about the ontological essence of translatability/untranslatability, we will dwell on the dynamic nature of these categories. According to the German translator W. Koller, the degree of translatability/untranslatability may decrease or increase depending on the nature of the relationship between language, mode of thinking, perception of reality, reality itself, the uniqueness of each language, and

many other factors (ibidem). In other words, the category of untranslatability may lose its absolute character, and turn to the category of probable translatability, and then into potential and real translatability. In this regard, the urgent task of modern translation studies, in our opinion, is to identify and systematize linguistic and extralinguistic barriers, cultural bumps and other hindrances that increase the degree of untranslatability of texts and, thereby, impede full-fledged intercultural communication.

There are different criteria, permitting to evaluate the degree of translatability/untranslatability of texts. According to A. Neubert, the degree of translatability of literary texts depends on the genre of the work: "... fiction and drama have a higher degree of translatability than lyrical poetry" (Neubert 1968, 30—31). M. Pavlova identifies the place of bilingual literary texts in the paradigm of translatability/untranslatability, noting that single foreign inclusions are easier to translate than extensive text fragments that have bilingual characteristics (Pavlova 2017, 22). E. Maslennikova states, that texts may be steeped in context of cultures, opposing each other, which leads to cultural bumps or clashes, when the original and its translation, embodying two alien cultural worlds, come up against each other as "opposing" or even "mutually exclusive", thus increasing the degree of text untranslatability (Maslennikova, 2014: 152, 156).

The present article aims to contribute, however modestly, to supplementing the list of factors, influencing the degree of translatability/untranslatability of literary texts by identifying the role of sociolect nature of the source text, which is viewed as one of the barriers in the translation process.

Perhaps it would not be an exaggeration to say that the study of a language from a social perspective is one of the distinguishing features of linguistics of the 20th century. But despite the fact that hundreds of research papers and books on the relations between language and society have been published, and "the sociolinguistic enterprise has grown so much that it is difficult to keep up with developments in its various subfields" (Coulmas 1998) there is still a number of sociolinguistic phenomena requiring theoretical explanation. One of such underresearched areas is contrastive sociolectology, the sphere of sociolinguistics, which is diagnosed with "theoretical deficit" (Korovushkin 2005).

2. On the polysociolect nature of the national language

Contrastive sociolectology is an important branch of sociolinguistics, the task of which is to address the problem of translation of social dialects. K. Azhezh wrote: "... beyond the infinite variety of languages, lies the enchanting diversity of cultures" (Azhezh 2003, 278). This thought is applicable to the national language, which consists of a set of various language variants or social dialects, reflecting the heterogeneous character of the national culture. Thus, the existence of social dialects is caused by the properties of the national language itself, which exists not as a homogenous indiscreet entity, but as a complex combination of dialectically related language forms (variants), predetermined by various extralinguistic factors, such as the heterogeneity of the social structure of society (diastratic formations), the situa-

tion of communication (diasituational lexical groups) and territorial differentiation (diatopic variants). The situation is further complicated by the fact that, as T. Kryuchkova writes, in themselves, linguistic variants never exist "in pure form", correlated with only one extra-linguistic parameter (Kryuchkova 2016, 431). As a result, there is a huge variety of linguistic forms: besides traditionally distinguished sociological notions, such as jargon, argot, slang, professional languages, etc., the researchers identify various kinds of 'lects': 'familylects' — social dialect of a family (Lipatov 2010, 31), 'religiolects' — language varieties used by the representatives of a certain religious confession (Bugayeva 2010), 'geolects' are regionally, territorially and locally limited forms of the existence of the national language (Korovushkin 2005, 12), 'genderolects' — male and female speech (Medvedeva 2012), etc. It would be appropriate to refer here to R. Barthes, who wrote that each of us is included into a peculiar "game of sociolects", as no language can exist outside the sociolect sphere: the speech of every individual is inevitably included in one of the sociolect dialects (Barthes 1989, 526).

A means of communication of cultures (and subcultures, in particular) is the text, which acts as a unique cultural code that requires special interpretation, since its constituent language signs, along with the denotative meaning, are imbued with many changeable social meanings, which they acquire in the context of their use. In other words, the text is the most important representation of culture (subculture). R. Barthes figuratively compared the social characteristics of a text with its shadow, which the text can only get rid of "by consistent self-depletion": "Some would like the text (artwork, painting) not to have a shadow; not to be affected by the "dominant ideology". In the meantime, to demand this means to demand a fruitless, unproductive, well-polished text" (Barthes 1989, 486—487).

Further on we intend to illustrate the fact that taking into account sociolect specificity of the original text is extremely important in the process of its translation and that there are certain translation strategies, allowing doing this in a most effective way.

3. The study material

The linguistic situation that occurred in the former Soviet Union in the 20th century provides material for a fruitful and rewarding study on linguistic variations, as in the result of the 'nationalization' of the Russian language by the state, emerged the "Soviet language", which was later called the "newspeak", by analogy with the term coined by J. Orwell. M. Krongauz writes about the "newspeak" as a specific, separate and independent language (Krongauz 1991). It should be noted that the "newspeak" did not replace everyday language, but existed alongside with it, which led to the development of diglossia — the simultaneous existence in the society of two forms of the same language, applied in different functional spheres. Newspeak was not the only form of sociolect dialect, which emerged in response to the changes, occurred in the society. The period from the early 20s to the late 50s of the 20th century was marked by the spread of another social dialect, which served as a communication means for prisoners of the Soviet

camps — camp jargon. This social dialect was used by the former GULAG prisoners, who found the strength to remember everything that happened to them and to write about their camp experience on the pages of their memoirs, novels, narratives, plays, poems, etc. Among the outstanding Russian authors of the camp prose there are such writers as A. Solzhenitsyn, E. Ginzburg, V. Shalamov, L. Kopelev, L. Razgon and many others. Their works were translated into foreign languages and published in many countries. There is an opinion, that the camp theme is a thing of the past and though it was "vigorously debated in the 1960s-70s", today "a much more common reaction to Stalin terror — boredom and indifference" (Epplbaum 2006, 16). Such an assessment seems to us not completely objective. The fact that today, almost a century after the publication of the first translations of Russian camp prose into English, new translation are being prepared (*Memoir of a Gulag Actress* by T. Petkevich (2010); *Children of the Gulag* by S. Vilenski and K. Frierson (2011); *My Journey: How One Woman Survived Stalin's Gulag* by O. Adamova-Sliozberg (2011); *Five Fates from a Wondrous Planet* by G. Demidov (2015), etc.), prove that the interest to this topic did not fade.

The present research is therefore designed not only to understand the properties and functions of camp speech and the differences between standard language and social dialect, but also to analyze translation strategies, which make it possible to cope with these differences and thus help to reduce intercultural bumps in the process of sociolect texts translation. The research is based on the examples taken from the works of most well-known authors of Soviet camp prose, who employed in their works the vocabulary peculiar for the Soviet camp sociolect.

4. Translation of texts: from culture-sympathy to cultural bumps

The degree of translatability of sociolect texts may be different, depending on a number of factors. M. Snell-Hornby gave sufficient evidence that the possibility of the translation of the original text greatly depends on the degree of its cultural specificity: «the extent to which a text is translatable varies with the degree to which it is embedded in its own specific culture, also with the distance that separates the cultural background of source text and target audience in terms of time and place» (Snell-Hornby 1988, 41).

Analyzing the translations of *GULAG Archipelago* into English and German, a most well-known novel by A. Solzhenitsyn in which the author masterly blended the language of common people with harsh camp jargon, A. Bond came to the conclusion that the German translator enjoyed an advantage, to a degree, over the American translator, which lies outside a competence as a translator: "the German translator had a greater degree of perception of and empathy for Solzhenitsyn's subject matter… P's (*A. Peturnig — a translator of the GULAG Archipelago into German — my personal comment, EK*) appreciation of the kind of socio-cultural and political situations and conditions described must, one can safely say, be more attuned to her sensibilities than to those of someone whose European experience is not entirely first hand" (Bond 1983, 311—312). The main reason why the German translation was mainly characterized as "the most successful Solzhenitsyn translation

that had been done" (Bond 1983, 304), while the English translation, according to the reviewers, quite accurately conveyed only the content of the original, was that T. Whitney (*a translator of the GULAG Archipelago (Vol. 1 & 2) into English – my comment, EK.*) to a greater extent than A. Peturnig had to deal not only with discrepancies in the linguistic structures of the English and Russian languages, but also in the "worlds" themselves, that is, in the described objects and phenomena. The use of similar camp systems in the USSR and Germany affected the wide dissemination of specific camp vocabulary in both languages, which was not and could not be the case in English-speaking countries where there was no system of concentration camps. Thus, the possibility of 'importing' Soviet camp subculture by means of translation to English-speaking countries is significantly limited.

To render the specificity of the Soviet camp social dialect in English a translator needs to perform a certain amount of adaptation interventions[2]. The sociolect nature of the text is primarily revealed on the lexical level of the language. Sociolect markers of the source text include designations of subcultural realia and lexical elements reflecting peculiarities of the source subculture. An extract from a novel by a well-known Russian author L. Kopelev *Ease my Sorrows* can serve as an example of the source text, the sociolect nature of which pushes a translator to apply adaptation in the translation process:

> *Dmitry Panin was a native Muscovite, an aristocrat, engineer, and theoretician of blacksmithing. He was arrested in 1940 for "conversations" and sentenced in absentia to five years by an OSO (secret "court" under the MGB)*. And then in the camp in 1943 he was tried for "defeatist" agitation and was "given the whole spoon" – ten years.*
>
> *He had been brought to Butyrki Prison in Moscow for Vorkuta, near the Arctic Ocean, by a special warrant.*
>
> *There were a lot like him in the room – engineers, scientists, workers. It was from them that I first heard about sharashkas* (Kopelev 1983, 3).

In the abstract under analysis the author employs a number of lexical elements reflecting peculiarities of the Soviet subculture: realia (*спецнаряд, шарашка*), proper names (*Бутырки, Воркута*), abbreviations (*ОСО*), prison jargon (*навесить полную катушку*), which are assigned to a specific sociolect

[2] Despite the profound and long-lasting research of the much-disputed question of adaptation in translation, the term is still characterized as 'elusive' (Windle 2011) and the opinion on the adaptation in the translation process remains divided: from being treated as 'unacceptable' to 'legitimate strategy' (ibidem). However, linguistic and sociocultural differences inevitably embodied in a source text make adaptational interventions a practical necessity, since translation is always target-oriented, as there is no translation without the reader. Besides, blurriness of the divisions between translation and adaptation answers the question whether adaptation is deemed acceptable or not. To stop this endless discussion on the interrelations between translation and adaptation, Y. Gambier suggested in November 2003 in the special issue of *The Translator* dealing with screen translation (p. 178) the term "Transadaptation" (in English) and "Tradaptation" (in French), to stress the idea that there is always adaptation, to a certain extent, in translation and it is a question of degree, and not a difference of nature (Gambier 2003, 178).

nature of the source text. The translation of this 'sociolect markers' requires from the translator mastering of special intralinguistic skills to handle the specificity of the original sociolect text when there are no lexical means for its rendering into the target language.

