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*Introducing Translation Studies* remains the definitive guide to the theories and concepts that make up the field of translation studies. Providing an accessible and up-to-date overview, it has long been the essential textbook on courses worldwide.

This fourth edition has been fully revised and continues to provide a balanced and detailed guide to the theoretical landscape. Each theory is applied to a wide range of languages, including Bengali, Chinese, English, French, German, Italian, Punjabi, Portuguese and Spanish. A broad spectrum of texts is analysed, including the Bible, Buddhist sutras, *Beowulf*, the fiction of García Márquez and Proust, European Union and UNESCO documents, a range of contemporary films, a travel brochure, a children’s cookery book and the translations of *Harry Potter*.

Each chapter comprises an introduction outlining the translation theory or theories, illustrative texts with translations, case studies, a chapter summary and discussion points and exercises.

New features in this fourth edition include:

- new material to keep up with developments in research and practice, including the sociology of translation, multilingual cities, translation in the digital age and specialized, audiovisual and machine translation
- revised discussion points and updated figures and tables
- new, in-chapter activities with links to online materials and articles to encourage independent research
- an extensive updated companion website with video introductions and journal articles to accompany each chapter, online exercises, an interactive timeline, weblinks, and PowerPoint slides for teacher support

This is a practical, user-friendly textbook ideal for students and researchers on courses in Translation and Translation Studies.

**Jeremy Munday** is Professor of Translation Studies at the University of Leeds, UK, and is a qualified and experienced translator. He is author of *Style and Ideology in Translation* (Routledge 2008) and *Evaluation in Translation* (Routledge 2012), editor of *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (2009) and co-author, with Basil Hatim, of *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book* (Routledge 2004).
Praise for this edition

‘Jeremy Munday’s *Introducing Translation Studies* has long been admired for its combination of theoretical rigour and down-to-earth explanation, and this new edition will further confirm its place as the go-to introduction for students and teachers alike. Its further incorporation of ideas from the Chinese context is particularly welcome.’
Robert Neather, *Hong Kong Baptist University, China*

‘An even better fourth edition of a widely popular and commonly used book in Translation Studies (TS). Munday’s volume is a sound and accessible introduction to TS, combining scholarly rigor with reader-friendly style and an excellent didactic orientation, which will continue to make this book highly attractive to students, teachers and newcomers.’
Sonia Colina, *University of Arizona, USA*

Praise for the third edition

‘This book provides a comprehensive and precise coverage of the major theories of translation … The discussion and research points at the end of each topic will be welcomed by students, teachers and researchers alike … written in exceptionally clear and user-friendly style … Readers who may have no previous knowledge of translation studies will also find the book interesting and illuminating.’
Susan Xu Yun, *SIM University, Singapore*

‘Whether you are a researcher, teacher, practitioner or learner of translation, you should read this book to get a comprehensive view of translation theories of the world, at present and in the past. This book is extremely useful as the starting point for understanding translation theories. It is deep enough for you to get adequate details and broad enough to let you know which directions to follow in your further research.’
Chris Shei, *Swansea University, UK*

‘Jeremy Munday covers it all in this up-to-date book. It covers most, if not all, aspects of translation, whether they are theoretical or practical. This book is also an essential resource of knowledge for professional, academic, and practicing translators. Many approaches to translation are clearly and thoroughly explained.’
Said M. Shiyab, *UAE University, UAE*

‘It would be difficult to find a better introduction to the complex field of translation studies … A real must for everybody interested in this discipline.’
Maria Sánchez, *University of Salford, UK*

‘This updated edition of *Introducing Translation Studies* provides a clear, thorough, and balanced introduction to major past and current trends in translation studies. It will be of great assistance to translation instructors and students seeking an updated overview of the field.’
Françoise Massardier-Kenney, *Kent State University, USA*
Para Cristina,
que me ha hecho feliz
Chapter 4 Studying translation product and process 86
  4.0 Introduction 87
  4.1 Vinay and Darbelnet's model 88
  4.2 Catford and translation 'shifts' 95
  4.3 Option, markedness and stylistic shifts in translation 98
  4.4 The cognitive process of translation 100
  4.5 Ways of investigating cognitive processing 103

Chapter 5 Functional theories of translation 113
  5.0 Introduction 114
  5.1 Text type 114
  5.2 Translatorial action 124
  5.3 Skopos theory 126
  5.4 Translation-oriented text analysis 131

Chapter 6 Discourse and Register analysis approaches 141
  6.0 Introduction 142
  6.1 The Hallidayan model of language and discourse 142
  6.2 House's model of translation quality assessment 145
  6.3 Baker's text and pragmatic level analysis: a coursebook for translators 149
  6.4 Hatim and Mason: the levels of context and discourse 156
  6.5 Criticisms of discourse and Register analysis approaches to translation 159

Chapter 7 Systems theories 169
  7.0 Introduction 170
  7.1 Polysystem theory 170
  7.2 Toury and descriptive translation studies 174
  7.3 Chesterman's translation norms 186
  7.4 Other models of descriptive translation studies: Lambert and van Gorp and the Manipulation School 189

Chapter 8 Cultural and ideological turns 197
  8.0 Introduction 198
  8.1 Translation as rewriting 199
  8.2 Translation and gender 205
  8.3 Postcolonial translation theory 208
  8.4 The ideologies of the theorists 213
  8.5 Translation, ideology and power in other contexts 214

Chapter 9 The role of the translator: visibility, ethics and sociology 222
  9.0 Introduction 223
  9.1 The cultural and political agenda of translation 223
  9.2 The position and positionality of the translator 233
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 10</th>
<th>Philosophical approaches to translation</th>
<th>249</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Steiner’s hermeneutic motion</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Ezra Pound and the energy of language</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>The task of the translator: Walter Benjamin</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Deconstruction</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 11</th>
<th>New directions from the new media</th>
<th>274</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Audiovisual translation</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Localization, globalization and collaborative translation</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Corpus-based translation studies</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 12</th>
<th>Research and commentary projects</th>
<th>302</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Consilience in translation studies</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Translation commentaries</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Research projects in translation studies</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes 319
Bibliography 328
Index 361
## Figures and tables

### Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Holmes's 'map' of translation studies</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The applied branch of translation studies</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Translation strategies</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Translation procedures</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Nida's three-stage system of translation</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Reiss's text types and text varieties</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Text type and relevant criteria for translation</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The Hallidayan model of language</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Revised scheme for analysing and comparing original and translated texts</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Conditions when translation is in primary position in polysystem</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Toury's initial norm and the continuum of adequate and acceptable translation</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Initial, preliminary and operational norms</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Control factors inside and outside the literary system</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Domestication and foreignization: ethical and discursive levels</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Steiner's hermeneutic motion</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Concordance sample of <em>loom large</em></td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Concordance sample of <em>se cierne(n)</em></td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Example of componential analysis</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Comparison of Newmark's semantic and communicative translation</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Characteristics of research foci for different equivalence types</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Segmentation of text into units of translation</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Functional characteristics of text types and links to translation methods</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Register variables and their typical realizations</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Forms of cohesion</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Comparison of Toury's and Chesterman's norms</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Multimodal transcription model</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Example translation specification sheet</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Comparison of terminology for orientation of strategies</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Types of research questions</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Types of hypotheses</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to thank the following copyright holders for giving permission to reproduce the following: Figure 1.1, reproduced from G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – And Beyond*, revised edition copyright 2012, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. Figures 1.3 and 1.4 reproduced from L. van Doorslaer ‘Risking conceptual maps’, in Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (eds) *The Metalanguage of Translation*, special issue of *Target* 19.2: 217–33, reissued in Benjamins Current Topics 20 in 2009. Figure 5.2, reproduced from M. Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, copyright 1998, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. All the above reproduced with kind permission by John Benjamins Publishing Company, www.benjamins.com. Figure 3.1, reproduced from E. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, copyright 1969, Leiden: E. J. Brill. Figure 6.2, reproduced from J. House, *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*, copyright 2015, Routledge. Table 5.1, translated and adapted from K. Reiss, *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*; the original is copyright of K. Reiss. While every effort has been made to trace copyright holders and obtain permission, this may not have been possible in all cases. Any omissions brought to the publisher’s attention will be remedied at the earliest opportunity.


*Introducing Translation Studies* has evolved over time, but I acknowledge my sincere debt to Lawrence Venuti (Temple University, USA) for his encouragement with the initial project and for his detailed comments and suggestions on drafts of the first edition.

My thanks also go to Rana Nayar (Reader, Department of English at Panjab University, Chandigarh, India) for his assistance with the case study in Chapter 9. I also thank colleagues at the Universities of Leeds, Surrey and Bradford for their support during the writing of the various editions of this book, and to my students...
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

at all those institutions and universities where I have been lucky enough to be invited to speak, who have responded to versions of this material. My thanks also to all who have contacted me with comments on the earlier editions with suggestions for revision, to those journal reviewers who have made constructive suggestions and most particularly to the reviewers of the proposal and drafts for this fourth edition.

There are many other translation studies colleagues who have offered suggestions and help in many ways. I thank them all.

I would also like to express my extreme gratitude to Louisa Semlyen, Laura Sandford and everyone at Routledge, who have been so very supportive and patient throughout the writing and editing process. Also to Anna Callander for her careful attention to detail. And thanks to Jacob Blakesley and Falih Al-Emara for help with the index. Any remaining errors or deficiencies are of course mine alone.

Finally, but most of all, my thanks to Cristina, whose love and help mean so much to me, and to Nuria and Marina, who continue to add so much more to my life.

Jeremy Munday
London, August 2015
# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@AC</td>
<td>Before Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>descriptive translation studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>source language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>source text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>target text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Translation studies is the now established academic discipline related to the study of the theory, practice and phenomena of translation. This book brings together and clearly summarizes the major strands of translation studies, in order to help readers acquire an understanding of the discipline and the necessary background and tools to begin to carry out their own research. It also presents and discusses theoretical frameworks into which professional translators and trainee translators can place their own practical experience.

The first three editions of *Introducing Translation Studies* (2001, 2008 and 2012) presented a practical introduction to an already diverse field. This fourth edition, while maintaining the structure and much of the material, is fully revised and updated. New content has been included throughout, ‘exploration boxes’ have been inserted within the text to link to full-text articles available on the *Introducing Translation Studies* companion website (http://www.routledge.com/cw/munday) and other material has been located online. The website also contains new video summaries of each chapter and revised PowerPoint presentations that may be customized by the tutor.

However, the general structure of the book remains the same. It sets out to give a critical but balanced survey of many of the most important trends and contributions to translation studies in a single volume, written in an accessible style. The different contemporary models are applied to illustrative texts in brief case studies so that the reader can see them in operation. The new research contained in these case studies, together with the ‘discussion and research points’ sections, is designed to encourage further exploration and understanding of translation issues.

The book is designed to serve as a coursebook for undergraduates and postgraduates in translation, translation studies and translation theory, and as a solid theoretical introduction for students, researchers, instructors and professional translators. The aim is to enable the readers to develop their understanding of the issues and associated technical language (metalanguage), and
to begin to apply the models themselves. The reader is also encouraged to carry out a closer examination of specific issues and to pursue further reading in those areas that are of greatest interest. In this way, the book may provide a stimulating introduction to a range of theoretical approaches to translation that are relevant both for those engaged in the academic study of translation and for the professional linguist.

Each of the chapters surveys a major area of the discipline. Each is designed to be self-standing, so that readers with a specific focus can quickly find the descriptions that are of most interest to them. However, conceptual links between chapters are cross-referenced and the book has been structured so that it can function as a coursebook. The twelve chapters might be covered in one or two weeks, depending on the length of the course, to fit into a semesterized system. The discussion and research points additionally provide substantial initial material for students to begin to develop their own research.

The progression of ideas is also from the introductory (presenting main issues of translation studies in Chapter 1) to the more complex, as the students become more accustomed to the terminology and concepts. In general, the progression is chronological, from pre-twentieth-century theory in Chapter 2 to linguistic-oriented theories (Chapters 3 to 6) and to more recent developments from cultural studies such as postcolonialism (Chapter 8), and from sociology (Chapter 9) and new technologies (Chapter 11). But it is also conceptual, since some of the earlier theories and concepts, such as equivalence and universals of translation, are constantly being revisited (e.g. in Chapter 10).