P. Toper believes that the reader's perception is the highest argument in the debate about the translation quality, as it "organizes around itself all the other criteria necessary for evaluating the translation" (Toper 2000, 226). Dealing with a sociolect text, a translator is to decide how to render the 'otherness' embedded in the source text, so that it could be perceived by the ultimate reader as a text, marked by a subcultural specificity. In fact, the sociolect nature of the source text may influence to a certain extent the translation strategy: rendering the denotative component of the sociolect unit is no more perceived as a primary task. In the case when a sociolect unit does not carry important cognitive information or has an explicit inner form, the translator may resort to various translation techniques, such as loan translation (calques and half-calques), coining terms or borrowing of a word from the source text, which might hinder the understanding of the target text by the recipient, but at the same time the target text will be perceived as a sociolect dialect, the main function of which is to serve as 'language ID' for its users. Consider the following example from L. Kopelev's book:

> *Working in a camp means hauling, bending your back, pushing with your horns. But without kicking the bucket, 'floating off', earning 'a wooden jacket' – you have to goof off, shirk, pad, look like you're working, chisel, inflict wounds that will fester…* (Kopelev 1983, 5).

The choice of translation equivalents shows that the translator was seeking to maintain a proper balance between replicating the source text specificity and observing intelligibility of the translation for the recipients. Resorting to the terms the meanings of which overlap with the foreign terms (*haul, kick the bucket, goof off, shirk, pad, chisel*) and explanatory translation (*look like you're working, inflict wounds that will fester*), the translator at the same time preserved alienation effect by borrowing foreign terms ('*pushing with your horns', 'floating off', earning 'a wooden jacket*'), which seems to be quite justifiable. O. Rtischeva wrote that "barriers in the cross-cultural sphere are not only an obligatory, but also necessary factor for establishing interaction between language culture communities. The main function of cross-cultural barriers is not to divide, but to regulate interaction between the communicating cultures. The constructive role of cross-cultural barriers is to help keeping national originality, on the one hand, (it is especially important for globalization era and establishing multicultural community), and on the other, to stimulate interest in foreign culture society because lack of a barrier often depreciates object of knowledge. Thus, barriers aren't a barrier between cultures; they are an additional incentive to communication" (Rtischeva 2019, 129). The task of the translator is to properly assess the degree of foreignness that is acceptable and desirable to provide both the "incentive to communication" and intelligibility of the translation.

In the article *Beyond the particular* A. Chesterman provides examples of different types of what some call translation universals. According to one of the hypotheses, "translations tend to be longer than their source texts" (Chesterman 2004, 40). Amplifications in translation are indeed a characteristic feature of the translation process. However, the limitations arising from the sociolect nature of the text need to be taken into account, as excessive amplification in translation may ruin the sociolect nature of the text. For example, J. Glad, the translator of the *Kolyma Tales* by V. Shalamov in English found six different ways to translate the camp jargonism «*доходяга*»: *starving man; physically exhausted; emaciated prisoner; on the brink of death; goner; those who had gone through the hell of Kolyma* (Shalamov 1994: passim). It seems that the approximation '*goner*' corresponds better to the structure of the original, as it allows recreating in translation the laconism of the form and at the same time renders the imagery inherent in the original.

A good example of an effective strategy for rendering the specificity of sociolect texts is found in H. Willets's translation of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* by A. Solzhenitsyn. It should be noted that there were six English translations of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. Four of them were published almost simultaneously in 1963. The translation made by R. Parker, which is also provided beneath, was reprinted many times in most English-speaking countries, until H. Willets's translation appeared in 1991. Let us consider a small fragment from the translations performed by R. Parker and H. Willets:

One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. Tr. by R. Parker	**One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. Tr. by H. T. Willets**
But Shukhov had never forgotten the words of his first squad leader, Kuziomin – a hard-bitten prisoner who had already been in for twelve years by 1943 – who told the newcomers, just in from the front, as they sat beside a fire in a desolate cutting in the forest: "Here, men, we live by the law of the taiga. But even here people manage to live. The ones that don't make it are those who lick other men's leftovers, those who count on the doctors to pull them through, and those who squeal on their buddies." As for squealers, he was wrong there. Those people were sure to get through camp all right. Only they were saving their own skin at the expense of other people's blood.	*Shukhov never for a moment forgot what his first foreman, Kuzyomin, had told him. An old camp wolf, twelve years inside by 1943. One day around the campfire in a forest clearing he told the reinforcements fresh from the front, "It's the law of the taiga here, men. But a man can live here, just like anywhere else. Know who croaks first? The guy who licks out bowls, puts his faith in the sick bay, or squeals to godfather." He was stretching it a bit there, of course. A stoolie will always get by, whoever else bleeds for him.*

The first thing you pay attention to when comparing the two replicas of the original is a lengthy and redundant character of the translation made by R. Parker. Comp.: *squad leader* (P.) — *foreman* (W.); *a hard-bitten prisoner who had already been in for twelve years by 1943* (P.) — *an old camp wolf, twelve years inside by 1943* (W.); *Those people were sure to get through camp all right. Only they were saving their own skin at the expense of other people's blood* (P.) — *A stoolie will always get by, whoever else bleeds for him* (W.). Though both translators

conveyed the informative side of the source text, Willets's translation is more consistent with the translatological characteristics of the camp sociolect text. Parker's translation is much more explicit that the source text seems to be, which reduces the adequacy of the translation since it does not correspond to the source text pragmatics. However, one should take into account that Parker's translation appeared when the camp theme was just opened up and at that time very few English-speaking readers knew about the gulag.

5. Concluding remarks

Ch. Barslund writes that there are "some writers whose books may not 'travel' successfully to another language, even though it is technically possible to translate them. They may be deeply rooted in their own culture, for example, and have little appeal to foreign readers, though highly regarded in their country of origin." (Barslund 2012). The authors of the Soviet camp literature may serve as a good example here. The very first attempts to make a film based on Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the life of Ivan Denisovich* came across a misunderstanding on the part of the producers, whose summaries were as follows: "Lots of snow. Lots of long Russian names. No women. No escapes. No violence. Would have to be "opened up"... Recommendation: Not for us." (Harwood 1971). However, the right choice and appropriateness of target vocabulary and structures may help to bridge cognitive dissonance of cultures and thus, overcome communication breakdowns. The above examples are intended to show that the main task of a translator when working with a sociolect text is to resist the temptation to translate only the denotative component of the semantic structure of a sociolect word, but to do everything possible to achieve an adequate communicative effect on the recipients of translation.

References

Azhezh, K., 2003. *Chelovek govoryashchiy: Vklad lingvistiki v gumanitarnyye nauki* [Homo loquentes: The contribution of linguistics to the humanities]. Moscow: Editorial URSS (in Russ.).

Barslund, Ch., 2012. The Translation of Literary Prose. In: K. Windle and K. Malmkjaer, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford Handbooks Online. Available at: https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306 [accessed 15 May 2019].

Barthes, R., 1989. *Selected Works: Semiotics: Poetics*. Tr. from Fr. Moscow: Progress.

Bond, A., 1983. *A Study of the English and the German Translations of Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn's The Gulag Archipelago*. Vol. I. Bern; Frankfurt/Main; N. Y.: Peter Lang.

Bugayeva, I., 2010. *Yazyk pravoslavnoy sfery: sovremennoye sostoyaniye, tendentsii razvitiya* [The language of the orthodox sphere: current state, development trends]. Dissertation abstract. Moscow (in Russ.).

Chesterman, A., 2004. Beyond the particular. In: A. Mauranen and P. Kujamäki, eds. *Translation Universals: Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 33—49.

Coulmas, F., 1998. Introduction. In: F. Coulmas, ed. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Reference Online. Available at: http://bookre.org/reader?file=1159559 [accessed 15 May 2019].

Epplbaum, E., 2006. *GULAG. Pautina Bol'shogo terrora* [The GULAG. The web of the Great terror]. Moscow, Moskovskaya shkola politicheskikh issledovanii (in Russ.).

Gambier, Y., 2003. Introduction: Screen transadaptation: Perception and reception. *The Translator,* 9(2), pp. 171—189.

Harwood, R., 1971. Introduction. In: A.I. Solzhenitsyn, ed. *The Making of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich.* New York: Ballantine Books, Inc. pp. 1—24.

Koller, W., 1997. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. 5 Aufl. Wiesbaden: Quelle and Meyer.

Kopelev, L., 1983. *Ease my Sorrows. A Memoir*. Tr. by A. Bouis. New York, Random House.

Korovushkin, V., 2005. *Osnovy kontrastivnoy sotsiolektologii* [Fundamentals of contrastive sociectology]. Dissertation abstract. Pyatigorsk (in Russ.).

Krongauz, M., 1991. *Bessiliye yazyka v epokhu zrelogo sotsializma* [Powerlessness of language in the era of mature socialism]. Available at: http://www.ruthenia.ru/folklore/krongauz1.htm [accessed 15 May 2019].

Kryuchkova, T., 2016. Social Variability of Language. In: V. Mikhal'chenko, ed. *Language and Society. Encyclopedia*. Moscow: Azbukovnik. pp. 428—432.

Lipatov, A., 2010. *Sleng kak problema sotsiolektiki* [Slang as a problem of sociolectics]. Moscow: Elpis (in Russ.).

Maslennikova, E., 2014. *Khudozhestvennyi perevod: novoe o starom* [Literary translation: new about the old]. Tver, Tverskoi gosudarstvennyi universitet (in Russ.).

Medvedeva, T., 2012. «And again about gender: he says, she says...». *Bulletin of Moscow State Linguistic University*, 1(634), pp. 113—121.

Neubert, A., 1968. Pragmatische Aspekte der Übersetzung. In: A. Neubert, ed. *Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift Fremdsprachen II)*. Leipzig, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie. pp. 21—33.

Pavlova, M, 2017. Artistic bilinguism and the problem of untranslatability (by the example of the novel "A clockwork orange" by A. Burgess). *Philology. Theory and practice,* 12(78), pp. 21—25.

Rtischeva, O., 2019. Content of Language Cultural Universal in Cross-Cultural Communication. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1 (12), pp. 128—136.

Shalamov, V., 1994. *Kolyma tales*: Tr. by J. Glad. London: Penguin Books.

Snell-Hornby, M., 1988. *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Solzhenitsyn, A., 1969. *One day in the life of Ivan Denisovich*: Translated by R. Parker. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Solzhenitsyn, A., 1991. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*: Translated by H.T. Willets. Harvill: HarperCollins.

Toper, P., 2000. *Perevod v sisteme sravnitel'nogo literaturovedeniya* [Translation in the system of comparative literature]. Moscow: Naslediye (in Russ.).

Windle, K., 2011. The translation of drama. In: K. Malmkjaer and K. Windle, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford UP. Oxford Handbooks Online. Available at: https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306 [accessed 15 May 2019].

The author

Elena Kharitonova, associate professor, I. Kant Baltic Federal University.
E-mail: eharitonova.bfu@gmail.com

To cite this article:
Kharitonova, E. 2019, Translation of sociolect texts, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 94—104. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-7.