Clarity has been a major consideration, so each chapter follows a similar format of:

- an introductory table clearly presenting key terms and ideas;
- the main text, describing in detail the models and issues under discussion;
- ‘exploration boxes’ with links to relevant full-text articles online and with self-study or classroom activities;
- an illustrative case study, which applies and evaluates the main model of the chapter;
- suggestions for further reading;
- a brief evaluative summary of the chapter;
- a series of discussion and research points to stimulate further thought and research;
- links to the ITS website (www.routledge.com/cw/munday) where each chapter is accompanied by a video summary, multiple-choice recall test,
customizable PowerPoint slides, extra research articles, further reading hints and research project questions. Extra case studies in other languages appear.

In common with other anthologies and introductory books, this volume is necessarily selective. The theorists and models covered have been chosen because of their strong influence on translation studies and because they are particularly representative of the approaches in each chapter. Much other worthy material has had to be excluded due to space constraints and the focus of the book, which is to give a clear introduction to a number of theoretical approaches. Over recent years, the field has continued to expand dramatically with a considerable increase in the number of publications and the borrowing of concepts from new fields such as cognitive studies, sociology, literary theory and corpus linguistics. It is not practicable, and indeed would be impossible, to attempt to be fully comprehensive. I am also aware that the organization of the book inevitably gives preference to those theorists who have advanced major new ideas and gives less than sufficient due to the many scholars who work in the field producing detailed case studies or less high-profile work.

For these reasons, detailed suggestions are given for Further reading. These are designed to encourage students to go to the primary texts, to follow up ideas that have been raised in each chapter and to investigate the research that is being carried out in their own countries and languages. In this way, the book should ideally be used in conjunction with the readers mentioned in section 1.2 and be supported by an institution’s library resources. An attempt has also been made to refer to many works that are readily available, either in recent editions or reprinted in one of the anthologies. The emphasis is on encouraging reflection, investigation and awareness of the new discipline, and on applying the theory to both practice and research.

A major issue has been the choice of languages for the texts used in the illustrative case studies. There are examples or texts from Chinese, English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish. Some additional examples are given from Arabic, Bengali, Dutch, Punjabi and Russian. Yet the case studies are written in such a way as to focus on the theoretical issues and should not exclude those unfamiliar with the specific language pairs. A range of text types is offered. The earlier editions included the Bible, Beowulf, the fiction of García Márquez and Proust, European Union and UNESCO documents, a travel brochure, a children’s cookery book, the translations of Harry Potter and subtitled films from Bengali, French and German. This fourth edition expands to discuss website
localization, other types of technical translation, videogame transcreation and crowdsourced translations, amongst others.

A guide to chapters

The book is organized as follows.

Chapter 1 discusses what we mean by ‘translation’ and what the scope is of the discipline of translation studies. It discusses the three types of translation defined by Jakobson: intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic. It then presents the well-known Holmes/Toury conceptual map of the discipline, and critiques it with new conceptualizations and knowledge structures used in the construction of the online publications database, the Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography.

Chapter 2 describes some of the major issues that are discussed in writings about translation up to the twentieth century. This huge range of over 2,000 years, beginning with Cicero in the first century, focuses on the ‘literal vs. free’ translation debate, an imprecise and circular debate from which theorists have emerged only in the last sixty years. The chapter describes some of the classic writings on translation over the years, making a selection of the most well-known and readily available sources. It aims to initiate discussion on some of the key issues.

Chapter 3 deals with the concepts of meaning, equivalence and ‘equivalent effect’. Translation theory in the 1960s under Eugene Nida shifted the emphasis to the receiver of the message. This chapter encompasses Nida’s model of translation transfer, influenced by Chomsky’s generative grammar, and his concepts of formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Newmark’s similarly influential categories of semantic translation and communicative translation are also discussed, as is Koller’s analysis of equivalence.

Chapter 4 overviews attempts that have been made to describe the product and process of translation. These include classifications of the linguistic changes or ‘shifts’ which occur in translation. The main model described here is Vinay and Darbelnet’s classic taxonomy, but reference is also made to other traditions, such as Loh’s English-Chinese model, and to Catford’s linguistic model. The latter part of the chapter introduces some of the work that has been conducted from a cognitive perspective, which seeks to explain message processing and how translation as communication is achieved. This section
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covers the interpretive model of the Paris School, Gutt’s work on relevance theory and recent advances in empirical studies.

**Chapter 5** covers Reiss and Vermeer’s text-type and skopos theory of the 1970s and 1980s and Nord’s text-linguistic approach. In this chapter, translation is analysed according to text type and function in the TL culture, and prevailing concepts of text analysis – such as word order, information structure and thematic progression – are employed. Hybrid and multimodal text genres are also discussed.

Linked closely to the previous chapter, **Chapter 6** moves on to consider House’s recently modified Register analysis model and the development of discourse-oriented approaches in the 1990s by Baker, and Hatim and Mason, who make use of Hallidayan linguistics to examine translation as communication within a sociocultural context.

**Chapter 7** investigates systems theories and the field of target-oriented ‘descriptive’ translation studies, following Even-Zohar, Toury and the work of the Manipulation School.

**Chapter 8** examines the cultural and ideological approaches in translation studies. These start with Lefevere’s work of the 1980s and early 1990s – which itself arose out of a comparative literature and Manipulation School background – and move on to more recent developments in gender studies and translation (in Canada), to postcolonial translation theories (in India) and other ideological implications of translation. The chapter then focuses on a case study of translation from Asia.

**Chapter 9** looks at the role of the translator and the ethics of translation practice. It begins by following Berman and Venuti in examining the foreign element in translation and the ‘invisibility’ of the translator. The idea explored is that the practice of translation, especially in the English-speaking world, is considered to be a derivative and second-rate activity, and that the prevailing method of translation is ‘naturalizing’. The role of ‘agents’ such as literary translators and publishers is also described and linked to recent work on the sociology and historiography of translation, incorporating theories from Bourdieu, Latour and Luhmann.

**Chapter 10** investigates a range of philosophical issues around language and translation, ranging from Steiner’s ‘hermeneutic motion’, Pound’s use of archaisms, Walter Benjamin’s ‘pure’ language, and Derrida and the deconstruction movement. These question some of the basic tenets of translation theory.

**Chapter 11** looks at the challenges presented by the unprecedented growth in new technologies. It discusses audiovisual translation, the most prominent of the new research areas, but also localization processes in translation practice and corpus-based translation studies. These technological advances have forced
a dramatic revision of some long-held beliefs and the reassessment of central issues such as equivalence and translation universals.

Chapter 12 brings together some of the distinct strands of the discipline in Chesterman’s call for ‘consilience’. It then discusses how research advances may be achieved, with the reaching out to other disciplines, and proposes specific advice for those working on reflexive translation commentaries and MA or PhD research projects.
CHAPTER 1

Main issues of translation studies

Key concepts

- Definitions of translating and interpreting.
- The practice of translating is long established, but the discipline of translation studies is relatively new.
- In academic circles, translation was previously relegated to just a language-learning activity.
- A split has persisted between translation practice and theory.
- The study of (usually literary) translation began through comparative literature, translation ‘workshops’ and contrastive analysis.
- James S. Holmes’s ‘The name and nature of translation studies’ is considered to be the ‘founding statement’ of a new discipline.
- Translation studies has expanded hugely, and is now often considered an interdiscipline.

Key texts


1.1 The concept of translation

Watch the introductory video on the companion website.

The main aim of this book is to introduce the reader to major concepts and models of translation studies. Because the research being undertaken in this field is now so extensive, the material selected is necessarily only representative and illustrative of the major trends. For reasons of space and consistency of approach, the focus is on written translation rather than oral translation (the latter is commonly known as interpreting or interpretation), although the overlaps make a clear distinction impossible (cf. Gile 2004). More subtly, interpreting is defined, by Otto Kade, as ‘a form of Translation (in the wider sense) in which (a) the source language text is presented only once and thus cannot be reviewed or replayed, and (b) the target language text is produced under time pressure, with little chance for correction and revision’ (Pöchhacker 2009: 133, following Kade 1968).

The English term translation, first attested in around 1340, derives either from Old French translation or more directly from the Latin translatio (‘transporting’), itself coming from the participle of the verb transferre (‘to carry over’). In the field of languages, translation today has several meanings:

1. the general subject field or phenomenon (‘I studied translation at university’)
2. the product – that is, the text that has been translated (‘they published the Arabic translation of the report’)
3. the process of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating (‘translation service’).

The process of translation between two different written languages involves the changing of an original written text (the source text or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or SL) into a written text (the target text or TT) in a different verbal language (the target language or TL):

Source text (ST) in source language (SL) → Target text (TT) in target language (TL)

Thus, when translating a product manual from Chinese into English, the ST is Chinese and the TT is English. However, internationalization and communication practices have meant that this traditional conceptualization of translation needs
to be broadened to include those contexts in which there is no clearly defined source text. This may be because there are multilingual versions of the same text, each of which is deemed to be equally valid (e.g. the Acquis body of European Union law), or because of an ‘unstable’ source text that is subject to constant updating or adaptation, each iteration of which requires a modification of existing target texts rather than a completely new translation (e.g. a multilingual website). The traditional ST-TT configuration is the most prototypical of ‘interlingual translation’, one of the three categories of translation described by the Russo-American structuralist Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) in his seminal paper ‘On linguistic aspects of translation’. Jakobson’s categories are as follows:

(1) **intralingual** translation, or ‘rewording’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language’

(2) **interlingual** translation, or ‘translation proper’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language’

(3) **intersemiotic** translation, or ‘transmutation’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign systems’.

(Jakobson 1959/2012: 127)

These definitions draw on **semiotics**, the general science of communication through signs and sign systems, of which language is but one (Cobley 2001, Malmkjær 2011). The use of the term **semiotics** is significant here because translation is not always limited to verbal languages. **Intersemiotic translation**, for example, occurs when a written text is translated into a different mode, such as music, film or painting. Examples would be Jeff Wayne’s famous 1978 musical version of H. G. Wells’s science-fiction novel *The War of the Worlds* (1898), which was then adapted for the stage in 2006, or Gurinder Chadha’s 2004 Bollywood *Bride and Prejudice* adaptation of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*. **Intralingual translation** would occur when we produce a summary or otherwise rewrite a text in the same language, say a children’s version of an encyclopedia. It also occurs when we rephrase an expression in the same language. In the following example, *revenue nearly tripled* is a kind of intralingual translation of the first part of the sentence, a fact that is highlighted by the trigger expression *in other words*.

In the decade before 1989 revenue averaged around [NZ]$1 billion a year while in the decade after it averaged nearly [NZ]$3 billion a year – in other words, revenue nearly tripled.³
It is **interlingual translation**, between two different verbal sign systems, that has been the traditional focus of translation studies. However, as we shall see as the book progresses, notably in Chapters 8 to 10, the very notion of ‘translation proper’ and of the stability of source and target has been challenged. The question of what we mean by ‘translation’, and how it differs from ‘adaptation’, ‘version’, ‘transcreation’ (the creative adaptation of video games and advertising in particular, see section 11.1.8), ‘localization’ (the linguistic and cultural adaptation of a text for a new locale, see section 11.2) and so on, is a very real one. Sandra Halverson (1999) claims that translation can be better considered as a **prototype** classification, that is, that there are basic core features that we associate with a prototypical translation, and other translational forms which lie on the periphery.

Much of translation theory has until recently also been written from a western perspective and initially derived from the study of Classical Greek and Latin and from Biblical practice (see Chapter 2). By contrast, Maria Tymoczko (2005, 2006, 2007: 68–77) discusses the very different words and metaphors for ‘translation’ in other cultures, indicative of a **conceptual orientation** where the goal of close lexical fidelity to an original may not therefore be shared, certainly in the practice of translation of sacred and literary texts. For instance, in India there is the Bengali **rupantar** (="change of form") and the Hindi **anuvad** (="speaking after", ‘following’), in the Arab world **tarjama** (="biography") and in China **fan yi** (="turning over"). Each of these construes the process of translation differently and anticipates that the target text will show a substantial change of form compared to the source.4 Tymoczko (2007: 107–39) also frames the ‘cross-cultural’ concept of translation as an interface of representation, transmission and transculturation.

### 1.1 Exploration: The term ‘translation’

Which word(s) are used for ‘translation’ in the languages you work with? Explore their origins. What do these terms suggest about the conceptualization of translation?