ПЕРЕВОД СОЦИОЛЕКТНЫХ ТЕКСТОВ

Е. Харитонова[1]

[1] Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 24.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-7

Лингвосоциокультурная гетерогенность национального языка, обусловленная консолидацией в языке различных языковых форм, отражающих неоднородный характер национальной культуры, ни у кого не вызывает сомнений. Вместе с тем, несмотря на то что вариативность рассматривается лингвистами как объективное имманентное свойство языка, значительная часть теоретических изысканий основывается на стандартном литературном языке, выступающем носителем искусственной нормы, а не на естественных социально-групповых диалектах. В статье проанализирован феномен языковой вариативности на материале специфического некодифицированного фрагмента русского языка XX в. – лагерного социолекта – в аспекте контрастивной социолектологии. Социолектная природа оригинала трактуется как один из факторов, увеличивающих степень непереводимости исходного текста. Делается вывод о характере переводческих адаптаций, необходимых для адекватной передачи лагерных социолектизмов на английский язык. Анализ способов перевода социально-маркированных единиц свидетельствует об использовании переводчиками стратегии, направленной, с одной стороны, на воссоздание социолектной специфики оригинала, с другой – на достижение адекватного коммуникативного эффекта у реципиентов перевода. Удачный выбор переводчиком способов трансляции «чужой» культуры, а именно совмещение приемов, направленных на раскрытие значения социолектизмов (описательный или «разъяснительный» перевод, приблизительный или контекстуальный перевод), а также на воссоздание их национально-культурной специфичности (калькирование) позволяет в той или иной степени передать содержательную сторону исходного текста, избежав при этом стандартизации социолектного текста.

***Ключевые слова**: социолект, перевод, непереводимость, лагерный жаргон, адаптация.*

Список литературы

Ажеж К. Человек говорящий: Вклад лингвистики в гуманитарные науки. М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2003.

Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика: Поэтика. М. : Прогресс, 1989.

Бугаева И.В. Язык православной сферы: современное состояние, тенденции развития : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. М., 2010.

Коровушкин В.П. Основы контрастивной социолектологии : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Пятигорск, 2005.

Кронгауз М.А. Бессилие языка в эпоху зрелого социализма [1991]. URL: http://www.ruthenia.ru/folklore/krongauz1.htm (дата обращения: 15.05.2019).

Крючкова Т.Б. Социальная вариативность языка // Язык и общество. Энциклопедия / ред. В. Михальченко. М. : Азбуковник, 2016. С. 428–432.

Липатов А.Т. Сленг как проблема социолектики. М. : Элпис, 2010.

Масленникова Е.М. Художественный перевод: новое о старом. Тверь : Тверской государственный университет, 2014.

Медведева Т.В. И снова о гендере: он говорит, она говорит... // Вестник МГЛУ. 2012. Вып. 1 (634). С. 113–121.

Павлова М.В. Художественный билингвизм и проблема непереводимости (на примере романа Э. Берджесса «Заводной апельсин») // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2017. №12 (78), ч. 1. С. 21—25.

Топер П.М. Перевод в системе сравнительного литературоведения. М. : Наследие, 2000.

Эпплбаум Э. Паутина большого террора. М. : Московская школа политических исследований, 2006.

Barslund Ch. The Translation of Literary Prose // The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies. 2012. URL: https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306 (дата обращения: 15.05.2019).

Bond A. A Study of the English and the German Translations of Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn's The Gulag Archipelago, Volume I. Bern; Frankfurt a/M ; N. Y. : Lang, 1983.

Chesterman A. Beyond the particular // Mauranen A., Kujamäki P. (eds). Translation Universals: Do they exist? Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 2004. P. 33—49.

Coulmas F. Introduction // Coulmas, Florian (ed.). The Handbook of Sociolinguistics. 1998. Blackwell Reference Online. URL: http://bookre.org/reader?file=1159559 (дата обращения: 15.05.2019).

Gambier Y. Introduction: Screen transadaptation: Perception and reception // The Translator. 2003. Vol. 9, №2. P. 171—189.

Harwood R. Introduction // The Making of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich by A.I. Solzhenitsyn. N. Y. : Ballantine Books, Inc., 1971. P. 1—24.

Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft. 5 Aufl. Wiesbaden : Quelle and Meyer, 1997.

Kopelev L. Ease my Sorrows. A Memoir / transl. by A. Bouis. N. Y. : Random House, 1983.

Neubert A. Pragmatische Aspekte der Übersetzung // Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Leipzig : VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968. S. 21—33.

Rtischeva O. Content of Language Cultural Universal in Cross-Cultural Communication // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. 2019. №1 (12). P. 128—136.

Shalamov V. Kolyma tales / transl. by J. Glad. L. : Penguin Books, 1994.

Snell-Hornby M. Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam : J. Benjamins, 1988.

Solzhenitsyn A. One day in the life of Ivan Denisovich / transl. by R. Parker. Harmondsworth : Penguin Books, 1969.

Solzhenitsyn A. One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich / transl. by H.T. Willets. Harvill : HarperCollins, 1991.

Windle K. The translation of drama // Malmkjaer K., Mindel K. (eds). The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2011. Oxford Handbooks Online. URL: https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199239306 (дата обращения: 15.05.2019).

Об авторе

Елена Харитонова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Калининград, Россия.
E-mail: eharitonova.bfu@gmail.com

Для цитирования:
Kharitonova E. Translation of sociolect texts // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 94—104. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-7.

TRANSLATION: THE PUZZLE OF COLOUR

E. Shevchenko[1], *I. Tomashevskaya*[1]

[1] Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University,
14 Nevskogo Str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-8

This research contributes to the study of colour terms as a cognitive phenomenon. Since colour is not a universal concept and an ordinary mind does not perceive colour separately from the object, it is possible to observe the knowledge about colour, which exists in the language but does not exist in its physical sense. We hold that the given knowledge is the cause of significant difficulties arising in the translation of various colour terms, though the nature of these terms existence should not be complex in its essence, being a basic phenomenon of the natural world. Moreover, certain ambiguity rises when reference points of colour do not coincide with the indirect naming of colours and shades in different languages. Different pairs of languages apparently set their individual spectrum of translation difficulties. We characterise some typical colour-related English into Russian translation difficulties which arise at the cognitive level.

Keywords: *colour terms, concepts, categorisation, colour perception, translation difficulties.*

1. Perception and naming of colours

The object of analysis in this article is ambiguity which rises when reference points of colour do not coincide with the indirect naming of colours and shades in different languages. The nature of colour is a classic philosophical question, mainly because colour depends on our perception. Colour has long been the subject of research by psychologists and physiologists; they investigated the functions of the eye and nervous system for colour perception. Colour terms were studied from different perspectives, so two research traditions were created: linguistic proper, on the one hand, and psychological, cultural and anthropological on the other.

In psychology, colour sensations are a specific reaction of the eye and brain to light frequency oscillations. "The world is colourless, there is no colour in nature, there are impressions of a certain reality, visible in colour sensations. As a result, the reality of the colour range is apparent. The colour models created by the right and left hemispheres do not coincide: the right hemisphere is focused on the long-wave part of the spectrum (red) and is responsible for the colour pictures associated with sensory perception; the left hemisphere is focused on the mid-wave part of the spectrum (blue) and is responsible for the colour pictures associated with the conceptual complex. Consequently, the perception of colour includes a logical and sensual way of perceiving the world. Thus, the perception of colour in this aspect can be viewed as a transition of non-verbal, figurative thinking to the verbal level.

From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, colour is not a universal concept. And researchers have long studied the problem of the formation of concepts that represent colours in the languages of different peoples and their influence on perception. The classical work of B. Berlin and P. Kay (Berlin, Kay 1969) states that all people are able to perceive and differentiate all the basic colours (*Basic Colours Theory* — BCT), but not all languages provide means of indication for all the basic concepts of colour. The theory of the existence of central colours, at the same time, can shed light on the problem of the referential correlation of physical colours with their best prototypes and colour naming in various languages. It is the idea of the researchers that regardless of what particular concepts denoting basic colours are present in the language and whether they exist at all, users of the language choose practically the same best examples of basic colours for correlating with real physical colours. Even if, for example, in English, there is a concept that refers to two of the basic colour fields (BLUE and GREEN), the best example of such a concept, surprisingly, will be not TURQUOIS, even though it is located in the centre of the blue-green sector of the spectrum, but a central BLUE or a central GREEN. The presence of central colours, firstly, demonstrates that the members of the categories denoting colour are unequal. For example, some members of the BLUE category (namely, central BLUE) serve as better examples than others. Secondly, the presence of central colours allows us to compare the concepts of colours in different languages.

The undeniable conclusions drawn from these classic studies are the following: colour perception among representatives of different nations at the physiological level is almost identical; all people, regardless of ethnicity, are able to recognize 11 basic colours and choose almost the same best examples, but despite this, there are different numbers of concepts that represent colours in different languages; the number of concepts existing in a particular language, meaning the colours distinguished in a given culture, does not affect the perception of different colours among the representatives of a given culture. At the same time, it is paradoxical that in different cultures, different sensory concepts are formed in different quantities to denote the basic colours of the spectrum that are accessible to perception (Polyakov 2017).

The above described can be called *pure* perception of colour. However, ordinary consciousness does not perceive colour separately from the object. Consequently, we can speak about the information about the colour, which is present in the language and at the same time is not a part of the scientific truth. We believe that it is this exact information that is the cause of significant difficulties arising in the translation of various colour terms.

Thus, Oleg A. Kornilov (Kornilov 2003) writes that the almost total discrepancy between colour concepts in the languages of the world is probably due to the differences in the choice of reference points. Different communities choose their referents in their environment, which predetermines the divergence of their national prototypes at the level of "foci" which are "best samples" of colours.

We have no reason to talk about the identity of categorising sensory experience in different cultures because, for example, *blue* (English) is not "*синий/sinij*" (Russian) and *blue* is not "*голубой/goluboj*" (Russian). The following example demonstrates how the derivatives from the words «синий» and «голубой» (in bold) are translated into English with only one word "blue".

*«Над головой — густая сочная **синь**, бездонная глубь. Чуть далее, стекая по небосклону, **синева** светлеет, переходя в нежную **голубизну**, в бирюзу, а потом и вовсе в лазурь. Сияющая белизна облаков — кучевых, плывущих нескончаемым караваном, или далеких, перистых, их морозный узор оттеняет небесную **синь**» (*Ekimov 2016*).*

*"Above the head is a rich, juicy **blue**, a bottomless depth. Slightly further, flowing down over the sky, the **blue** brightens, turning into a gentle **blue**, into turquoise, and then into the azure. The shining whiteness of the clouds — cumulus, floating in endless succession, or distant, cirrus, their frosty pattern sets off the **blue** of the sky"* (*Voice of the Sky* by Boris Ekimov, translated by the authors of the article).

L. Hjelmslev (Hjelmslev 1963) writes that considering the colour designation system in different languages, we can see that the formless continuity, which is the colour spectrum, is arbitrarily divided by each language into a certain number of individual areas — blue, green, yellow etc. And these areas in different languages do not match (Weisgerber 2004). Similarly, the Latin and Greek concepts representing the colours of objects do not coincide with the corresponding concepts of modern European languages. In Latin, for example, there are no conceptual correspondences for the German "*blau*" (blue), "*braun*" (brown) and "*grau*" (grey), and some researchers even suggested that the Romans were unable to see colours. In Latin, the words "*albus*" — "*niger*" correspond to German "*weiss*" (white) and "schwarz" (black), but the intermediate link between them — the German "*grau*" (grey) — is not available as an equal abstract category. Instead, here you can find many specific concepts: "*canus*", "*rauus*", "*caesius*", etc. The word "*canus*" is used almost exclusively to denote grey hair and is also used only as poetic metaphors to denote the colour of the sea, snow, etc.; "caesius" — for grey eyes, similar to "*rauus*". But the universal generalising concept (as German "grau") is missing.

According to J. L. Weissgerber (ibid.), the discrepancy between Greek colour concepts and modern ones even led to the well-known discussion of colour perception in the 70s and 80s of the last century, in which some researchers stated that such discrepancies could be traced to the development of colour perception, while others seriously advocated the point of view that the Greeks were colour blind.

Thus, the correlation of physical colour perception and its naming in a language in translation perspective is in the focus of attention of the present article. Notable here is the fact that the use of English terminology as the metalanguage in BCT is argued in some research as leading to inferences making, i.e. see patterns where there are none to be found (Lucy 1992).

2. Colour Coding Systems in Languages as a translation problem

Colour can be expressed explicitly (by directly naming a colour or a trait by colour), and implicitly (by naming an object, the colour attribute of which is fixed in everyday life or culture at the level of tradition).

The colour naming system has the main features of the semantic field. Lexical units which are parts of this semantic field are the representatives of

various aspects of the concept COLOUR. Most of the lexical units of colour are structured in such a way that it is possible to distinguish their core and periphery. But it is possible to single out the centre of many colour terms, based on extralinguistic criteria — knowledge of physics, which means that the main colours of the spectrum (red, *orange, yellow, green, blue, violet*) will form the core of the semantic field of colour while all other shades will make the near and far periphery of this field. Structured in this way, the colour field will reflect the colour perception model, which is characteristic, with minor variations, for most people and, accordingly, for most languages.

Ambiguity arises when reference points do not coincide with the indirect designation of colours and shades. An illustrative example is the name of the shade found in one of the colour templates catalogues — the brownish-red colour was named *Siberian squirrel* (https://slidehelper.com/blog/150-custom-color-palettes-for-powerpoint-word-and-excel/) which does not give the clear idea of the physical colour for the Russian-speaking people, firstly because the squirrels change fur colours according to season, secondly, due to the fact that in colloquial speech and fiction in Russian, it is often referred to as *ginger squirrel (ryzhaja)*. The discrepancy in terms leads to confusion since in the United States and Canada the same term refers to the *red squirrel* — a member of the genus Tamiasciurus.

We assume that different pairs of languages will represent an individual spectrum of translation problems. Some typical difficulties in a pair of English — Russian arising at the cognitive level can be characterised by us as follows:

— Since the knowledge of colour, coded in the system of English and Russian languages, is intended for the user of a particular language, it is used in different scopes by native speakers at different degrees of its application. Thus health-food aficionados have a motto — "*Eat your greens*!", which is most often translated into Russian not through the use of the Russian equivalent of the word "*greens*" — "*зелень*/zelen'", but with the more general term "*овощи*" (vegetables), since the Russian-speaking receptor is more familiar with information about the healthiness of all vegetables, and not just green vegetables. Which means that depending on our culture and situation, we categorise differently and judge certain objects to be more representative than others [Tarnaeva 2013]. The meaning of the word "*greens*" is not defined across all cultures based on its characteristics as the edible leaves and stems of certain plants, eaten as a vegetable. Instead, humans associate it with the vegetable they are most familiar with or which is most prevalent in their society, thus instantaneously associating it with an individual and, at the same time, culturally dependent world of colours, shape, and taste. Consequently, the translator's understanding of a text necessarily depends on their nonlinguistic preconceptions.

Similarly, for example, in the Russian language, there is the concept of COLOURLESSNESS, i. e. an object can be 'colourless' or 'colour free': *бесцветное покрытие* (*colourless top layer*) or can have an ambiguous colour — UNIDENTIFIABLE COLOUR: *какой-то странный цвет (what a strange colour)* and *серо-буро-малиновый* (*grey-brown-crimson colour*). In the latter case, the less clear concept has a reference to somehow more visually represented matter.

— A feature of any language is the attribution of colour to abstract, visually imperceptible entities, e. g. *Black Monday, Black Friday, Black Saturday*. The meaning of the colour component in these phrases is obscure and cannot be subject to direct translation; it requires decoding: *Black Monday* — Monday, October 19, 1987 — the day on which the largest drop in the Dow Jones Industrial Average occurred in its history — 22.6 %. This event affected not only the United States, but quickly spread throughout the world, and the term has come to mean a severe financial crisis. The term *Black Friday* first appeared in Philadelphia and meant heavy traffic jams on Friday after Thanksgiving. The modern interpretation of this term in English is more positive — it is associated with the idiom "to be in the black" idiom (i. e., "to have positive balance", as opposed to "to be in the red"), implying that many sellers will gain significant profits on this day. The term *Black Saturday* originates from the Soviet Union times when it used to mean a Saturday which was a working day instead of a day-off. The name "Black Saturday" is derived from the colour of the ink that indicated working days and weekends on the calendar. Weekends, including Saturdays, were printed in red, working days — in black. Accordingly, the working Saturday turned out to be literally black. The translator here is the main cognizer in charge of constructing meaning from the mental stimulation. The meaning should be reconstructed out of the original communication act and conveyed to the receptor of the translated text in such a way that allows them to reconstruct it by themselves. But this process of mental simulation is extremely complex, and translators are restricted by many different factors, which comprise their conceptualisation processes, such as the restrictions of the textual context, those of the working environment, or the prevailing norms from the cultural and the historical context. All this advances the translators' mental experience which is constrained by their capacities, such as their knowledge, background, ideological and religious views, personality traits and idiosyncrasive reactions and so on.

— In Russian, it is possible to detect the connection between colours and emotional evaluation of the object, e. g. *синенький, нежно-зеленый, серебристый* (*blue, soft green, silver)* The first line of a famous war-time Russian song «***Синенький*** *скромный платочек…*» when translated into English as "*A* ***blue*** *modest shawl*" loses all the affectionate diminutive meaning encoded in the form of the word "*синенький*" as well as its pragmatic aspect — describing something distinctively feminine.

— The reference to colour produced with the help of metaphorical and metonymic models is particularly difficult when translating, because on the one hand, it is an endless source of replenishment of lexical compositions of languages, and on the other hand, the mismatch of reference points in two languages (*the colour of wet asphalt* and the above-mentioned example of *Siberian squirrel*).

As A. Steinvall puts it, colour terms may take on a classifying function (classifying a subtype), and in doing so they can refer to nuances which might well lie outside their normal area of designation (Steinvall 2002). Thus, *white wine* is usually far from *white* and *black bread (Russian rye bread type)* is definitely not *black*.

The advertising industry is another field where the problem of perceiving and translating words denoting colour is of crucial importance. The rapidness and intensity of the process of introducing new colour terms into the language use that it provides are unprecedented. According to A. Vasilevich (Vasilevitch, Kuznetzova, Mischenko 2005), if we talk about the development of the vocabulary of colour designations, then we must consider two crucial points. The first being the formation of a kind of "universal market" of goods and services — cars, perfumery, fabrics, painting paints, etc. are produced by a relatively small number of firms, while being sold throughout the world. The second — the emergence of such a form of sale as catalogue marketing. When dealing with a catalogue of merchandise a customer must choose a product by studying a description of a product in a catalogue or a magazine, and not only the product itself (for example, the brand of car), but also its colour is subject to assessment. As only an insignificant number of texts that advertise imported goods is written in the Russian language, the bulk of them has to be translated, which brings us back to the problem of the translation of colour terms, the names of colours and their shades in particular.

As it has already been established, the knowledge of colour, coded in the system of English and Russian languages, is intended for the speaker of a particular language and can be recognised differently by non-native and native speakers. The name of the colour of the goods is an inseparable part of the goods' "packaging" and a powerful selling tool: after all, to call a car "*red*", "*white*" or "*silver*" is not at all the same as giving such catchy names to its colour as "*Monte Carlo*", "*Brisket*", "*Safari*" or "*Aventurine*". Similarly, "*Red lipstick, No. 17*" is perceived differently than lipstick "*Mystery of the East*", "*Pink kiss*" or "*Pink nocturne*".

The names of the colours of the new type appeared: they can be called "advertising words". The main function of such words is to draw attention to a given shade of colour, and not to call it. Due to this trend, Russian users get the names of colours like *iguana, amaretto,* and *papaya whip*. In the proposed form, the terms of colour are completely alien to the perception of the Russian consumer and are completely devoid of the associations for which the original trademark was designed. This way the colours called "*Boston University Red*" and "*Bondi Blue*" (colour of the water at Bondi Beach in Australia) will turn into ordinary "*red*" and "*blue*" for a Russian-speaking person during translation, completely losing their cultural connotation in the process.

3. Conclusions

A translator, of course, chooses the category from which a certain concept will be extracted and processed. He/she is free to experiment by giving greater explicitness to the implicit, adding subtle explanations of cultural differences, inventing new terms and adding metaphors to reveal meaningful connections and to manifest an implication that cannot be expressed directly.

Perspective area of further research into the nature of colour terms translation difficulties is the analysis of the usage of colour terms in classifying function are vantage and reference point as suggested by A. Steinvall (Steinvall 2002). The vantage represents the perspective of the conceptualiser, and the reference point is a salient landmark through which the target, the classi-

fied entity, is accessed. The choice of the reference point is largely based on the vantage point of the conceptualiser, and since it is a matter of characterising a type, generality (and thus, salience) is striven for.

Our research supports the hypothesis that for a full picture to emerge when translating colour terms, both the structure of the conceptual domain and the lexical field should be thoroughly examined.

We demonstrated that it is possible to observe the knowledge about colour, which exists in the language but does not exist in its physical sense. The given knowledge is the cause of significant difficulties arising in the translation of various colour terms, though the nature of these terms existence should not be complex, being a basic phenomenon of the natural world. Moreover, certain ambiguity rises when reference points of colour do not coincide with the indirect naming of colours and shades in different languages.

We have tried to show some typical English into Russian translation difficulties which arise at the cognitive level.

References

Berlin, B., Kay, P., 1969. *Basic Color Terms. Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Ekimov, B., 2016. *Golos neba* [Voice of heaven]. Available at: http://rulibs.com/ru_zar/prose_contemporary/ekimov/2/j7.html [accessed 29 April 2019] (in Russ.).

Hjelmslev, L., 1963. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Translated by F. Whitfield. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kornilov, O. A., 2003. *Yazykovye kartiny mira kak proizvodnye natsional'nyh mentalitetov* [Language pictures of the world as derivatives of national mentalities]. M.: Book House University KDU (in Russ.).

Lucy, J. A., 1992. *Language Diversity and Thought: A Reformulation of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polyakov, S., 2017. *Concepts and other constructions of consciousness*. Saint-Petersburg: Peter.

Steinvall, A., 2002. *English Colour Terms in Context*. Umeå: Umeå universitet.

Tarnaeva, L. P., 2013. *Kognitivnaja paradigma I sovremennoe perevodovedenie* [Cognitive paradigm and modern translation]. Available at: http://spr.fld.mrsu.ru/2013/12/kognitivnaya-paradigma-i-sovremennoe-perevodovedenie-l-p-tarnaeva/ [accessed 14 April 2019] (in Russ.).