### 1.2 What is translation studies?

Throughout history, written and spoken translations have played a crucial role in interhuman communication, not least in providing access to important texts for
scholarship and religious purposes. As world trade has grown, so has the importance of translation. By 2015, the global market for outsourced translation, interpreting and related technologies was estimated to exceed US$38 billion, while international organizations such as the European Union translate between 24 languages and spend some €456 million per year on translation and interpreting services. Yet the study of translation as an academic subject only really began in the second half of the twentieth century. In the English-speaking world, this discipline is now generally known as ‘translation studies’, thanks to the Dutch-based US scholar James S. Holmes (1924–1986). In his key defining paper delivered in 1972, but not widely available until 1988, Holmes describes the then nascent discipline as being concerned with ‘the complex of problems clustered round the phenomenon of translating and translations’ (Holmes 1988b/2004: 181). By 1995, the time of the second, revised, edition of her Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach, Mary Snell-Hornby was able to talk in the preface of ‘the breathtaking development of translation studies as an independent discipline’ and the ‘prolific international discussion’ on the subject (Snell-Hornby 1995, preface). Little more than a decade later, the editors of the second edition of the Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation comment on ‘new concerns in the discipline, its growing multidisciplinarity, and its commitment to break away from its exclusively Eurocentric origins, while holding on to the achievements of the past decades’ (Baker and Saldanha 2009: xxii).

There are four very visible ways in which translation studies has become more prominent. Unsurprisingly, these reflect a basic tension between the practical side of professional translating and the often more abstract research activity of the field. First, just as the demand for translation has soared, so has there been a vast expansion in specialized translating and interpreting programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. These programmes, which attract thousands of students, are mainly oriented towards training future professional commercial translators and interpreters and serve as highly valued entry-level qualifications for the professions. The types of translation covered at each institution vary. These may include MAs in applied translation studies, scientific and technical translation, conference and bilateral interpreting, audiovisual translation, specialized Sign Language and audio description. A smaller number of programmes focus on the practice of literary translation. In Europe, literary translation is also supported by the RECIT network of centres where literary translation is studied, practised and promoted. The first of these was set up in Straelen, West Germany, in 1978.

Second, the past decades have also seen a proliferation of conferences, books and journals on translation in many languages. Longer-standing
international translation studies journals such as *Babel* (the Netherlands) and *Meta* (Canada), first published in 1955, were joined by TTR (*Traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, Canada) in 1988, *Target* (the Netherlands) in 1989, *Perspectives* (Denmark) in 1993 and *The Translator* (UK) in 1995.

Online accessibility is increasing the profile of certain publications including open access journals such as *The Journal of Specialised Translation* and *New Voices* (see www.routledge.com/cw/munday). In addition, there is a whole host of other journals devoted to single languages, modern languages, applied linguistics, comparative literature and others where articles on translation are often published.

### 1.2 Exploration: Translation studies journals

The companion website for *Introducing Translation Studies* includes a list of major translation studies journals.

The front and backlists of publishers such as Bloomsbury, John Benjamins, Multilingual Matters, Peter Lang, Palgrave, Rodopi and Routledge (including St Jerome publishing) have significant series in translation studies. There are also various professional publications dedicated to the practice and study of translation. In the UK these include *The Linguist* of the Chartered Institute of Linguists, *The ITI Bulletin* of the Institute of Translating and Interpreting and *In Other Words*, the literary-oriented publication of the Translators Association.

A Companion to Translation Studies (Bermann and Porter 2014). The best-known searchable online bibliographies are Translation Studies Bibliography (John Benjamins/Routledge) and the free-access BITRA (University of Alicante).⁷

Fourth, international organizations have also prospered. The Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (International Federation of Translators, FIT) was established in 1953 by the Société française des traducteurs and its president Pierre-François Caillé (1907–79). It brought together national associations of translators. In more recent years, translation studies scholars have banded together nationally and internationally in bodies such as the Canadian Association for Translation Studies/Association canadienne de traductologie (CATS, founded in Ottawa in 1987), the European Society for Translation Studies (EST, Vienna, 1992), the European Association for Studies in Screen Translation (ESIST, Cardiff, 1995), the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association (ATISA, Kent, OH, 2002), the International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies (IATIS, Seoul, 2004) and the Asia-Pacific Forum on Translation and Intercultural Studies (Hangzhou-Tsinghua, 2011). International conferences on a wide variety of themes are held in an increasing number of countries. From being a relatively quiet backwater in the early 1980s, translation studies has now become one of the most active and dynamic new areas of multidisciplinary research.

1.3 An early history of the discipline

Writings on the subject of translating go far back in recorded history. The practice of translation was crucial for the early dissemination of key cultural and religious texts and concepts. In the west, the different ways of translating were discussed by, among others, Cicero and Horace (first century BC) and St Jerome (fourth century AD). As we shall see in Chapter 2, their writings were to exert an important influence up until the twentieth century. In St Jerome’s case, his approach to translating the Greek Septuagint Bible into Latin would affect later translations of the Scriptures. Indeed, in western Europe the translation of the Bible was to be the battleground of conflicting ideologies for well over a thousand years and especially during the Reformation in the sixteenth century. In China, it was the translation of the Buddhist sutras that inaugurated a long discussion on translation practice from the first century BC.

While the practice of translation is long established, the study of the field developed into an academic discipline only in the latter part of the twentieth century. Before that, translation had often been relegated to an element of
language learning. In fact, from the late eighteenth century to the 1960s and beyond, language learning in secondary schools in many countries had come to be dominated by what was known as grammar-translation (Cook 2010: 9–15). Applied to Classical Latin and Greek and then to modern foreign languages, this centred on the rote study of the grammatical rules and structures of the foreign language. These rules were both practised and tested by the translation of a series of usually unconnected and artificially constructed sentences exemplifying the structure(s) being studied. This is an approach that persists even today in certain contexts. Typical of this is the following rather bizarre and decontextualized collection of sentences to translate into Spanish, for the practice of Spanish tense use. They appear in K. Mason’s *Advanced Spanish Course*, still to be found on some secondary school courses in the UK until the 1990s:

(1) The castle stood out against the cloudless sky.
(2) The peasants enjoyed their weekly visits to the market.
(3) She usually dusted the bedrooms after breakfast.
(4) Mrs Evans taught French at the local grammar school.

(Mason 1969/1974: 92)

The gearing of translation to language teaching and learning may partly explain why academia considered it to be of secondary status. Translation exercises were regarded as a means of learning a new language or of reading a foreign language text until one had the linguistic ability to read the original. Study of a work in translation was generally frowned upon once the student had acquired the necessary skills to read the original. Grammar-translation therefore fell into increasing disrepute, particularly in many English-language countries, with the rise of alternative forms of language teaching such as the direct method and the communicative approach from the 1960s and 1970s (Cook 2010: 6–9, 22–26). The communicative approach stressed students’ natural capacity to learn language and attempts to replicate ‘authentic’ language-learning conditions in the classroom. It often privileged spoken over written forms, at least initially, and generally avoided use of the students’ mother tongue. This led to the abandoning of translation in language learning. As far as teaching was concerned, translation then tended to become restricted to higher-level and university language courses and professional translator training. It is only relatively recently that there has been a move to restore translation to language teaching (see Cook 2010: 125–53, for examples).

In 1960s USA, starting in Iowa and Princeton, literary translation was promoted by the translation workshop concept. This was based on the reading and
practical criticism workshops of Cambridge critic I. A. Richards (1893–1979) from the 1920s and on later creative writing workshops. The translation workshops were intended as a platform for the introduction of new translations into the target culture and for the discussion of the finer principles of the translation process and of understanding a text. Running parallel to this approach was that of comparative literature, where literature is studied and compared transnationally and transculturally, necessitating the reading of some works in translation.

Another area in which translation became the subject of research was contrastive linguistics. This is the study of two languages in contrast in an attempt to identify general and specific differences between them. It developed into a systematic area of research in the USA from the 1930s onwards and came to the fore in the 1960s and 1970s. Translations and translated examples provided much of the data in these studies (e.g. Di Pietro 1971, James 1980 and later Connor 1996). The contrastive approach heavily influenced important linguistic research into translation, such as Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Catford (1965), even if it did not incorporate sociocultural and pragmatic factors nor sufficiently the role of translation as a communicative act. The continued application of linguistics-based models has demonstrated their obvious and inherent link with translation. Among the specific models used are those related to generative grammar, functional linguistics and pragmatics (see Chapters 3 to 6).

The more systematic, linguistic-oriented, approach to the study of translation began to emerge in the 1950s and 1960s. There are a number of now classic examples:

- Andrei Fedorov’s Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda [Foundations of a General Theory of Translation] (1953/1968), described by Mossop (2013) and shown by Pym (2016) to have heavily influenced Vinay and Darbelnet and Loh (below);
- Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet produced their Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais (1958), a contrastive study of French and English which introduced key terminology for describing translation. It was not translated into English until 1995;
- Alfred Malblanc (1944/1963) did the same for translation between French and German and Loh Dian-yang for Chinese and English (Zhang and Pan Li 2009; Pym 2016);
- Georges Mounin’s Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction (1963) examined linguistic issues of translation;
Eugene Nida (1964a) incorporated elements of Chomsky’s then fashionable generative grammar as a theoretical underpinning of his books, which were initially designed to be practical manuals for Bible translators.

This more systematic approach began to mark out the territory of the ‘scientific’ investigation of translation. The word *science* was used by Nida in the title of his 1964 book (*Toward a Science of Translating*, 1964a). The German equivalent, *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, was taken up by Wolfram Wilss in his teaching and research at the Universität des Saarlandes at Saarbrücken, by Werner Koller in Heidelberg and by the Leipzig School, where scholars such as Otto Kade and Albrecht Neubert became active (see Snell-Hornby 2006). At that time, even the name of the emerging discipline remained to be determined, with other candidates staking their claim, such as *translatology* and its counterparts *Translatologie* in German, *traductologie* in French and *traductología* in Spanish (e.g. Vázquez-Ayora 1977 and the substantial contribution of Hurtado Albir 2001).

### 1.4 The Holmes/Toury ‘map’

A seminal paper in the development of the field as a distinct discipline was James S. Holmes’s *The name and nature of translation studies* (Holmes 1988b/2004). In his *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Gentzler (2001: 93) describes Holmes’s paper as ‘generally accepted as the founding statement for the field.’ Snell-Hornby (2006: 3) agrees. Interestingly, in view of our discussion above of how the field evolved from other disciplines, the published version was an expanded form of a paper Holmes originally gave in 1972 in the translation section of the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen (Holmes 1972). Holmes drew attention to the limitations imposed at the time because translation research, lacking a home of its own, was dispersed across older disciplines (languages, linguistics, etc.). He also stressed the need to forge ‘other communication channels, cutting across the traditional disciplines to reach all scholars working in the field, from whatever background’ (1988b/2004: 181).

Crucially, Holmes put forward an overall framework, describing what translation studies covers. This framework was subsequently presented by the leading Israeli translation scholar Gideon Toury as in Figure 1.1.

In Holmes’s explanations of this framework (Holmes 1988b/2004: 184–90), the objectives of the ‘pure’ areas of research are: (1) the description of the
phenomena of translation; and (2) the establishment of general principles to explain and predict such phenomena (translation theory). The ‘theoretical’ branch is divided into general and partial theories. By ‘general’, Holmes is referring to those writings that seek to describe or account for every type of translation and to make generalizations that will be relevant for translation as a whole (one example would be Toury’s ‘laws’ of translation; see Chapter 7). ‘Partial’ theoretical studies are restricted according to the parameters discussed below (medium, text-type, etc.).

The descriptive branch of ‘pure’ research in Holmes’s map is known as descriptive translation studies (DTS, see Chapter 7). It may examine: (1) the product; (2) the function; and (3) the process.

(1) Product-oriented DTS examines existing translations. This may involve the description or analysis of a single ST–TT pair or a comparative analysis of several TTs of the same ST (into one or more TLs). These smaller-scale studies can build up into a larger body of translation analysis looking at a specific period, language or text/discourse type. Examples would be translation in the twenty-first century, in the English<>Chinese language pair, or of scientific reports. Larger-scale studies can be either diachronic (following development over time) or synchronic (at a single point or period in time). Holmes (ibid.: 185) foresees that ‘one of the eventual goals of
product-oriented DTS might possibly be a general history of translations – however ambitious such a goal might sound at this time’.

(2) By function-oriented DTS, Holmes (ibid.) means the description of the ‘function [of translations] in the recipient sociocultural situation: it is a study of contexts rather than texts’. Issues that may be researched include which texts were translated when and where, and the influences that were exerted. For example, the study of the translation and reception of Shakespeare into European languages, or the subtitling of contemporary cartoon films into Arabic. Holmes terms this area ‘socio-translation studies’. Nowadays it would probably be called the sociology and historiography of translation. It was less researched at the time of Holmes’s paper but is more popular in current work on translation studies (see Chapters 8 and 9).

(3) Process-oriented DTS in Holmes’s framework is concerned with the psychology of translation, i.e. it is concerned with trying to find out what happens in the mind of a translator. Work from a cognitive perspective includes think-aloud protocols (where recordings are made of translators’ verbalization of the translation process as they translate). More recent research using new technologies such as eye-tracking shows how this area is now being more systematically analysed (see section 4.4).

The results of DTS research can be fed into the theoretical branch to evolve either a general theory of translation or, more likely, partial theories of translation ‘restricted’ according to the subdivisions in Figure 1.1.

- **Medium-restricted theories** subdivide according to translation by machine and humans, with further subdivisions according to whether the machine/computer is working alone (automatic machine translation) or as an aid to the human translator (computer-assisted translation), to whether the human translation is written or spoken and to whether spoken translation (interpreting) is consecutive or simultaneous.

- **Area-restricted theories** are restricted to specific languages or groups of languages and/or cultures. Holmes notes that language-restricted theories (e.g. for the Japanese<>English pair) are closely related to work in contrastive linguistics and stylistics.

- **Rank-restricted theories** are linguistic theories that have been restricted to a level of (normally) the word or sentence. At the time Holmes was writing, there was already a trend towards text linguistics, i.e. analysis at the level of the text, which has since become far more popular (see Chapters 5 and 6 of this book).
Text-type restricted theories look at discourse types and genres; e.g. literary, business and technical translation. Text-type approaches came to prominence with the work of Reiss and Vermeer, among others, in the 1970s (see Chapter 5).

The term time-restricted is self-explanatory, referring to theories and translations limited according to specific time frames and periods. The history of translation falls into this category.

Problem-restricted theories may refer to certain problems such as equivalence (a key issue that came to the fore in the 1960s and 1970s) or to a wider question of whether so-called ‘universals’ of translation exist.

Despite this categorization, Holmes himself is at pains to point out that several different restrictions may apply at any one time. Thus, the study of the prefaces to the new English translations of novels by Marcel Proust, analysed in Chapter 2, would be area restricted (translation from Parisian French into English), text-type restricted (prefaces to a novel) and time restricted (1981 to 2003).

The ‘applied’ branch of Holmes’s framework concerns applications to the practice of translation:

- **translator training:** teaching methods, testing techniques, curriculum design;
- **translation aids:** such as dictionaries and grammars;
- **translation criticism:** the evaluation of translations, including the marking of student translations and the reviews of published translations.

Another area Holmes mentions is translation policy, where he sees the translation scholar advising on the place of translation in society. This should include what place, if any, it should occupy in the language teaching and learning curriculum.

There are drawbacks to the structure. The divisions in the ‘map’ as a whole are in many ways artificial, and Holmes himself points out that the theoretical, descriptive and applied areas do influence one another. The main merit of the divisions is, as Toury states (1991: 180; 2012: 93), that they allow a clarification and a division of labour between the various areas of translation studies which, in the past, have often been confused. The divisions are still flexible enough to incorporate developments such as the technological advances of recent years (see Chapter 11).

Even a cursory glance at Figure 1.1 shows the applied side to be underdeveloped. However, it is not difficult to expand it, as in Figure 1.2:
While the general categories have been retained, we have filled in the detail, particularly for translation aids with the explosion in the use of computer-assisted translation tools (CAT tools) and in automatic online translation.

Although it may have dated, the crucial role played by Holmes’s paper is in the delineation of the potential of translation studies. The map is still often employed as a point of departure, even if subsequent theoretical discussions have attempted to rewrite parts of it (e.g. Pym 1998, Hatim and Munday 2004, Snell-Hornby 2006, van Doorslaer 2007, see below). Also, present-day research has transformed the 1972 perspective. The fact that Holmes devoted two-thirds of his attention to the ‘pure’ aspects of theory and description surely indicates his research interests rather than a lack of possibilities for the applied side. ‘Translation policy’ is nowadays far more likely to be related to the ideology, including language policy and hegemony, that determines translation than was the case in Holmes’s description. The different restrictions, which Toury identifies as relating to the descriptive as well as the purely theoretical branch in the discontinuous vertical lines in Figure 1.1, might well include a discourse-type as well as a text-type restriction. Inclusion of interpreting as a sub-category of human translation would also be disputed by many scholars. In view of the very different requirements and activities associated with interpreting, and despite inevitable points of overlap, it would probably be best to consider interpreting as a parallel field or ‘sub-discipline’, under the title of ‘interpreting studies’ (see Pöchhacker 2004, 2009). Audiovisual translation (see Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007) and sign language interpreting might claim similar status.

Additionally, as Pym points out (1998: 4), Holmes’s map omits any mention of the individuality of the style, decision-making and working practices of human translators.
involved in the translation process. Yet it was precisely the split between theory and practice that Holmes, himself both a literary translator and a researcher, sought to overcome.

1.3 Exploration: Location in the Holmes/Toury map

Look at a recent issue of widely available online journals such as *Meta* and *JosTrans* (and, where possible, *Target, The Translator* and other journals). Try and locate each article within the Holmes/Toury ‘map’ (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). How easy is it to do so? Where would you locate your own work or studies in this schema?

1.5 Developments since Holmes

The surge in translation studies since Holmes has seen different areas of the map come to the fore. **Contrastive linguistics** generally fell by the wayside, but has resurfaced thanks to the advances in **machine translation** and **corpus-based studies** (see Chapter 11). The linguistics-oriented ‘science’ of translation has continued strongly in Germany, but the concept of **equivalence** associated with it has been questioned and reconceived (see Chapter 3). Germany has seen the rise of theories centred around **text types** and text **purpose** (the skopos theory of Reiss and Vermeer, see Chapter 5). The Hallidayan influence of **discourse analysis** and systemic functional grammar, which views language as a communicative act in a sociocultural context, came to prominence in the early 1990s, especially in Australia and the UK. It was applied to translation in a series of works by scholars such as Bell (1991), Baker (1992/2011), Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997), Calzada Pérez (2007), Munday (2008, 2012) (see Chapter 6). The late 1970s and the 1980s also saw the rise of a **descriptive approach** that had its origins in comparative literature and Russian Formalism (see Chapter 7). A pioneering centre was Tel Aviv, where Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury pursued the idea of the literary **polysystem** in which, among other things, different literatures and genres, including translated and non-translated works, compete for dominance. The polysystemists worked with a Belgium-based group including José Lambert and the late André Lefevere (who subsequently moved to the University of Austin, Texas), and with the UK-based scholars Susan Bassnett and Theo Hermans. A key volume was the collection of essays edited by Hermans, *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (Hermans 1985a), which gave rise to the name of the
‘Manipulation School’. Bassnett and Lefevere’s volume *Translation, History and Culture* (1990) then introduced the term ‘cultural turn’. This dynamic, culturally oriented approach held sway for much of the following decade (Chapter 8).

The 1990s saw the incorporation of new approaches and concepts: Canadian-based translation and gender research led by Sherry Simon, the Brazilian Cannibalist School promoted by Else Vieira, and postcolonial translation theory with the prominent figures of the Bengali scholars Tejaswini Niranjana and Gayatri Spivak (Chapter 8). In the USA, the cultural studies-oriented analysis of Lawrence Venuti called for greater visibility and recognition of the translator (Chapter 9). Developments continued at an ever-increasing pace in the new millennium, with special interest devoted to, for example, translation, globalization and resistance (Cronin 2003, Baker 2006, Boeri and Maier 2010, Marais 2014), the sociology and historiography of translation (e.g. Inghilleri 2005a, Wolf and Fukari 2007, Rundle 2014, Vorderobermeier 2014) and process-oriented research (e.g. O’Brien 2011). Research activity, as well as the practice of translation, has also been revolutionized by new technologies. These new areas include machine and automatic translation, audiovisual and multimodal translation, localization and corpus-based translation studies (see Chapter 11). Furthermore, the international reach of the discipline has expanded enormously with research and training in Asia (e.g. Chan 2004, Cheung 2006, 2009, Sato-Rossberg and Wakabayashi 2012) and the Arab world (Selim 2009) in particular.

1.6 The van Doorslaer ‘map’

In order to deal with such a breadth of work, a new conceptual tool was developed for the Benjamins *Translation Studies Bibliography*, as explained by van Doorslaer (2007). In the new maps, a distinction is drawn between ‘translation’ and ‘translation studies’, reflecting the different centres of interest of research.9 ‘Translation’ looks at the act of translating and, in the new map (van Doorslaer 2007: 223), is subdivided into:

- lingual mode (interlingual, intralingual);
- media (printed, audiovisual, electronic);
- mode (covert/overt translation, direct/indirect translation, mother tongue/other tongue translation, pseudo-translation, retranslation, self-translation, sight translation, etc.);
- field (political, journalistic, technical, literary, religious, scientific, commercial).
Translation studies (ibid.: 228–31) is subdivided into:

- approaches (e.g. cultural approach, linguistic approach);
- theories (e.g. general translation theory, polysystem theory);
- research methods (e.g. descriptive, empirical);
- applied translation studies (criticism, didactics, institutional environment).

Alongside these is a ‘basic transfer map’ (ibid.: 226) of terminology to describe the linguistic manoeuvres that, despite the cultural turn, remain central to the concrete translating process. This consists of strategies, procedures/techniques, ‘errors’, rules/norms/conventions/laws/universals and translation tools. Figures 1.3 and 1.4 display the taxonomy of ‘strategies’ and ‘procedures’.

**Figure 1.3** Translation strategies (following van Doorslaer 2007: 226)
The distinction is an important one, even if it is sometimes blurred in the literature: a **strategy** is the overall orientation of a translated text (e.g. literal translation, see Chapter 2) while a **procedure** is a specific technique used at a given point in a text (e.g. borrowing, calque, see Chapter 4).

Linguistic transfer of course still occurs within a sociocultural and historical context and institutional environment that place their own constraints on the process.

### 1.7 Discipline, interdiscipline or multidiscipline?

A notable characteristic of recent research has been its **interdisciplinarity**. In the first edition of this book we ended with a discussion of translation studies as
a discipline, interdiscipline or sub-discipline, and saw the future in interdisciplinarity. We discussed the nature of interdisciplines, referring to Willard McCarty’s paper ‘Humanities computing as interdiscipline’ (1999), which gives the following description of the role of an interdiscipline in academic society:

A true interdiscipline is ... not easily understood, funded or managed in a world already divided along disciplinary lines, despite the standard pieties ... Rather it is an entity that exists in the interstices of the existing fields, dealing with some, many or all of them. It is the Phoenician trader among the settled nations. Its existence is enigmatic in such a world; the enigma challenges us to rethink how we organise and institutionalise knowledge.

(McCarty 1999)

An interdiscipline therefore challenges the current conventional way of thinking by promoting and responding to new links between different types of knowledge and technologies. Viewing the hierarchy of disciplines as a systemic order, McCarty sees the ‘conventional’ disciplines having either a ‘primary’ or a ‘secondary’ relationship to a new interdiscipline. For us, translation studies would itself be the Phoenician trader among longer-established disciplines. It has the potential for a primary relationship with disciplines such as:

- linguistics (especially semantics, pragmatics, applied and contrastive linguistics, cognitive linguistics);
- modern languages and language studies;
- comparative literature;
- cultural studies (including gender studies and postcolonial studies);
- philosophy (of language and meaning, including hermeneutics and deconstruction and ethics);

and, in recent years, with sociology, history and creative writing. Some current projects are also multidisciplinary, involving the participation of researchers from various disciplines, including translation studies.

It is important to point out that the relationship of translation studies to other disciplines is not fixed. This explains the changes over the years, from a strong link to contrastive linguistics in the 1960s to the present focus on more cultural studies perspectives and even the recent shift towards areas such as computing and multi-media. Other, secondary, relationships come to the fore when dealing with the area of applied translation studies, such as translator training. For instance, specialized translation courses should have an element of
instruction in the disciplines in which the trainees are planning to translate – such as law, politics, medicine, finance, science – as well as an ever-increasing input from information technology to cover computer-assisted translation.

While the discussion has continued on interdisciplinarity (e.g. Ferreira Duarte et al. 2006) and multidisciplinarity (House 2014), some, like Daniel Gile, have seen it as a threat:

[Partnerships established with other disciplines are almost always unbalanced: the status, power, financial means and actual research competence generally lie mostly with the partner discipline. Moreover, interdisciplinarity adds to the spread of paradigms and may, therefore, weaken further the status of [translation research] and [interpreting research] as autonomous disciplines.