Vasilevitch, A. P., Kuznetsova, S. N. and Mischenko, S. S., 2005. T*svet I nazvania tsveta v russkom yazyke* [Color and color names in Russian]. M., "KomKniga" (in Russ.).

Weisberger, J., 2004. *Native language and soul development* [Native language and the formation of the spirit]. Moscow: Editorial Publishing House (in Russ.).

The authors

Elizaveta Shevchenko, PhD in Linguistics, Ass. Proff., Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia.

E-mail: eshevchenko@kantiana.ru

Irina Tomashevskaya, PhD in Linguistics, Ass. Proff., Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia.
E-mail: itomashevskaja@kantiana.ru

To cite this article:
Shevchenko, E., Tomashevskaya, I. 2019, Translation: the puzzle of colour, *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent,* Vol. 10, № 3, p. 105—113. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-8.

ПЕРЕВОД: ЗАГАДКА ЦВЕТА

Е. Шевченко[1], *И. Томашевская*[1]

[1] Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-8

Данное исследование лежит в русле изучения цветообозначений как когнитивного феномена. Поскольку цвет не является универсальным понятием и обыденное сознание не воспринимает цвет отдельно от объекта, представляется возможным определять такую информацию о цвете, которая присутствует в языке, но не существует в физическом смысле. В статье обосновывается тезис о том, что данная информация является причиной значительных трудностей, возникающих при переводе различных цветовых терминов, хотя природа существования этих терминов должна быть однозначной по своей сути, будучи базовым явлением окружающего мира. Более того, определенная неоднозначность возникает в том случае, когда эталонные точки референции цветов не совпадают с непрямым наименованием цветов и оттенков на разных языках. Различные пары языков, очевидно, обладают индивидуальным спектром трудностей перевода цветообозначений. В статье определены некоторые типичные трудности перевода цветотерминов, которые возникают на когнитивном уровне в паре таких языков, как английский и русский,

***Ключевые слова**: цветообозначения, наименования цвета, категоризация, референция, восприятие цвета, переводческие трудности.*

Список литературы

Вайсбергер Й.Л. Родной язык и формирование духа. М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2004.

Василевич А. П., Кузнецова С. Н., Мищенко С. С. Цвет и названия цвета в русском языке. М. : КомКнига, 2005.

Екимов Б. Голос неба. 2016. URL: http://rulibs.com/ru_zar/prose_contemporary/ekimov/2/j7.html (дата обращения: 29.04.2019).

Корнилов О. А. Языковые картины мира как производные национальных менталитетов. М. : ЧеРо, 2003.

Тарнаева Л. П. Когнитивная парадигма и современное переводоведение. 2013. URL: http://spr.fld.mrsu.ru/2013/12/kognitivnaya-paradigma-i-sovremennoe-perevodovedenie-l-p-tarnaeva/ (дата обращения: 14.04.2019).

Berlin B., Kay P. Basic Color Terms. Their Universality and Evolution. Berkeley ; Los Angeles : University of California Press, 1969.

Hjelmslev L. Prolegomena to a Theory of Language / transl. by F. Whitfield. Madison : University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Lucy J. A. Language Diversity and Thought: A Reformulation of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Polyakov S. Concepts and other constructions of consciousness. Saint-Petersburg : Peter, 2017.

Steinvall A. English Colour Terms in Context. Umeå : Umeå universitet, 2002.

Об авторах

Елизавета Шевченко, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Калининград, Россия.
E-mail: eshevchenko@kantiana.ru

Ирина Томашевская, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Калининград, Россия.
E-mail: itomashevskaja@kantiana.ru

Для цитирования:
Shevchenko E., Tomashevskaya I. Translation: the puzzle of colour // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 105—113. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-8.

ON COMBINING TRANSLATOR TRAINING WITH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

L. Boyko[1]

[1] Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University,
14 Nevskogo Str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9

Contemporary methodological landscape in translator training (TT) is dominated by the competence-based principles whose epistemological roots are found in social constructivism asserting learners' active participation in knowledge accrual. The paper gives a brief account of the status quo of TT and revisits the controversial issue of appropriateness of combining TT with foreign language teaching (FLT). The author maintains that FLT may, and quite often has to, be part of TT course, the share of linguistic component in TT depending on the curriculum design and teaching circumstances. Centred solely around the linguistic aspect of TT, the paper proposes combining training methods that serve the purposes of both TT and FLT. TT practices aimed at developing linguistic and translational competences simultaneously are subdivided into analytical and reinforcement training techniques, the latter being the focus of this paper. The author argues that exercise-type activities beneficial for both TT and FLT can be practiced in full harmony with the competence-based student-centred teaching principles.

Keywords*: translator training (TT), foreign language teaching (FLT), translation, trainer, trainee, exercise, competence.*

1. Introduction

It is no secret that for a very long time there was — and someplace is — strong prejudice against translation didactics per se. Meanwhile, translator training (TT) has existed for centuries, if in a rudimentary 'master-apprentice relations' form, as A. Pym notes in his comprehensive historical overview [Pym 1992:1; Pym 2012]. In recent decades, more thought has been given to the research into the methodology of TT. It is primarily due to the fact that Translation Studies (TS) is now recognized as a full-fledged area of study in quite a number of societies, owing to a great degree to the strengthening of the philosophical premises of TS and TT. Even more important is the fact that the number of training programmes has considerably grown in the last four decades.

Contemporary TT rests on the principles of competence-based training. Many have convincingly and justly argued for concentrating on other-than-linguistic trade-relevant competences in TT. Meanwhile, the role and share of linguistic competence in TT has been apparently played down. A departure from language-based methodology in TT is explained by the generally shared assumption that translation should be taught to linguistically competent trainees. I will argue that the relationship between foreign language teaching (FLT) and TT begs a wider debate, and particular circumstances of

TT deserve closer attention. I will also show that, once a balanced distribution is achieved among classroom activities, teaching techniques can complement each other in fostering translational competences alongside linguistic ones without disrupting the principles of student-centred, text-based teaching.

2. Translation through the students' eyes

With the long-lasting stereotype of the translator as a self-exiled bookworm, the many-faceted nature of translation practice is seldom realized by laymen and novices and even by students taking up translation as their major. Newcomers to translation are often totally unaware of the complexity and versatility of the needs and skills the translation profession involves. Quite often, students joining a T&I university course appear to be vaguely or even wrongly motivated — suffice it to recall "the unbeatable 'I love to travel'" motive [Gouadec 2007: 341]). To validate this observation and obtain a real-life motivation profile of T&I students, a small-scale free-response survey was conducted among 71 undergraduates of the T&I department at the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia. The questionnaire sought to identify the students' initial inspiration for joining the course and to elicit their preferences, should they face a choice between translation and interpreting as their potential careers. With only a few (10) exceptions, the reason for enrolling with the T&I department was predominantly described (if variously worded) as 'love for languages'. Among the ten exceptions, four respondents spoke of the desire to help people communicate, while the remaining six mentioned either a prestigious, well-paid profession (interpreting), or just a random choice. All those who explicitly excluded the option of specialising in translation (12) said it was 'boring'; the rest were either equally prepared for taking up translation and/or interpreting finding both interesting (36) or remained undecided (23). These quick data confirm that students are largely ill-informed about their future profession, and when faced with direct questions they are drawing on the long-standing clichés and prejudices. Another interesting observation comes from the commentaries in which translation is described as a solitary occupation dealing with texts and dictionaries. The take on translation as a process reduced to its linguistic aspect alone is nowhere better felt than in the translation classroom where trainees seem to invariably expect a finished translation by the end of the class. Such a view also prevents translation learners from appreciating the trainer's digressing from 'translation proper' into other classroom activities meant to demonstrate various — other than linguistic — aspects of translator's work [Pym 2003: 21].

Should this one-dimensional perception of translation as a purely linguistic transfer come as a surprise? Hardly so. In Russian universities, for example, translation has always been taught at both BA and MA students only within the Linguistics degree programme. BA students enrol to study languages and linguistics alongside translation, not vice versa. The curriculum contains a substantial share of linguistic theories, and the sought degree is termed as 'linguist; translator/interpreter'. These circumstances alone prompt interest to look into the relationship between FLT and TT.

3. Approaches to TT

Perception of translation as a purely linguistic transfer has had a long history. For decades since its very emergence, TS was a branch of linguistics, thus defining the pertinent teaching principles and strategies. No sooner than in the late 20th century did TT scholars articulate that "being a language specialist is simply not enough for expert translation behaviour" [Wilss 1992: 392]. For some time now, the attitudes to, and the very philosophy of TT have been revised, for today translation process is viewed as a complex cognitive and psychological activity whose participants are also heavily involved in social interaction. Indeed, because of its complexity, heterogeneity and multidimensionality, translation process differs from other types of language-related activity as there are many more facets to the translational occupation than just dealing with words. The translator's identity as that of a bilingual individual will presumably be first manifested through competent language use; however, he/she will also act as a researcher, a cultural and intercultural mediator, a communication agent, a computer-user; and, above all, a life-long learner. Also counter to the false and dated stereotype depicting the translator as a lone wolf, present-time translators are no longer confined to their studies. They extensively use electronic media discussing difficult issues with their peers or seeking advice from native speakers and specialists in various areas; they often work in teams, technologies allowing them to align their translations to achieve consistency in word use and style; they also need to do plenty of networking and negotiations. Professional translation is becoming even more dependent on the useful technological time-savers such as CAT, MT, corpora, word banks and translation memory tools. All these and many more resources are an absolute must in the profession, and therefore need to be taught.

It was the dynamic changes in all the spheres of modern society that necessitated revising TT approaches to align them with the present-day translator's professional profile. Contemporary TS thoroughly investigate translator's linguistic, communicative, cognitive, social and technological behaviour in search of a most comprehensive grasp of the competences translation learners should be taught. Although the first translation competence models appeared in the last decades of the 20th century, it was not until the early noughties that the training paradigm saw a radical change — namely, a turn to the competence-based model whose foundations rest on cognitive-constructivist and socio-constructivist learning theories [PACTE 2017: 14, Venuti 2017]. The translation competence is, in most general terms, defined as "the underlying system of knowledge, abilities and attitudes required to be able to translate" [PACTE 2000: 100]. Elaborating on the crucial role of translation competence in the TT curriculum design D. Kelly views it as a multi-dimensional macro-competence [Kelly 2005: 14—15] comprising communicative, textual, cultural, intercultural, professional, instrumental, strategic, interpersonal, attitudinal, and subject area (sub)competences. [Kelly 2005: 32—33]. Contrary to the multi-componential competence approach promoted and expanded on in many a research, A. Pym comes up with a

minimalist principle, in which he proceeds from the necessity to train a translation professional who is capable of a) generating a target text and 2) confidently selecting a viable target text from a series of variants. The author contends that "specifically translational part of their practice is strictly neither linguistic nor solely commercial. It is a process of generation and selection, a problem-solving process that often occurs with apparent automatism" [Pym 2003: 489].