(Gile 2004: 29)

It is also true that translation studies has in some places been colonized by language departments driven by the perceived attractiveness of academic teaching programmes centred on the practice of translation but harbouring their own academic prejudices. Ironically, this has also worsened the artificial gap between practice and theory. For example, research assessments in the UK (formal external audits and evaluations of individuals’ and departments’ research output) have valued academic articles higher than translations, even translations of whole books. This ignores the fact that the practice of translation is an invaluable, not to say essential, experience for the translation theorist and trainer.

Yet the most fascinating developments have been the continued emergence of new perspectives, each seeking to establish a new ‘paradigm’ in translation studies. This provoked debate, highlighted by Chesterman and Arrojo (2000) and pursued in subsequent issues of Target, as to what ‘shared ground’ there actually was in this potentially fragmenting subject area. The volume New Tendencies in Translation Studies (Aijmer and Alvstad 2005), deriving from a workshop at Göteborg University, Sweden in 2003, set out a concerted attempt to bring together and evaluate research methodologies. As the editors, with some understatement, pointed out in the introduction (ibid.: 1), there has been ‘a movement away from a prescriptive approach to translation to studying what translation actually looks like. Within this framework the choice of theory and methodology becomes important.’ Such choice is crucial and it depends on the goals of the research and the researchers. As we shall see as this book progresses, methodology has evolved and become more sophisticated (see Saldanha and O’Brien 2013). At the same time, there is considerable divergence on methodology, as
translation studies has moved from the study of words to text to sociocultural context to the working practices of the translators themselves. An illustration of the diversity of current research can be gauged by the 19 panels at the 5th IATIS conference held in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, in July 2015.

1.4 Exploration: Translator studies

Read the online article by Chesterman (2010) for a discussion of some developments in Holmes’ map. See also the bibliometric study by Zanettin et al. (2015), available through the ITS website, for a discussion of sub-fields in translation studies.

Even the object of study, therefore, has shifted over time, from translation as primarily connected to language teaching and learning to the study of the circumstances in which translation and translators operate.

Summary

Translation studies is an academic research area that has expanded massively over the years. Translation was formerly studied as a language-learning methodology or as part of comparative literature, translation ‘workshops’ and contrastive linguistics courses. The discipline as we now know it owes much to the work of James S. Holmes, who proposed both a name and a structure for the field, but the context has now advanced. The interrelated branches of theoretical, descriptive and applied translation studies initially structured research. Over time the interdisciplinarity and specialization of the subject have become more evident and theories and models have continued to be imported from other disciplines but also forged from within translation studies itself.

Discussion and research points

1. Investigate the use of other translation-related terms, such as ‘adaptation’, ‘version’ and ‘transcreation’. In what contexts are they used? How easy is it to define these terms? In the light of your findings, try to write a definition of ‘translation’.
2 Investigate how research-based translation studies fits into the university system in your country. How many universities offer ‘translation studies’ (or similar) MA or doctoral programmes? In which university departments/faculties are they housed? What are the ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ relationships to other disciplines? What do you conclude is the status of translation studies in your country?

3 As you read each of the following chapters, try and locate each topic or concept within the Holmes/Toury ‘map’ (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). Carry out the same exercise with the van Doorslaer schema and compare the results.

The ITS website at www.routledge.com/cw/munday contains:

- a video summary of the chapter;
- a recap multiple-choice test;
- customizable PowerPoint slides;
- further reading links and extra journal articles;
- more research project questions.
Key concepts

- The new media have transformed translation practice and caused theory to revisit and embrace new concepts.
- Audiovisual translation studies, especially subtitling but embracing all forms of multimodality, has become a sub-branch of translation studies.
- The concepts of ‘vulnerable translation’ and ‘transcreation’.
- Localization and globalization: modern translation practice and environment alter notions of equivalence and of power.
- New technologies: the complex interaction between machine and translator.
- Corpus-based, and corpus-driven, translation studies: a means of investigating translated language.

Key texts


11.0 Introduction

Watch the introductory video on the companion website.

The emergence and proliferation of new technologies have transformed translation practice, as will be evident from some of the translation examples that feature throughout this fourth edition. Additionally, new technologies are exerting an impact on the theorization of translation. This chapter briefly looks at three examples: (11.1) audiovisual translation studies, (11.2) localization and globalization and (11.3) corpus-based translation studies.

11.1 Audiovisual translation

11.1.1 Early days: the ‘virgin area of research’

Very dramatic developments in translation studies have occurred in the field of audiovisual translation, most notably subtitling. Initially audiovisual translation was more or less overlooked by translation theory. Katharina Reiss (1971/2000; see section 5.1, this volume) had included what she termed an ‘audio-medial’ text type, but this was not developed and indeed her definition seemed to refer more to fields such as advertising rather than film and documentary translation. In James
S. Holmes’s ‘map’ (Chapter 1) there is a category of ‘medium-restricted’ theories but no specific mention of audiovisual at all. Later, Snell-Hornby (1988/1995) links ‘film’ to ‘literary translation’ in her integrated theory (see Figure 5.2).

Early articles by Titford (1982) and Mayoral et al. (1988) coined the term ‘constrained translation’, focusing on the non-verbal elements that marked out audiovisual translation. Notwithstanding these publications, and despite a lengthy bibliography, Dirk Delabastita was justified in saying that the field was ‘still a virgin area of research’ at the time of his groundbreaking article ‘Translation and mass-communication: Film and TV translation as evidence of cultural dynamics’ (1989: 202). That article sought to identify some of the important characteristics of this type of translation, namely that ‘film establishes a multi-channel and multi-code type of communication’ (ibid.: 196). These codes include what Delabastita describes as:

- the verbal (with various stylistic and dialectal features)
- the literary and theatrical (plot, dialogue, etc., appropriate to the genre)
- the proxemic and kinetic (relating to a wide range of non-verbal behaviour)
- the cinematic (camera techniques, film genres and so on).

Delabastita avoids any simplistic verbal–non-verbal distinction by emphasizing that the visual channel sometimes conveys verbal signs (e.g. credits, letters, shop signs) and that the acoustic channel transmits some non-verbal signs (music, background noise, etc.). He maps this against five types of operative realizations drawn from Classical rhetoric (repetition, addition, reduction, transmutation and substitution) to give a large number of possible translation procedures (ibid.: 199–200).

It is noteworthy that Delabastita constantly compares film translation to other forms of translation, such as theatrical performance. In his view, the major difference is that, whereas drama is constituted slightly differently on each occasion it is performed, film is recorded and ‘is perfectly producible in material terms’. That is, once recorded, the film is distributed and replayed to and by different audiences but, except on rare occasions, it remains unaltered.1 There are also very particular constraints that normally govern the subtitling of film, namely the co-existence of the sound channel and the vision channel, which restrict the procedures open to the translator. One example from the theatre is Shakespeare’s Othello (ibid.: 198). In place of a handkerchief in the ST, a material token of love which comes to symbolize infidelity, some French translators have given Desdemona a crucifix. In film, such a change would be impossible because the image cannot be altered and because of the requirement not to contradict the image.
Delabastita’s article attempts to deal with both subtitling and dubbing but is ‘only a first step towards the development of a competence model’ (ibid.: 201) for this kind of translation. Importantly, Delabastita, based in Belgium (where dual subtitles – in Dutch and French – are common), was working from within a norm-based descriptive framework (see Chapter 7) that encompassed not only linguistic phenomena but also the sociocultural and historical environment. Delabastita raises another question that pertains to the status of the practice and theory and is reminiscent of discussions at the infancy of translation studies: the name for the phenomenon and whether it could really be classed as ‘translation’ rather than ‘adaptation’ (compare Chapter 1).

11.1.2 The name and nature of the field

Delabastita’s article in many ways marked much early research into this medium. Certainly, the discussion of the name for the field and its relation to the umbrella term ‘translation studies’ has received much attention. Rather than ‘film translation’, Luyken et al. (1991) speak of ‘audiovisual language transfer’. Meanwhile, Gottlieb (1994) describes interlingual subtitling as a form of ‘diagonal translation’: not only is the SL rendered as a TL but speech is rendered by written text, in contrast to the more conventional ‘horizontal’ transfer that occurs in interpreting (speech by speech) and in interlingual translation (written text by written text). Relating this to Roman Jakobson’s types of translation (see section 1.1), Gottlieb considers subtitling to be ‘intrasemiotic’:

it operates within the confines of the film and TV media, and stays within the code of verbal language. The subtitler does not even alter the original; he or she adds an element, but does not delete anything from the audiovisual whole.

(Gottlieb 1994: 105)

Gambier (2003), in his introduction to a special issue of The Translator devoted to the subject, discusses the competing terms ‘audiovisual translation’, ‘screen translation’ and ‘multimedia translation’. Each has a slightly different bias, in part due to the rapid development of the technology that has seen subtitling, for instance, move from film to documentary to news to entertainment, from video to DVD to video games, from cinema to opera to
INTRODUCING TRANSLATION STUDIES

Although Gambier himself proposed the term ‘transadaptation’ (‘tradaptation’ in French, see Gambier 2004), within a few years Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 11–12) were concluding that ‘[the term] audiovisual translation (AVT) was fast becoming the standard referent’.

However, Gambier’s article was timely because of its identification of the different types of audiovisual activity and the way in which these were causing a rethink of older, translation-based categories. Thus, among others, there is:

- **interlingual subtitling**, now in various forms for the cinema and video (where the subtitles are ‘open’, meaning that they are an integral part of the version of the film), and DVD (where they may be ‘closed’, meaning that the viewer can select whether to see them or not and in which language);
- **bilingual subtitling**, in countries such as Belgium, where subtitles are provided simultaneously in two languages;
- **intralingual subtitling** for the hard of hearing, increasingly a regulatory requirement;
- **dubbing**, which covers ‘lip-synchronization’ or ‘lip-sync’, where the SL voice-track is replaced by a TL voice-track;
- **voice-over**, used mainly for documentary or interview;
- **surtitling**, subtitles which are projected above the stage or on the seatbacks at the opera or theatre;
- **audio description**, a mainly intralingual audio commentary on the action on the stage or film, etc., for the visually impaired.

11.1 Exploration: Types of AVT

Read the extract of Chapter 1 of Luis Pérez-González’s *Audiovisual Translation* (2014), available through the ITS companion website. Map Gambier’s types onto Pérez-González’s three ‘transfer methods’ of AVT: subtitling, revoicing and assistive. Which additional types does Pérez-González include? Try to find an example of each type.

AVT is a vast area and has grown rapidly in both teaching and research terms. To date, the bulk of the work has been carried out on interlingual subtitling and on the linguistic translation strategies and technical requirements and
constraints. Linde and Kay (1999: 3) note the differences between interlingual subtitling and written translation, notably the space and time constraints (normally a maximum of two lines of text each of a maximum of around 38 Roman characters or 13–15 Chinese or Japanese characters, depending on the medium, and a duration of around six seconds for each caption) that lead to a necessary reduction in the number of words on the screen. They also emphasize the other obvious additional constraints of the image on the screen, which is normally inviolable, and the soundtrack in the source language, which is retained. The subtitler must therefore try to respect aspects of the cinematography such as camera cuts and match the duration of the subtitles to the rhythm of the dialogue. Note, however, that these constraints are altering: DVD subtitling is now typically more flexible and some films, notably the very successful Slumdog Millionaire (Danny Boyle, 2008), even play with the location of the English subtitles of the Hindi part of the soundtrack, placing them at different points on the screen. Others, such as Man On Fire (Tony Scott, 2004) and Day Watch (Timur Bekmambetov, 2007), flouted typographical conventions to convey the on-screen emotions.

11.1.3 The linguistic and prescriptivist nature of subtitling research

In their seminal study of subtitling, Díaz Cintas and Remael devote only a short chapter to semiotics but go into great detail about the intricate technical considerations and the stylistics and linguistics of the translation process. They sum up what they term ‘subtitling guidelines’ as follows:

Subtitling style will vary somewhat with genre, and customers will always have their say, but some subtitling guidelines are almost universal. Grammar and lexical items tend to be simplified and cleaned up, whereas interactional features and intonation are only maintained to some extent (e.g. through word order, rhetorical questions, occasional interjections, and incomplete sentences). In other words, not all the features of speech are lost, quite a few can be salvaged in writing, but rendering them all would lead to illegible and exceedingly long subtitles. [..] [S]ubtitling focuses on those items that are informationally most relevant.

(Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 63–4)
Although the above are classified as ‘guidelines’, they are what in Toury’s descriptive terms (see Chapter 7) would be ‘generalizations’. They are made from the authors’ own studies and experience, ‘almost universal’ features which, in another context, might go some way to determining descriptive ‘laws’ for audiovisual translation. Diaz Cintas and Remael are therefore drawing on a tradition of terminology and methodology from translation studies. This is also the case with the prominent ‘translation issues’ they note (ibid.: 184–236) which include ‘marked speech’ (style, register, dialect/sociolect/idiolect, taboo words), culture-bound references, songs and humour. As far as culture-specific references are concerned, Chiaro (2009: 154–65) gives many examples, including:

- institutions and systems (Supreme Court, Grand Jury);
- the school system of grades and assessments (First grade, baccalauréat, a degree);
- place names (DC, LA, Time Square);
- units of measurement (pounds, ounces, gallons);
- monetary system (dollars, pounds, rupis, yuan, yen);
- food and drink (pancakes, sushi, dahl);
- festivals (Halloween, Thanksgiving, Chinese New Year, Eid);
- nationally known names, personalities, pastimes (The Knicks, snakes and ladders).

In the case of marked speech, acceptability in oral and written production often varies. So, the appearance of a taboo term in a subtitle or piece of writing tends to have a stronger effect than hearing the same word.

Most of these are difficult translation problems in other genres and modes too, for example in translating the fictional dialogue of the Brontë sisters, D. H. Lawrence and John Steinbeck; also in drama scripts (see the discussion on Pirandello in Anderman 2005: 325–6) where the characters speak with a strong dialectal and/or sociolectal voice that has no equivalent in the TL and that can scarcely be indicated graphically. When attempts are made to replace a dialect, such as in La haine, where in places a semi-black American dialect replaces the non-standard French, it may attract criticism (Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 192; compare the contrasting standardization strategies in the film discussed in the case study in Chapter 6). There are also interesting divergences from the issues of traditional translation studies: punctuation, reduction and line breaks, for instance, feature very prominently (ibid.: 102–43, 145–71 and 172–80). These are rarely treated in such detail in other forms of translation.
11.1.4 Norms of audiovisual translation

Much has been written on the technical and linguistic aspects of subtitling, but less attention has so far been paid to the integration of subtitling and broader analytic models. Without such a move, audiovisual translation studies risks remaining the realm of a prescriptive, practice-based phenomenon rather than extending to embrace a theoretical branch of its own. This section will look at a sample of theoretical frameworks borrowed for the study of audiovisual translation and employed by Karamitroglou and Pedersen (norms), Taylor (transcription) and Chaume (codes).

Karamitroglou (2000) is an early study that draws on polysystem theory and the concept of norms to discuss dubbing and subtitling preferences in Greece. He emphasizes the need to consider the range of human agents involved in the process, as well as ‘the catalytic role of the audience’ and the importance of differentiating between different film types and genres (ibid.: 105). The list of the elements considered covers:

- the human agents;
- the products (TTs);
- the recipients (addressees and customers);
- the mode (characteristics of audiovisual translation);
- the institution (critics, distributors, TV channels, etc. which participate in the preparation and making of the film);
- the market (cinemas, film clubs, etc. which decide the screening of the TTs).

The human agents include the following: ‘spotters, time-coders, adapters, dubbing director, dubbing actors, sound technicians, video experts, proof-reading post-editors, translation commissioners, film distributors and finally the translator him/herself’ (ibid.: 71). Karamitroglou uses a questionnaire survey of the different professionals within the industry, a useful and wide-ranging ethnographic tool. However, the findings are rather restricted. More recently, Pedersen (2011) has carried out a detailed investigation of linguistic norms of subtitling for television using a corpus of 100 Anglophone films subtitled into Danish and Swedish in an attempt to circumvent the problem of individual case studies (compare the rationale for descriptive translation studies in Chapter 7). The model of analysis is centred on ‘extralinguistic cultural references (ECRs)’ (compare Díaz-Cintas’ and Remael’s ‘translation issues’ above) and the translation ‘strategies’ employed: retention, specification, direct translation, generalization, substitution, omission or the use of an official equivalent.
11.1.5 Multimodal transcription

In contrast to Karamitroglou’s macro-contextual research, Christopher Taylor (2003) tackles the key micro-contextual question of **multimodal transcription** – in other words, how to record and analyse a multimodal product in writing. Taylor borrows from Thibault’s (2000) model for the analysis of film and TV advertising, which consists of breaking down a film sequence into individual frames/shots/phases and then producing a multi-layered multi-columned description as in Table 11.1.

**Table 11.1** Multimodal transcription model (following Taylor 2003: 192–3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Shots</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of frame and order of presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the visual frames</strong></td>
<td><strong>Components of the visual image</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames numbered individually and duration indicated in seconds. Frames are selected according to the level required in the analysis</td>
<td>Still images from the source</td>
<td>‘Kinesic action’ of the characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogue and description of the soundtrack</strong></td>
<td><strong>Metafunctional interpretation of how the film creates meaning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera position, perspective, focus, distance, salient items, clothing, colours, etc.</td>
<td>Gestures, movements, etc.</td>
<td>Words uttered, tone, music, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational, interpersonal, textual, and visual grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11.2 Exploration: Extralinguistic cultural references

The sixth element (metafunctional interpretation) is taken from Hallidayan linguistics (ideational, interpersonal, textual meaning, cf. Chapter 6) and from Kress and van Leeuwen’s (1996/2006) visual grammar, which integrates the different semiotic modalities of visual texts. Taylor applies this form of transcription and analysis to a scene from Roberto Benigni’s La vita è bella (1999), among others. Taylor contends that the findings will be useful for a subtitler in ‘spotting’ where to best locate subtitles and in deciding on where to omit verbal elements. However, the form of transcription, unwieldy for long sections, is probably of most use for theoretical descriptive studies of subtitles. The finding that ‘the interpersonal component is extremely important and is carried largely by the voice prosodies and the kinesic action’ (Taylor 2003: 197) is an interesting illustration of the role of non-verbal material. At the same time it begs the question whether, in a multimodal age and copyright permitting, it will become increasingly the norm in such studies for analysis to be presented visually anyway, or at least in a combination of the visual and written. Hence Díaz Cintas and Remael’s decision to include a DVD of extracts to complement the discussion in their book.

11.3 Exploration: Multimodal transcription

Study Taylor’s article on the ITS website (Taylor 2003) and try out the model of transcription on a short extract (2–3 minutes) from a subtitled film. Note any difficulties in using the model (e.g. how and where to punctuate and how to represent spoken language). What evidence can you find in the subtitles to support or challenge the ‘guidelines’ suggested by Díaz Cintas and Remael above?

11.1.6 Codes and narratives

Frederic Chaume proposes a combination of translation studies and film studies in an attempt to produce an ‘integrated’ model of analysis of ‘rules’ and norms designed for the analysis of ‘the signifying codes of cinematographic language’ (Chaume 2004: 13, 16). Focussing mainly on dubbing, Chaume identifies ten such codes (ibid.: 17–22). The first four concern the acoustic channel:

1. The linguistic code: Here Chaume (ibid.: 17) makes the crucial point that problems such as wordplay, co-presence of multiple languages,
culture-specific elements, etc. ‘are shared by other translation types (e.g. legal, scientific, technical, etc.) and should not be considered problems specific to audiovisual translation’. For him, the features of the linguistic code in audiovisual texts are that they are most often scripted but ‘written to be spoken as if not written’, which poses considerable demands on the translator to conform to a similar register.

(2) **The paralinguistic code:** The preparation of dubbing scripts would involve the addition of symbols to indicate laughter, pauses, and so on, while in subtitling graphical signs (upper case, exclamation marks, suspension marks, etc.) indicate voice level, tone and pauses.

(3) **The musical and special effects code:** The representation and adaptation of song lyrics and their function.

(4) **The sound arrangement code:** There are differences depending on whether the speaker is on or off screen. This will necessitate orthographic variation in subtitling (an off-screen character’s words may be indicated in italics) and will affect both the translation procedure and sound quality in dubbing (an on-screen speaker’s words will need to be lip-synchronized).

The other six codes relate to the visual channel:

(5) **The iconographic code:** Iconographic symbols unlikely to be recognized by the TT viewer (e.g. a picture or portrait of a figure famous in the SL culture but not in the TL culture) may need verbal explanation if it is important for the understanding of the text. Coherence with the image needs to be maintained. Similarly, any wordplay with reference to an item that appears on screen creates a specific problem. Like Delabastita above, Chaume (ibid.: 19) makes the point that audiovisual translation is distinct since the presence of the image on screen restricts the range of free translation that would be open to written translation.

(6) **Photographic codes:** Examples of the problems which arise are changes in lighting which necessitate a change of colour for subtitles and also the use of a culture-specific visual or colour feature which may confuse or be misunderstood by the TT audience. So, while in Asia white is often associated with death (for example, a white carnation in a Japanese film), in the west it is more commonly the colour black. On the other hand, a red carnation may be the symbol of love.

(7) **The planning code:** Relates to close-ups that require lip synchronization in dubbing and also the translation of important information on features that are not spoken (on posters, etc.).
The mobility code: Concerns the positioning of the characters in a dubbed scene and the need to co-ordinate movement and words (e.g. a shake of the head and a negative phrase in most cultures).

Graphic codes: The representation of intertitles, titles, text and subtitles that appear on screen in the ST. This is a particular problem for dubbing.

Syntactic codes: Involve editing principles, such as the checking of the association of a verbal textual element to the image and other semiotic forms and also the start and end of sequences.

Chaume’s codes are useful in drawing attention to the non-linguistic and particularly to the visual. Only one of the ten codes is linguistic, a huge departure from the norm in most translation studies work. The main focus is applied; that is, on a model that has pedagogical applications, for teaching the techniques to trainee subtitlers. However, in Chaume’s paper, and perhaps due to space limitations, there is little indication of precisely how these codes are realized on screen. As far as the linguistic code is concerned, there seems to be quite general agreement on the relatively restricted number of such issues in audiovisual translation (reduction, omission, register variation, humour, punctuation, etc., see Gambier 2003: 153). It is quite possible that future progress in descriptive studies will come from the exploration of the other codes and from taking up Jorge Díaz Cintas’s call for macro-level incorporation of those aspects of power, culture and ideology that for some time have been common in ‘mainstream’ translation studies (Díaz Cintas 2003: 32).

11.4 Exploration: Codes of cinematic language

Refer to the full version of Chaume’s paper online (http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2004/v/n1/009016ar.html). Look for examples from products that are dubbed or voice-overed or are accompanied by audio description to illustrate each of Chaume’s codes. You may find additional examples in Chaume’s book Audiovisual Translation: Dubbing (2012).

11.1.7 Subtitles as ‘vulnerable translation’

Gottlieb (1994) calls subtitling a form of House’s ‘overt translation’ (see Chapter 6) since the visibility of the title is an inherent part of the activity. And the physical
status of the medium is central because the TTs are ‘modifications of originals’ which retain the ‘nonverbal elements’ (Gottlieb 1997: 309). In fact, of course, they also retain the verbal elements of the ST, which makes them ‘a written, additive, synchronous type of translation of a fleeting, polysemiotic text type’ (ibid.: 312). This physical status provokes a paradoxical situation for the subtitler: on the one hand, the subtitles are visible to all, yet more often than not the individual translator is not credited with his/her work and remains in a state of ‘forced invisibility’ (Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 40). The co-existence of ST soundtrack and TT subtitles creates another tension, which is described by the concept of ‘vulnerable translation’: ‘Not only must subtitles respect space and time constraints, they must also stand up to the scrutiny of an audience that may have some knowledge of the original language’ (ibid.: 57). In other words, a viewer with some understanding of the ST will have an expectation of the subtitles which, when disappointed (e.g. if there is an omission, or reduction), may cast doubt on the quality of those titles. This vulnerability is less often present in other forms of translation and represents an additional pressure for the subtitler.