The emphasis on text generation and problem-solving cannot be overestimated in TT. This alone could trigger the changeover from 'teacher-centred, product-oriented transmissionist and prescriptivist approaches' to 'student-centred, process-oriented one' [PACTE 2017] — another momentous turn in the training paradigm. Before the issue of the epistemological grounds of TT was raised [Pym 1993], the literature on TT hardly contained any in-depth analysis of teaching models. Meanwhile, the general shift to the human dimension in education required reconsidering the philosophical foundations of the training modus operandi. The traditional 'sage on the stage' practice had dominated the landscape of teaching methodology for years on end, with the ultimate authority in the classroom vested in the teacher. The approach apparently proceeded from the doctrine that the trainer is a certain Mr. Know-All, the unquestionable source of knowledge. For the students, the only other revered staple was a dictionary, preferably a bilingual one. This looking-up-to-an-authority attitude reflects an apparently objectivist perception of knowledge existing independently of our minds— the assumption shattered convincingly in [Pym 1993]. Indeed, once we depart from this erroneous belief, we would logically arrive at the idea that creating meaningful messages requires independent thinking and interpretation skills, as meanings in translation may "go beyond our knowledge, beliefs and observable behaviour of the speakers" [Raatikainen 2012: 166]. Explicating the crucial difference in the objectivist (positivist) and social constructivist approaches to TT methodology D. Kiraly argues that knowledge does not exist independently of human cognition [Kiraly 2000; Kiraly 2003]. Advocate of process-oriented pedagogy, the author contends that, as we understand the world, meanings in this world are construed by us humans ("At the heart of the social constructivist perspective is the belief that there is no meaning in the world until we human beings make it — both individually and collectively" [Kiraly 2003: 26]). Translation viewed as a process seems to be the most vivid example of how meanings are created. Drawing on cognitive- and socio-constructivist thinking, Kiraly's philosophical analysis reveals that changes in TT methods of recent years resulted firstly in the classroom setup with the focus redirected from teacher to students, and, secondly, in the choice of teaching material made in favour of 'message-carrying' texts rather than isolated sentences taken out of context. The trainee who is challenged with having to make choices and take decisions thus gets some freedom to be creative and develop critical thinking instead of being spoonfed with ready-made solutions. The U-turn in the classroom relationship between students and teacher brought about the empowerment and collaboration model of TT [Kiraly 2000]. However, it would be an overstatement to

say that there is full consensus on the basic methodology of TT, and even though there is a shift from a teacher-oriented to a learner-centred approach, there is rather a mixture of approaches. [Gambier 2012: 163].

4. TT scholarship in Russia

In the Russian translation thought, the didactics of translation appears to be the least investigated field in TS. With little attention paid to the theoretical premises of TT, most publications in this field so far have been strictly grammatically-pragmatic by nature, the better part of them being collections of exercises designed to overcome lexical and grammatical difficulties in translation and carry out transformations. This approach to TT apparently rests on the firmly established linguistic theory of equivalence that has dominated the TS scene in Russia for decades. In her review of unresolved issues in TT, Korolyova [Korolyova 2015] characterizes the state of TT research field as eclectic, lacking in a generally accepted methodological base and unified conceptual approaches. Translator training remains torn away from practice and 'intuitive' rather than scientifically based. A thorough analysis of the approaches to TT given in [Korol'kova 2013] clearly shows that up until recently the common feature of all didactic materials in the Russian school of TT was its pronounced 'drilling' bent.

However, it would be unfair to overlook an observable change in the attitude to TT principles in the Russian methodological literature. Russian TT scholarship today shows more interest in state-of-the-art methodology: it is generally acknowledged that translational competences should be formed, and translators-to-be should also be taught the metalanguage of translation and reflective reading [Bazylev 2013]. In [Alexeeva 2006, 2008; Latyshev 2013; Korol'kova 2013], the training principles are based on text type diversity, with a strong emphasis on the analytical side of TT. Due attention is paid to the formation of an all-round personality of the translator [Gavrilenko 2004]. The text-typological approach consistently pursued in [Alexeeva 2006; Korol'kova 2013] reveals the implementation of the constructivist principles in TT. The overall picture of the status quo of TT in Russia shows that there is largely, if not universally, shared theoretical understanding of methodological developments in the field. Although the current body of research into the theories underlying TT remains to be scarce [Alexeeva 2008], there are tangible changes in the organization of TT process both in terms of work material selection, and in terms of teaching strategies, with the analytical aspect of TT gaining noticeable impetus.

5. TT and language teaching

On the whole, contemporary TT is aimed to raise the trainees' awareness of the multiple facets of translation, to develop trade-relevant competences, and to create an independent decision-maker yet in the classroom. The translation competence is no longer viewed as just summation of two languages [Pym 2003]; therefore, the linguistic competence, if a crucial component, is viewed as only part of the translational one [Colina 2003b: 46]. All current

trends in TT proceed from the underlying presumption that language (sub)competence is a pre-requisite of TT. Since it is broadly accepted that translation should be taught to linguistically competent students so that they do not have to struggle linguistically in the translation process [See: Colina 2003a:38], the language (sub)competence is apparently played down in most TT studies. In this framework it is not surprising that Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) is denied any presence in a translation class. Nevertheless, it is admitted that interaction of and relationship between translation and language competences are much under-researched [Colina 2003b: 46], and questions remain. What if adequate language competence is not the case in a particular teaching situation? Does FLT have to be divorced from TT? Can the challenges of TT be met if the curriculum by definition combines linguistic education with translation? Considering the circumstances, can FLT be integrated in TT? If the answer is 'yes', will the use of FLT methodology — such as reinforcement exercises —violate the principle of student-centred TT only because they allegedly narrow down creative opportunities? What kind of teaching materials can fit in the multi-competence approach to teaching?

At this point, it is time we discussed the role and share of the linguistic component in TT in the context of teaching circumstances which may vary greatly, as the case is in Russia. In spite of the longstanding belief that TT makes sense only when trainees have reached the required command of two languages [Lederer 2007: 146, Gouadec 2007: 335; Pym 1993, 2003], it not uncommon that in universities translator training starts with the students' linguistic competence still underdeveloped (at BA level) [Kelly 2005: 115, Carreres 2014].[2] Even MA-level enrolment for a university translation course, although meant to be competitive enough, does not always fully meet the requirement of sufficient language competence. MA translation trainees come from a wide range of spheres — law, psychology, aviation, music — to mention but a few (the case of 2017 and 2018 enrolments at BFU). With their former other-than-linguistic background, such students often make the trainers go 'back to square one' in term of language teaching. So, we should be realistic about our trainees starting positions and try to bridge the 'linguistic gap' on the go. [Korol'kova 2013]. Indeed, compared to their peers of 20 years ago, today's students on the whole enjoy a much better command of L2 owing to a better exposure to the anglophone world. However, we are now being at the beginning of this long journey to gaining foreign language confidence through experience; therefore, A. Pym's recommendation to "let them learn languages from the road" [Pym 2005: 6] appears a bit premature. So does D. Kelly's vision of the TT curriculum design aimed at enhancing language learning through participation in exchange programmes and foreign internships [Kelly 2005]: in Russia, for example, such practices remain to be few and far between, mostly being just a student's good luck. Here I cannot agree more that the issue of TT curriculum design deserves "a situation analysis including societal, institutional, learner, and teacher factors"

[2] Unless it is a highly selective — non-degree — postgraduate vocational training course like, for example, the one in the St. Petersburg School of Conference Interpreting and Translation, Russia.

[Kearns 2006: 166—175] and that "it is simply unfair and impractical to impose the same model on a culture with both a long history of institutionalized language learning and translator training […] with a culture where these institutions may be less developed…" [Kearns 2006: 138]. The only minor addition to this could be: not necessarily less developed but based on different principles, as the case is with TT in Russia — as it has been mentioned, in Russia TT and language teaching have been inseparable for more reasons than just the above-mentioned firmly-established tradition of language-oriented TS.

Although formation of other skills may be of greater relevance for the training process, linguistic competences cannot be underestimated either: firstly, because translation is still very much about language, and secondly, because its development will enhance command of the foreign language if there is a need for it. That said, and in view of the circumstanced described above, I have to disagree with the assumption that it is impossible to teach languages and translation simultaneously [Lederer 2007: 143]. The long-standing teaching practice proves to the contrary too. Moreover, being a committed lifelong language learner, the translator cannot but constantly develop his/her linguistic competences alongside translational ones. Since text comprehension and production are the translational competences requiring trainees' awareness of language and speech norms, we should not — most often cannot, and in certain circumstances, must not — discard systematically the possibility of combining FLT with TT. Consequently, the methods traditionally used in language teaching can and should be used to the best advantage to develop both linguistic and translational skills.

The methodology of mutually beneficial FLT and TT has two major constituents — analysis and training ('drilling') proper. The analytical part of TT is undoubtedly holistic by nature: it involves divergent thinking, info-mining, interpretative skills, linguistic and background knowledge, decision-making, and much more. Analytical activities in a TT course are meant to introduce students to the intricacies and complexity of translation process as a highly demanding cognitive and psychological endeavour. It is certainly the most essential and interesting part of both teaching and learning translation, and it is worthy of special attention. This paper, however, focuses on the other part, which includes reinforcement exercises as a training method with a long history and plenty of potential in the combined language and translation teaching methodology. Although exercises are thought to be more appropriate for language teaching than for TT, it would be still unwise to condemn such practices offhandedly in TT. The now-seldom-spoken-of benefits of reinforcement techniques may help us to find a middle ground for the mutually complementary approaches to TT. Indeed, the main disadvantage of most traditionally designed translation exercises is that they consist of sentences taken out of context. It is certainly inconvenient because they do not constitute a continuum, and, unless carefully selected, may simply lead to a translation deadlock. This latter pitfall is quite avoidable if the patterns (words /phrases) are nested in more extensive contexts ensuring disambiguation. Another limitation is that the traditional 'read-and-

translate' exercises usually find their resolutions in the key or the authority of the trainer. Does it have to be an inevitable blow to the student-centred principle? Not necessarily, if a way to diversify them is found thus reinforcing their relevance.

Let us look at some of such activities. The 'training' component of TT consists of two major types of exercises, according to the resources used: sentence-based reinforcement ('drilling') ones, more appropriate for earlier stages of learning (BA level); and text-based ones, equally appropriate for lower and more advanced levels. The first type is based on the assumption that habits are formed through reinforcement. Exercises consisting of similarly structured sentences or stretches of texts containing targeted lexical units or syntactical structures can be used in TT to train an automatized skill of spotting and resolving typical challenging situations. The importance of this ability should not be underestimated, since students have trouble with identifying a problem [Kussmaul 1995: 17]. It is crucial for the teacher to realize this latter observation. The exercises in question give the student an opportunity to focus on resolving a problem already pinpointed for them. Such materials are especially useful for obtaining and consolidating specific skills required in particular translation situations, such as dealing with transliteration, syntactical conversions, numeric expressions, false cognates, clichés, etc. Here is just one case of many.