11.1.8 Fansubs and video games, a site for transcreation

The rapid development of technology has had important knock-on effects for audiovisual translation practice as well as bringing new challenges for translation studies. New forms of translation are being created, two of which are fansubs and video games. **Fansubs** (Díaz Cintas and Muñoz Sánchez 2006) is the (legally rather dubious) practice of amateur subtitling and distribution of films, TV series and other film extracts online. It was originally used for the translation of mainly Japanese *manga* and *anime* cartoons and the practice has now proliferated thanks to the greater access to free subtitling software such as Subtitle Workshop, Jubler or OpenSubtitle Editor. Díaz Cintas (2005) points to the peculiar characteristics of the addition of glosses and metalinguistic information in the titles and the fact that little work has thus far been done in this area. The practice of amateur translation is not confined to subbing – the Harry Potter series appeared in unauthorized written translation in several languages including German, where a collective team of fans translated the fifth volume in less than forty-eight hours. A French translation led to the amateur translator being arrested for alleged breach of copyright.²

**Video game translation** is a blend of audiovisual translation and software localization. Indeed, Mangiron and O’Hagan (2006: 11) call this type of activity
'game localization' since the games may be subtitled or dubbed or both. The important defining feature is the 'creativity and originality' that is demanded of the translator in order to ensure that the game is entertaining (ibid.: 13). Such creativity includes the renaming of elements and characters, using neologisms, and the deliberate choice of non-standard dialects. Commenting on the American version of the game *Final Fantasy*, Mangiron and O’Hagan (ibid.: 17) give the example of the weapon *fūrinkazan* (comprising the Chinese characters for ‘wind, forest, fire and mountain’) that, due to space constraints and genre conventions, is translated by the more concise *Conqueror*; for humorous (and, we might say, stereotypical) effect, a Cockney London accent is also added to the speech of the merchant O’aka, even though he speaks with a standard accent in Japanese.

Bernal Merino (2006: 32–3) discusses the term *transcreation* ‘used by a new wave of companies seeking to distance themselves from traditional translation firms’. Originally, this term was employed by the Indian translator and academic P. Lal (1964) for his domesticating English translations of Sanskrit plays (see also Holmstrom 2006) and later used by the Brazilian writer Haroldo de Campos and the Brazilian postcolonial theorist Else Vieira (1999) (see section 10.2). Transcreation is contrasted to other terms such as ‘domestication’, ‘localisation’ and ‘skopos’. So, while ‘transcreation’ is used to stress the creative and transformative nature of the process, ‘the skopos of game localisation is to produce a target version that keeps the “look and feel” of the original, yet passing itself off as the original’ (Mangiron and O’Hagan 2006: 20). Here, the creativity behind the new term ‘transcreation’ is combined with the description ‘look and feel’, which comes straight from the discourse of localization and translation.

### 11.5 Exploration: Transcreation

Investigate the use of the term ‘transcreation’ by commercial companies on their websites. What definitions do they give? Which genres or text-types does it cover? How do the companies differentiate themselves from more traditional translation companies?

### 11.2 Localization, globalization and collaborative translation

In the digital age, translation has become big business and in industry (especially the software industry) the term is often subsumed into the acronym *GILT*
Globalization (g11n) in this context normally means the organization of business processes (management, marketing, consumer care) to support internationalization and localization.

Internationalization (i18n) refers to the development stages of a digital product to ensure that it will function internationally.

Localization (L10n) refers to the adaptation of the product to the target locale, ‘the combination of a sociocultural region and a language in industrial setting’ (Jiménez-Crespo 2013: 12). Localization may involve the substitution of inappropriate cultural symbols and the translation of text, including the need to fit specific space constraints on the screen/page, etc. Dunne (2006: 2) makes the important point that localization is a ‘focal point in the corporate matrix’, an intersection of development and authoring (as above), sales, marketing (promotional materials may need to be redesigned), legal advice (to comply with local legislation) and management (concerned to restrict costs).

The difference between localization and translation is blurred (Mazur 2007, Jiménez-Crespo 2013: 11), but generally localization is seen by industry as a superordinate term that encompasses translation. Thus, in the words of LISA, the Localisation Industry Standards Association, operational from 1990 to 2011, ‘localization involves taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold’.

In this instance, it is industry that has been active in supplying theory with new conceptual terms such as ‘localization’ and ‘locale’, although in practice it has sometimes relegated ‘translation’ to the linguistic replacement of small, decontextualized chunks of language (Jiménez-Crespo ibid.: 52–3).

11.6 Exploration: Localization and translation

There is a growing number of publications explaining the mechanistic, day-to-day operation of new technologies in this new environment (starting with Esselink 2000, Austermühl 2001, and O’Hagan and Ashworth 2002; more recently Dunne and Dunne 2011 as well as Jiménez-Crespo 2013). Hartley (2009: 117–24) provides a useful summary of core concepts of both computer-assisted translation (CAT) and machine translation (MT) tools.

- **Computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools** used by professional translators encompass tools for the alignment of ST–TT pairs, concordancing of search terms and term extraction. In particular, translation memory tools allow the creation of databases of previous translations. These are used to indicate matches with items in the text on which the translator is working. This increases work speeds and facilitates consistency in the translation of a given term in different texts by different translators.

- **Machine translation (MT) tools** generate automatic translations. These are largely used for assimilation (Hartley 2009: 121), that is for comprehension. Among the most widely known are the free online translators such as Bing translator (https://www.bing.com/translator/), Google Translate (https://translate.google.com/) and Systran (http://www.systransoft.com/). However, Hartley (ibid.) points out that MT is increasingly used for dissemination, for example by the European Commission in order to provide a draft first translation of documents which are then post-edited by a human translator or editor.

The same technologies have also spawned innovative theoretical work that discusses what these changes mean for the translator and for our conceptualization of translation. Anthony Pym’s *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution* (2004) is a major contribution to the theoretical discussion. It revisits common issues of translation within this new context. For example, a translation theory perspective is applied to *internationalization*, which leads to the adaptation of accepted communication models. Thus, the production of multiple TL versions (e.g. software localized for distribution worldwide in the local languages) modifies the ‘simple’ model of ST–TT transfer. An internationalized, *interlingua* version (a term taken from machine translation) is used as a basis for producing the versions for the TL locale. It is this interlingua version which is constantly updated, so that the status and role of the initial ST disappears (Pym 2004: 34–5, drawing on Lambert 1989). In internationalization, instead of representing a measure of TT against its ST, equivalence is above all concerned with
the **functionality** of the target text. Pym identifies the differentiating features of this new industrial phenomenon as being complexity and size of environment:

> Perhaps the most obvious of these differences is that of size. Internationalization, indeed the whole discourse of localization, is traditionally concerned with narrow professional locales. Translational equivalence, on the other hand, is traditionally concerned with large-scale complex social entities [and] cannot help but engage in the complexity and overlaps of culture. (Pym 2004: 65)

The picture Pym paints of localization is one of a dehumanizing process focused on marketing locale rather than human cultures. Projects are conducted in teams of individuals who rarely see the larger picture and who are governed by deadlines, regulations and the market (ibid.: 198). In addition, a more recent phenomenon which needs to be taken into account is that of **collaborative translation** (in some cases also known as **crowdsourcing**) often among large groups of non-professional translators. Outstanding examples include the translation (or localization) of Facebook or Wikipedia. But such practices raise ethical questions of quality, fair pay and status – can or should a competent translation be attempted without payment and without the employment of professionals?

In Europe, the centre of the localization industry for many years has been Ireland. It is thus not surprising, perhaps, that the major theoretical critique has come from that country, in the form of Michael Cronin’s *Translation and Globalization* (Cronin 2003) and *Translation in the Digital Age* (Cronin 2013). In a world increasingly dominated and revolutionized by information technology, Cronin investigates the concept of proximity of ‘networks of (translation) exchange’: so, while the ease of email and other communications may encourage translation agencies to prefer to contract translators in distant, lower-wage economies rather than the west, differentiated access to resources also means that translators in whatever country, however near, without access to such technology, are forever excluded from translation activity (Cronin 2003: 47). The technology of **globalization** has here come to redefine the role, relationship and status of translators. Not to be connected to the information superhighway is thus almost equivalent to not existing as a translator in the global economy.

The last chapter of the book revisits the issue of minority languages. Cronin discusses the fragile ‘linguistic ecosystem’, threatened by the major international languages but where he sees translation as having a positive as well as negative value. Cronin feels that translation theory is ‘a vital necessity’ for minority languages,
enabling them to understand translation policies and thereby counteract or manipulate them for their own benefit (ibid.: 149). He sets out a ‘translation ecology: a translation practice that gives control to speakers and translators of minority languages of what, when and ... how texts might be translated into and out of their languages’ (ibid.: 167). This presupposes an ‘activist dimension’ from translators, related to ‘the equally urgent task of getting societies and cultures to realize how important translation is to comparative self-understanding and future development’ (ibid.: 134). The task is urgent because translation is currently undervalued. This means, in monetary terms, that translators are underpaid and, in cultural and political terms, that translators and transnational policy-makers are ignorant of the historical context and importance of translation. This perhaps idealistic task would presumably be reliant on the translator’s broadened role as active transmitter. It would also answer a lingering and not completely rhetorical doubt that jumps out of the book: ‘Are translators, as incorrigible nomads who resist the confining lure of the local, not by definition sympathetic to the globalizing project?’ (ibid.: 54). However, more recent work on translator activist networks (e.g. Boéri and Maier 2010, Wolf 2012) has begun to challenge this, highlighting the role played by translators in fighting for equity and in raising awareness of the social responsibility of the translation profession.

11.3 Corpus-based translation studies

In 1998, the ‘corpus-based approach’, as it has become known, was being suggested as a ‘new paradigm in translation studies’ (Laviosa 1998a). The approach drew on the tools and techniques of monolingual (mainly English) corpus linguistics that had initially been developed in the early 1980s by John Sinclair (1933–2007) and his team working on the COBUILD English Dictionary project at Birmingham, UK (Sinclair 1987, 1991). The rapid evolution of computer systems meant that it was possible to create an electronic ‘corpus’ (plural ‘corpora’) of naturally occurring texts (texts which had been written for a real communicative context and not artificially invented by the language researcher) that could then be processed and analysed with software to investigate the use and patterns of the word-forms it contained. The major reason for using computer corpora was the quality of linguistic evidence, particularly on collocations and typical uses of lexical items, vastly superior to the analyst’s intuition (Sinclair 1991: 42). In translation studies, the corpus-based approach was pioneered in Oslo by the late Stig Johannson (1939–2010).
In a paper urging the use of computer corpora in translation studies research, the concept of typicality was considered by Baker (1993, 1995) to be related to the concepts of norms, laws and universals which Gideon Toury was working on (see Chapter 7). Baker’s focus was on identifying typicalities of the language of a corpus of translated texts which could then be compared to non-translated language. The differences could potentially reveal elements that were due to the process of translating and the norms at work. Possible characteristic features of translations suggested by Baker (1993: 244–5) were explicitation, grammatical standardization and an increased frequency of common words such as say. Similar hypotheses have been made in the pre-computational past. For example, Levý (1969: 108) noted that translations are often characterized by grammatically correct but artistically clichéd terms. Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983) suggested that lexical simplification is typical of translations, and Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995; see Chapter 4 in this volume) made many generalizations about the translation process, including the assertion that the TT is normally longer than the ST. It is with the advent of large computerized databases and readily available tools that these hypotheses could actually be tested on large amounts of text.

11.3.1 Different types of corpus

The papers in the special issue of Meta edited by Laviosa (1998b) were divided into those which discussed theoretical-methodological issues and those that used the new corpus-based tools for empirical research. In the years since that publication, and even with (or because of) the rapid development of technology and the much greater availability of electronic texts, these two issues have developed but are still not resolved into a generally accepted research methodology. This is in part because the methodology inevitably depends on the object of the research and because translation studies research normally has quite different goals from the original lexicographical projects for which the first corpora were developed. Perhaps the key question, though, is that of corpus type and design. Bernardini et al. (2003), in a volume on the use of corpora in translator training, briefly summarize corpus typology and the uses of each type, though admitting that ‘terminology in this area is not consistent’ (ibid.: 5). They discuss the following:

(1) **Monolingual corpora**: collections of texts in the same language. These may be analysed to identify characteristics of genre or author style or for the
use of specific word-forms. Translators may use them to check naturalness, including frequent collocation. It is important to add that large monolingual corpora, such as the British National Corpus and the COBUILD Bank of English, may serve as representative reference corpora, a yardstick of the language against which to measure deviation (see below).

(2) **Comparable bilingual corpora**, which are normally specialized collections of similar STs in the two languages and which can be ‘mined’ for terminology and other equivalences (cf. Bowker and Pearson 2002, Bowker 2011). Such corpora – for instance, of documents on solar panel technology written in German and English – might be constructed by a translator working on the translation of this domain in those languages.

(3) **Parallel corpora**, of ST–TT pairs, which, when aligned (sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph), can allow the strategies employed by the translator(s) to be investigated (cf. Kenny 2001, 2011). Examples are Linguee (http://www.linguee.com/), MyMemory (https://mymemory.translated.net/), OPUS (http://opus.lingfil.uu.se/) and the Canadian Hansard.

Importantly, Bernardini et al. (2003: 6) point out that ‘[w]hen used in conjunction with monolingual source and target corpora, a parallel corpus can also allow learners [or researchers] to compare features of texts produced under the constraint of translation with “original” texts in both languages’. That is, it is possible to identify salient lexical or grammatical features in TTs and then to see if such features are similarly salient in non-translated texts in the same language. Thus, Olohan and Baker (2000) examine the use of *that* in the Translational English Corpus (TEC) at the University of Manchester compared to its frequency in a reference corpus of original English, the fiction sub-corpus of the British National Corpus (BNC). Their tentative findings are that in the BNC the conjunction tends to be omitted more often when used with contractions (e.g. *I don’t think [that] she saw me*), possibly indicative of informal texts. On the other hand, in the TEC *that* occurs more frequently with contractions. The suggestion is that this may be a feature of translated language.

### 11.3.2 Other corpus-based and corpus–driven studies

Maeve Olohan’s *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies* (2004) provides an overview of this area of research and includes other case studies of syntactic and
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other features. Most of Olohan’s survey concerns the TEC corpus. That is, it looks at patterns in English TTs with little or no access to the STs. However, Olohan discusses commercially available software such as Wordsmith Tools (Scott 2012) and Paraconc (Barlow), to which we might add later software such as Antconc (http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/) and Sketch Engine (https://www.sketchengine.co.uk/), the latter founded by the late Adam Kilgarriff (1960–2015). These facilitate the analysis of researcher-constructed parallel corpora, for example, a ST–TT pair or series of pairs in electronic format, which have been downloaded or scanned, copyright permitting. The kinds of analysis this enables are both quantitative (comparing ST and TT statistics for word frequency, distribution, lexical density, sentence length, keywords, etc.) and qualitative (close analysis of concordance lines of individual instances). Figures 11.1 and 11.2 (Case study 1 below) show an example of the type of data that is generated by concordance lines in comparable monolingual corpora. By such methods, the corpus-based approach links with other methodologies and approaches. These are notably descriptive studies, which study the translation product or seek to identify typical features of translation.

The combination of rapid access to the ‘big picture’ of quantitative data, supported with close critical analysis of the texts in their sociocultural environment, comprises a complementary interdisciplinary methodology that reveals patterns that may otherwise pass unnoticed. Olohan attempts to link stylistic patterns in a text with the ideology of the translator or the environment by searching for informal contractions and keywords. However, the success of this approach is limited by the results the computer is able to generate and the justified interpretations it permits. Still, by contrasting the work of different translators and triangulating the findings against a reference corpus (the BNC), intuition as to the style of a text may be confirmed and hypotheses generated regarding translated language. This thus follows the path marked out by Baker (2000), who analyses the style of translators Peter Bush (from Spanish) and Peter Clark (from Arabic) using the frequency of the verb say as a marker of standardization and reduced lexical variation. Baker finds that Clark uses say twice as often as Bush, but this may be due to the high frequency of the Arabic ST qaal. This is the problem with Baker’s study. It claims to be developing a methodology for stylistic analysis, but there is little consideration at all of the SLs and STs. If we are to give any credence to Toury’s law of interference (Toury 1995/2012; see our Chapter 7), these must have some effect on the TT.

One of the most innovative projects in parallel corpora has been the English–Norwegian bidirectional parallel corpus initiated by Stig Johansson. However,
Johansson (2003) discusses the difficulties of collecting suitable texts for multilingual corpora, one problem being that far more is translated from English than in the other direction (cf. Venuti, Chapter 9). One suggestion which Johansson pursued is to commission multiple translations of the same literary text from professional translators in order to study variation. These are collected as the Oslo Multilingual Corpus. Such texts can also serve as training texts for apprentice translators and comparison with the professionals’ work may aid the improvement of decision-making strategies (ibid.: 140–1).

It is also noticeable that a good number of studies adopt a contrastive analysis approach, using the analysis of comparable corpora that may be genre specific. The collection edited by Granger and Petch-Tyson (2003) specifically promotes itself as a bringing together of corpus linguistics, translation studies and contrastive analysis, while work from Ian Williams (e.g. 2007) is based on a 500,000-word corpus of biomedical research articles comprising English SL texts, Spanish TTs and a comparable corpus of non-translated Spanish STs of the same genre. Such a corpus design enables identification of statistical deviations in the Spanish TTs (compared to the English STs) and also of deviations between Spanish STs and TTs. Williams examines the frequency and collocation of the Spanish lemma OBSERVAR (‘observe’). He finds (2007: 101) that OBSERVAR appears much more frequently in the Spanish TTs than the STs, and suggests that this shows ‘a more restricted lexical range and greater homogeneity of the translations in spite of TL norms’ (i.e. that Spanish TTs tend to show less variation than Spanish STs).

Although perhaps the most dramatic developments in this area are those that are producing practical results in the form of new statistical tools for the translator and for machine translation (see section 11.3.1 above), there is continued interest in the ways in which the corpora approach can assist translation theory. The volume Corpus-Based Translation Studies: Research and Applications (Kruger et al. 2011), for instance, examines a range of phenomena, including translation units, textual norms, terminographic practice and explicitation. Importantly, too, the inclusion of corpus-based interpreting studies (Setton 2011) shows the fluid methodological overlap between research into translation and interpreting. Zanettin (2012) explores the applications of corpora for descriptive studies systematically in his Translation-Driven Corpora, echoing the distinction made by Saldanha and O’Brien (2013: 61–2), following Tognini-Bonelli (2001), between the ‘corpus-based’ approach (which takes a pre-existing theory as its starting point) and ‘corpus-driven’ research (which builds up from corpus data towards patterns and generalizations).
11.7 Exploration: Corpora and translation studies

Read Federico Zanettin’s (2013) online article on corpus methods for descriptive translation studies. Make a note of the translation features analysed, the methods used and the ideal composition of the related corpora.

Case studies

We shall use examples of corpus-based translation studies and audiovisual translation as scenarios for a brief discussion of what they can bring to the theory and applications of translation studies, illustrated by reference to source material.

Case study discussion 1

The construction of new corpora is time-consuming and fraught with difficulties (investment in software and hardware, selection of texts, their preparation in a suitable format, revision of the texts to ensure deletion of unneeded tags, the insertion of tags to mark parts of speech or other features according to the purpose of the study, the interpretation of statistics, etc.). This is the reason that until recently there have been relatively few large-scale projects or even in-depth computer-assisted studies of translated books or authors. In addition, the results are sometimes treated with scepticism if they fail to relate to the sociocultural context of production and transmission. To some, the corpus-based approach smacks too much of the word- and text-restricted translation or may fit more closely into a contrastive analysis paradigm.

A project of mine (Munday 2011) on semantic prosody (see Stewart 2009) or association in Spanish and English looked at the dictionary equivalents (English) *loom large* and (Spanish) *cernerse* based on an analysis of examples from the Leeds Collection of Internet corpora and the Spanish Real Academia Corpus (see Figures 11.1 and 11.2).
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Figure 11.1 Concordance sample of *loom large*

One of the results showed that in Spanish the typical lexical and syntactic collocation of *cierrese* was *una amenaza que se cierne sobre* . . . ['a threat which hovers/looms over . . .']; in the English corpus this corresponded to a *gathering threat* or a *threat gathering* over . . . a different collocation and syntactic structure. Such findings are useful in gradually building up a contrastive picture of the languages that will then have applications for lexicographers and translators. It is not, however, the type of study that is in the mainstream of translation studies at present.

Case study discussion 2

Audiovisual translation has become more or less a separate branch within the field of translation studies. Yet the general absence of its own theoretical models is surprising. Its orientation has been above all prescriptive, describing and
deciding how and where the subtitles should appear and what are the best techniques for producing a successful product. Descriptive studies are now becoming more frequent, perhaps because of the popularity of the film medium and the ready availability of multiple ST–TT pairs on DVDs and downloads. Areas such as the translation of dialect and humour are flourishing (see Chiaro 2010).

However, many studies continue to limit themselves to the written word on the screen and its comparison to a researcher-produced transcription of the spoken dialogue, even though that is necessarily partial. A satisfactory theoretical treatment of the visual image, most plausibly incorporating techniques and metalanguage from film studies (cf. Chaume 2004), would seem to be paramount. One of the complications is that the visual image is hardly ever altered in the TT, so it is easier to focus on the written word. The other is that the translation studies theorist rarely has sufficient grounding in film theory. The same goes for postcolonial or cultural theory when dealing with what is often known as ‘world cinema’. Let us take as an example the acclaimed Bengali film Aparajito (Satyajit

![Figure 11.2 Concordance sample of se cierren](image-url)
Ray, 1956), the second in a trilogy shot in black-and-white, with music from Ravi Shankar. The film follows the life of a poor family by the Ganges, focusing particularly on the young son, Apu. It won the Golden Lion award in Venice in 1957, showing both the impact on and acceptance by an international audience.

The visual and aural impact of the film is particularly impressive but the most striking feature of the subtitling of the opening scenes is the number of borrowings in the dialogue. Thus, we have many food items that are italicized in the English: mung dal, mung, marou, khichree, paan masala, pedha. At times, several appear in the same subtitles, often with other culture-specific words:

Apu’s been asking for khichree since
he had some at the ghat the other day

where khichree is a dish of mung beans and rice and ghat refers to the steps leading down to the river for bathing. Occasionally, there is a mixture of explicitation and borrowing, such as:

A sweet made from milk [for ST dinche ladoo]
And a pedha as well

The explicitation may go unrecognized by most of the international audience. Yet the really interesting point to investigate would be the impact of these borrowings on the TT reception, the interaction between image and visual (how much of the sense can be gleaned from the picture?) and the positioning of the subtitler, viewer and subject through such choices. In particular, there are many culture-specific images and customs, mostly concerning the Hindu festival of Diwali, which are not explicated and which are conveyed by image alone. The in-depth analysis of this type of problem requires the associated expertise of theorists from film, postcolonialism and translation studies. A clearer example of the need for interdisciplinary collaboration would be hard to find.

**Summary**

This last chapter has examined three new scenarios for translation studies, each making use of or being determined by new technologies: audiovisual translation (section 11.1), localization and globalization (11.2) and corpus-based and corpus-driven approaches (11.3). Each has brought about a fundamental re-evaluation of
translation practice and theory. Thus, the corpus-based approach, perhaps still undervalued by some, enables the more thorough analysis and discovery of major features of translated language and is driving the development of automatic machine translation of various types; audiovisual translation is the site of many descriptive studies as well as of new creative practice; but it is localization and globalization that perhaps presents the major challenge to translators and is the most evident locus of contact between technology, translator identity and the postmodern world. These are also sites that require very specific expertise and training from the researcher, and ideally necessitate interdisciplinary co-operation to maximize the effectiveness of different specializations.

**Further reading**


**Discussion and research points**

1. Read the detailed analysis of audiovisual translation in Chiaro (2009). Investigate which forms of audiovisual translation (e.g. subtitling, dubbing, surtitling, voice-over, audio description, etc.) are used in your country. Which are most prominent, and for which text genres or modes of communication? Why?
2 Read Michal Borodo’s (2015) article on ‘Multimodality, translation and comics’, available on the companion website. Note the techniques employed for translating the visual image. Find an example of a translated graphic novel in your own languages. How far are similar techniques used?

3 How ‘vulnerable’ do you consider the subtitler really is? What other vulnerable translation contexts can you think of? To what extent does this fit with Anthony Pym’s (2008) view of translation as characterized by risk avoidance?

4 Look at the study by Karamitroglou and discuss how you would go about studying norms of audiovisual translation in these ways. Do you think that the results will be very different from those of more conventional written translation?

5 What answer would you give to Cronin’s question: ‘Are translators . . . not by definition sympathetic to the globalizing project?’ (Cronin 2003: 54). Read the papers in Boéri and Maier (2010) or Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva (2012) to see an activist view on the translator’s role.

6 Investigate what online corpus resources are available for your languages. What are the explicit objectives behind the creation of these corpora (e.g. language standardization, synchronic or diachronic analysis of language, contrastive analysis of languages, analysis of translation universals, etc.)?

The ITS website at www.routledge.com/cw/munday contains:

- a video summary of the chapter;
- a recap multiple-choice test;
- customizable PowerPoint slides;
- further reading links and extra journal articles;
- more research project questions.