Among many systemic differences between English and Russian there is a broader semantic relationship between the components in English AdjN structures because English attributive groups often convey adverbial ideas of cause, location, purpose, action-object relationships, etc. Such subtle inferential and distributional properties are not immediately observable, but in English-Russian translation typical English adjectival phrases most often have to be restructured depending on the semantic relationships between the two components. Thus, in the English sentence '*Unemployment contributes to social exclusion*' the AdjN structure requires conversion into a Russian prepositional noun phrase NPrepN (*'отчуждение от общества'*) while in '*Reasons must be given if the head teacher decides to make a temporary exclusion permanent*' the AdjN structure can be retained in Russian (*'временное исключение'*) (examples modified from British National Corpus). What is achieved through persistent practicing such transformations? The trainees obtain awareness of such structural dissimilarities and prepare themselves for dealing with them in an informed way. The translational competence formed this way includes quick identification and (near-)automated resolution of such cases. Simultaneously, such exercises are targeted at enhancing idiomatic language use in both L1 and L2. In the classroom, discussion should ensue on the nature of such patterns and their differential treatment in translation to answer why conversion required in the first case is not needed in second, where the pattern is the same.

Once the pattern is grasped, viability of alternative solutions can be discussed — for example, in different stylistic or situational contexts, displaying the attitude to the situation, revealing the axiological dimension, etc. Here are a few examples with the English pattern *to earn somebody something*:

The restructuring earned him a reputation for ruthlessness, but it won him praise from his boss.

Abraham Lincoln's reputation for telling the truth earned him the nickname "Honest Abe."

Comedian Tom Arnold's anti-Trump tweets earned him a visit from the Secret Service.

This 18-year-old's hacking hustle earned him $100000 — and it's legal. (Examples modified from the Internet)

The pattern will have to be treated differently in Russian with either positively connotated vocabulary, such as у*достоить(ся) снискать, заслужить (to be honoured, to be awarded)* or neutral words (*заработать, завоевать, получить/принести*); it can also get a negative interpretation *доиграться* (implying danger). It important to discuss what triggers the choice of variant, what necessitates changes of the syntactical structures, and what role interpretation plays in translation. Thus, the translational problem is spotlighted alongside enhancing the students' linguistic knowledge. Reversing the directionality of translation will only contribute to achieving the goal of the enhancement of both translational and linguistic skills. A better involvement of TT trainees in such activities can be ensured by asking the students to amass similarly patterned structures for classwork.

The second type of exercises to be discussed here is the text-based one. Short texts or extracts are perfectly suitable for being converted into exercises in this type of training routine. What turns short texts into training pieces of work is the focus on one or more selected translation challenge — cultural, linguistic, info-mining, textual, communicative — and many more. Such exercises also serve both ways — teaching the language and training translation techniques. The exercises can come in monolingual and bilingual forms, and among virtually infinite work forms there can be: retelling in the other language, rephrasing; choosing among synonyms, restoring the text with the use of key words in the other language; using the given thematic vocabulary in translation; restoring stretches of text written in the other language; choosing different strategies for different clients; a short text to be translated using given words and phrases in the target language, or alternating rendering of a text in L1 and L2 in succession — the list is far from complete. Both the language and translational competences are thus formed through text comprehension, developing flexibility of expression and text production; additionally, translational skills are attained through code switching. This type of exercises is not of a 'hammering' nature: they are rather flexible activities requiring plenty of cognitive effort, memory and judgement. Such activities are intended to provide linguistic support to TT too. This two-way methodology, if it is not overused, can perfectly well complement the major analytical component of TT.

Below is an excerpt that was made into an exercise primarily aimed to show how to deal with parataxis in translation. The targeted issue is a linguistic one: it will involve the discussion of the nature of such discrepancies between English and Russian and the use of idiomatic expression to deal with them. However, the text also contains plenty of material that can be used to form cultural, info-mining and textual competences. In the info-searching and cultural references the trainees will have to deal with most of

the capitalized words in the text; the textual competence will be needed for bringing the target text in line with the conventions of the target culture; the false cognate 'ironically' will require special attention too.

> *When 3,000 British teenagers were surveyed in 2008, 20 per cent expressed the opinion that Winston Churchill was a fictional character. While this statistic might expose the inadequacies of the British history curriculum, it ironically reflects how Churchill seems unbelievable – a sort of Edwardian superhero. Before he became prime minister in 1940, he survived a school stabbing, a sadistic headmaster, Dervish spears, Cuban bullets, tsetse flies, Boer and German artillery, a near-drowning, two plane crashes, three car accidents and a house fire. He was an aristocrat, soldier, novelist, journalist, Hollywood screenwriter, Nobel prizewinner and, of course, politician.* [From*: Churchill – Edwardian superhero* The Times. Sept. 29, 2018]

Text-based exercises apparently give more freedom to both trainer and trainee, and they are obviously student-driven, if teacher-directed. They should be designed so that they involve plenty of independent search on the student's part, but it is important that the relevant instances are clearly signposted in the task. The difference between this exercise-shaped and analytical activities is that texts for exercises should be short enough to ensure that they are targeted to deal with one or two features meant to be trained (see above: a selected translation challenge). The ultimate aim of such activities is to have these texts translated by the end of the day, in contrast to purely analytical tasks which do not necessarily involve this final stage.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to challenge the pedagogical and methodological divide between TT and FLT. I have tried to show that although it is wrong to approach TT only from its linguistic side, it is even less beneficial to disconnect TT from language learning, because a required language competence is not always a given in TT. Thus, my answer to the question whether language learning has to be divorced from TT is an emphatic 'NO'. Linguistic education can be combined with TT not only because such may be the circumstances, but also because the life-long process of language learning and translation are inextricable: the translator will never stop evolving as a language user and translation learner. Moreover, the crucial text-comprehension and text-production (translational) competences are inseparable from the language competence. Adopting a flexible approach to ensure adaptability to concrete circumstances and the changing environments can help to achieve the ultimate goal of training a competent translator.

The exercise-based practicing component in TT fits in the combined teaching model making the best use of both constructivist and objectivist perspectives. Without disrupting the main principles of learner-centred approach, it gives TT methodology another dimension. Exercises as a training technique are essential in TT pedagogy; they should remain part and parcel of TT making translation teaching and FLT mutually contributing. It is cru-

cial, however, to creatively design them so that they meet communicative needs and serve both ends. That way it would become possible to involve students more in the generating new knowledge, both translation- and language-wise. The share of this exercise-based methodology should be determined according to circumstances, but the sum total is that 'productive exchange' [Carreres 2006: 29] between teaching language and TT is well justified. It is also important to strike the right balance among various differently targeted activities aimed at the acquisition of relevant competences.

References

Alexeeva, I.S., 2006. *Pis'mennyi perevod. Nemetskyi yazyk* [Translation. The German language]. St. Petersburg.: "Soyuz" Publishing House (in Russ.).

Alexeeva, I.S., 2008. The current state of translation theory in Russia (critical review). *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of S. Petersburg University], (9) 1, pp. 26—38 (in Russ.).

Bazylev, V.N., 2013. *Didactica perevoda* [Didactics of Translation]. Moscow. Flinta. Nauka (in Russ.).

Carreres, Á., 2006. Strange Bedfellows: Translation and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Translation into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees: Uses and Limitations. In: *Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada, Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council*. Available at: http://cttic.org/ACTI/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf [accessed 10 September 2018].

Carreres, Á., 2014. Translation as a means and as an end: reassessing the divide. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), pp. 123—135.

Colina, S., 2003a. *Translation Teaching, from Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Colina, S., 2003b. Towards an Empirically-based Translation Pedagogy. In: B.J. Baer and G.S. Koby, eds. *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Vol. 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 29—59.

Gambier, Y., 2012. Teaching translation/training translators. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 163—171.

Gavrilenko, N.N., 2004. The main objectives of teaching to translate scientific and technical texts. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Russkii i inostrannye yazyki i metodika ikh prepodavaniya* [Bulletin RUDN. Series: Russian and foreign languages and teaching methods], 1(2), pp. 102—107 (in Russ.).

Gouadec, D., 2007. *Translation as a profession*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kearns, J., 2006. *Curriculum Renewal in Translator Training: Vocational challenges in academic environments with reference to needs and situation analysis and skills transferability from the contemporary experience of Polish translator training culture*. Dissertation. Available at: http://doras.dcu.ie/17625/1/John_Kearns_20121129165721.pdf [accessed 12 February 2019].

Kelly, D., 2005. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kiraly, D., 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kiraly, D., 2003. From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a Paradigm shift in translator education? In: B.J. Baer and G.S. Koby, eds. *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Vol. 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. pp. 3—28.

Korol'kova, S.A., 2013. Translation didactics. In: V.A. Mityagin, ed. *Obucheniye perevodchica. Kommunicativnyie I didacticheaskie aspecty* [Translator training. Communicative and didactic aspects. Collective monograph]. Moscow. Flinta. Science. pp. 214—272 (in Russ.).

Korolyova, D.B., 2015. *Metodika obuchebiya perevodu na sovremennom etape. Sovremennyie metody obucheniya perevodu* [Methods of teaching translation at the present stage. Modern translation teaching methods]. Available at: http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2015/9-1/24.html [accessed 10 September 2018] (in Russ.).

Kussmaul, P., 1995. *Training the translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Latyshev, L.K., 2013. *Perevod: problemy teorii, practiki I metodiki prepodavaniya.* [Translation: problems of theory, practice and teaching methods]. M.: Kniga po trebovaniyu (in Russ.).

Lederer, M., 2007. *Perevod segodnya* [La traduction aujourd'hui. Le modèle interprétatif]. Translated by N. Fenenko and E. Alekseeva. St. Petersburg.: Publishing House of the Hertzen RGPU (in Russ.).

PACTE, 2000. Acquiring translation competence: hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project. In: A. Beeby, D. Ensinger and M. Presas, eds. *Investigating Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 99—106.

PACTE, 2017. *Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pym, A., 1992 Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In: C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaard, eds. The *Teaching of Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 279—288.

Pym, A., 1993. *Epistemological problems in translation and its teaching: A seminar for thinking students*. Caminade.

Pym, A., 2003. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. *Meta*, 48 (4), pp. 481—497.

Pym, A., 2005. Training translators — ten recurrent naiveties. *Translating Today*, 2 (1), pp. 3—6.

Pym, A., 2012. Training Translators. Available at: https://www. researchgate. net/publication/297128820_Training_Translators [accessed 10 March 2019]. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0032.

Raatikainen, P., 2012. Philosophical Issues in Meaning and Translation. In: A. Aejmelaeus and P. Pahta, eds. *Translation — Interpretation — Meaning Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences 7*. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. pp. 157—167.

Venuti, L. ed., 2017. *Teaching Translation: Programs, Courses, Pedagogies.* London/New York: Routledge.

Wills, W., 1992. The Future of Translator Training. *Meta,* 37(3), pp. 391—396.

The author

Dr Lyudmila Boyko, Associate professor, Institute for the Humanities, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia.

E-mail: boyko14@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Boyko, L. 2019, On combining translator training with foreign language teaching, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 114—128. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9.

О СОВМЕЩЕНИИ ПОДГОТОВКИ ПЕРЕВОДЧИКОВ И ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ

Л. Бойко[1]

[1] Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9

Современные подходы к обучению переводчиков основаны на компетентностных принципах, эпистемологические корни которых обнаруживаются в концепциях социального конструктивизма, утверждающего активное участие учащихся в обретении знаний. В статье кратко представлена современная методологическая картина подготовки переводчиков и поднят уже не раз дебатировавшийся вопрос о целесообразности сочетания обучения переводу с языковой подготовкой. Обосновывается, что обучение иностранным языкам может, а зачастую должно и даже вынуждено быть частью курса подготовки переводчиков в вузе, при этом доля лингвистического компонента в подготовке переводчиков должна определяться в зависимости от учебного плана и конкретных обстоятельств обучения. Ограничиваясь рассмотрением только лингвистического аспекта обучения переводу, автор предлагает сочетать приемы и методы, направленные на одновременное развитие лингвистических и переводческих компетенций. Эти методы подразделяются на аналитические и тренировочные, и последним уделяется основное внимание в данной статье. Автор утверждает, что тренировочные упражнения, полезные как для обучения переводу, так и для языковой подготовки, могут практиковаться, не вступая в противоречие с компетентностным подходом к обучению, ориентированным на студента.

***Ключевые слова**: подготовка переводчиков, обучение иностранным языкам, перевод, преподаватель, студент, упражнение, компетенция.*

Список литературы

Алексеева И.С. Письменный перевод. Немецкий язык. СПб. : Союз, 2006.

Алексеева И.С. Современное состояние теории перевода в России (критический обзор) // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. 2008. Сер. 9 : Язык и литература. Вып. 1. С. 26—38.

Базылев В.Н. Дидактика перевода. М. : Флинта ; Наука, 2013.

Гавриленко Н.Н. Основные цели обучения переводу научно-технических текстов // Вестник РУДН. Сер.: Русский и иностранные языки и методика их преподавания. 2004. Вып. 1 (2). С. 102—107.

Королькова С.А. Дидактика письменного перевода // Обучение переводчика. Коммуникативные и дидактические аспекты / под ред. В.А. Митягина. М. : Флинта ; Наука, 2013. С. 214—272.

Королева Д.Б. Методика обучения переводу на современном этапе. Современные методы обучения переводу. 2015. URL: http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2015/9-1/24.html (дата обращения: 10.09.2018).

Латышев Л.К. Перевод: проблемы теории, практики и методики преподавания. М. : Книга по требованию, 2013.

Ледерер М. Перевод сегодня / пер. Н. Фененко и Е. Алексеевой. СПб. : Изд-во РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена, 2007.

Carreres Á. Strange Bedfellows: Translation and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Translation into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees: Uses and Limitations // Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada, Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council. 2006. URL: http://cttic.org/ACTI/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf (дата обращения: 10.09.2018).

Carreres Á. Translation as a means and as an end: reassessing the divide // The Interpreter and Translator Trainer. 2014. Vol. 8, №1. P. 123—135.

Colina S. Translation Teaching, from Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers. N. Y. : McGraw-Hill, 2003a.

Colina S. Towards an Empirically-based Translation Pedagogy // Baer B.J., Koby G.S. (eds.). Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2003b. Vol. 12. P. 29—59.

Gambier Y. Teaching translation/training translators // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2012. Vol. 3. P. 163—171.

Gouadec D. Translation as a profession. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2007.

Kearns J. Curriculum Renewal in Translator Training: Vocational challenges in academic environments with reference to needs and situation analysis and skills transferability from the contemporary experience of Polish translator training culture: diss. 2006. URL: http://doras.dcu.ie/17625/1/John_Kearns_20121129165721.pdf (дата обращения: 12.02.2019).

Kelly D. A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2005.

Kiraly D. A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2000.

Kiraly D. From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a Paradigm shift in translator education? // Baer B.J., Koby G.S. (eds.). Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2003. Vol. 12. P. 3—28.

Kussmaul P. Training the translator. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1995.

PACTE. Acquiring translation competence: hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project // Beeby A., Ensinger D., Presas M. (eds.). Investigating Translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2000. P. 99—106.

PACTE. Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2017.

Pym A. Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching // Dollerup C., Loddegaard A. (eds.). The Teaching of Translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1992. P. 279—288.

Pym A. Epistemological problems in translation and its teaching: A seminar for thinking students. Caminade, 1993.

Pym A. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age // Meta. 2003. Vol. 48, №4. P. 481—497.

Pym A. Training translators — ten recurrent naiveties // Translating Today. 2005. Vol. 2, №1. P. 3—6.

Pym A. Training Translators. 2012. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297128820_Training_Translators (дата обращения: 10.03.2019). http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0032.

Raatikainen P. Philosophical Issues in Meaning and Translation // Aejmelaeus A., Pahta P. (eds). Translation — Interpretation — Meaning Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences 7. Helsinki : Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, 2012. P. 157—167.

Venuti L. (ed.). Teaching Translation: Programs, Courses, Pedagogies. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2017.

Wills W. The Future of Translator Training // Meta. 1992. Vol. 37, №3. P. 391—396.

Об авторе

Людмила Бойко, кандидат филологических наук, доцент Института гуманитарных наук, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Калининград, Россия.

E-mail: boyko14@gmail.com

Для цитирования:

Boyko L. On combining translator training with foreign language teaching // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 114—128. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9.

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 prioritety 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.

SLOVO.RU: THE BALTIC ACCENT JOURNAL

Guide for authors

1. The journal welcomes relevant and novel contributions. Articles submitted should include problem formulation, results, and conclusions and comply with the guide requirements.

2. Submitted materials should be original and not published elsewhere. Upon submitting an article to the journal, the author undertakes not to publish the article elsewhere, in whole or in part, without consent from the editorial board of the journal.

3. The recommended length of an article is 40,000 characters and that of a report is 20,000 characters with spaces, abstracts, keywords, and references in Russian and English.

4. All submitted contributions are subject to double-blind peer review and plagiarism scanning. The acceptable similarity index is below 20%.

5. There is no charge for publication.

6. To be considered by the editorial board, contributions are submitted via e-mail to the editor-in-chief or the publishing editor. Alternatively, authors can use the submission form on the IKBFU Journals website at *http://journals.kantiana.ru/*

7. The decision on the acceptance, improvement, or rejection of articles is made by the editorial board, following peer review and discussion.

Article structure and style

1. Contributions should include:

- a Universal Decimal Classification index (UDC) most relevant to the topic of the article;
- the title of the article in English and Russian, all lowercase;
- abstracts in English and Russian (200—250 words); the abstract in Russian is placed after the title and before the keywords; the summary in English is placed after the body of the article and before the references;
- keywords in Russian and English (4—10 words); keywords are placed before the body of the article after the abstract;
- references in Russian prepared according to GOST R 7.0.5.-2008 and Harvard-style references in the Latin script;
- a brief autobiographical note in Russian and English, including the full name(s), academic title(s), affiliation(s), e-mail address(es), phone number(s), and work address(es) of the author(s).

2. References.

• References prepared according to GOST R 7.0.5.-2008 are given at the end of the article in alphabetical order, unnumbered. Sources in Russian are listed first, followed by those in foreign languages. If works that have the same author and were written in the same year are cited, a lowercase letter (*a, b,* etc.) should be used after the date to differentiate between the works. For example:

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.

Канит 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.

• If an online source is cited, the reference should include the exact URL for the article and the date of accession, parenthesised. For example:

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

3. References in the Latin script.

The English-language part of the article should contain Harvard-style references in the Latin script: name of the author(s) followed by the year of publication. The title of the book (journal) should be italicised. If a work has not been published in a language using the Latin script, an English translation of the title should be provided in brackets. For example:

Cyrillic-script book: 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 universal system of states], Moscow.

Latin-script book: Keohane, R. 2002, *Power and Interdependence in a Partially Globalized World*, New York, Routledge.

Cyrillic-script article: Dezhina, I. G. 2010, Menjajushhiesja prioritety mezhdunarodnogo nauchno-tehnologicheskogo sotrudnichestva Rossii [Changing priorities of Russia's international scientific and technological cooperation], *Ekonomicheskaja politika* [Economic policy], no. 5, pp. 143—155, available from: www.iep.ru/files/text/policy/2010_5/dezgina.pdf (accessed 08 April 2013).

Latin-script article: Johanson, J., Vahlne, J.-E. 2003, Business Relationship Learning and Commitment in the Internationalization Process, *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, no. 1, pp. 83—101.

For more details on Harvard-style referencing, see *libweb.anglia.ac.uk/referencing/harvard.htm*

4. In-text referencing.

• In-text references should be parenthesised and include the name(s) of the author(s), the year of publication, and the page number (for citations), separated by commas. For example: (Howell, 1992, p. 297).

• References to multi-volume works: the name(s) of the author(s), the year of publication, the volume number, and the page number, separated by commas (Scchopenhauer, 2001, 3, 22).

5. A failure to meet the above requirements may result in the rejection of a manuscript.

Formatting

Manuscripts should be submitted in an electronic format as an a4-size document (210 × 297 mm).

Contributions are accepted in the *doc* and *docx* formats only (Microsoft Office).

For more details on the text, table, and figure formatting and referencing, see the IKBFU Journals website at

https://journals.kantiana.ru/journals/ slovoru/pravila-oformleniya/

Peer review process

1. All submitted contributions are subject to double-blind peer review.

2. The editor-in-chief establishes whether submitted works fit the scope and comply with the standards of the journal and submits them for review to an expert with relevant qualifications, holding a doctoral or postdoctoral degree.

3. The review period is such as to ensure prompt publication of accepted articles.

4. The review establishes:

a) whether the content of the article corresponds to its title;

b) whether the contribution is in line with the latest findings in the field;

c) whether the language, style, and layout of the text, tables, diagrams, figures, and formulae make the work clear to readers;

d) whether the article contains original research;

e) what the strengths and weaknesses of the article are and what improvements should be made;

f) whether the manuscript is suitable for publication in the journal.

5. The review is sent to the author via e-mail.

6. If a reviewer recommends reworking the article, these recommendations are sent to the author with suggestions for revision. The author(s) has(ve) the right to defend his/her(their) position. A revised article is resubmitted for review.

7. An article that has been rejected by at least one reviewer cannot be resubmitted. The text of a negative review is sent to the author via e-mail, fax, or regular mail.

8. A positive review is a necessary but not sufficient condition for publication. A final decision is made by the editorial board.

9. If a positive decision is made, the publishing editor notifies the author(s) and inform him/her(them) of the publication date.

10. The editorial board keeps reviews for five years.

СЛОВО.РУ:
БАЛТИЙСКИЙ АКЦЕНТ

SLOVO.RU:
BALTIC ACCENT

2019

Том / Vol. 10
№ 3

Темы и проблемы современного переводоведения
Challenged and Challenging Matters in Translation Studies

Тематический выпуск
Special Issue

Часть 2
Part 2

Редакторы *Е. Боярская, И. Дементьев*. Корректор *П. Щербаков*
Компьютерная верстка *Г. Винокуровой*

Editors *E. Boyarskaya, I. Dementev*, *P. Shcherbakov*
Layout by *G. Vinokurova*

Подписано в печать 05.08.2019 г.
Формат 70×108 1/16. Усл. печ. л. 11,8
Тираж 120 экз. (1-й завод — 80 экз.). Заказ 161

Signed 05.08.2019
Page format 70×108 1/16. Reference printed sheets 11,8
Edition 120 copies (first print: 80 copies). Order 161

Издательство Балтийского федерального университета им. Иммануила Канта
236022, г. Калининград, ул. Гайдара, 6

Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University Press
6 Gaidara st., Kaliningrad, 236022, Russia