MΕΤΑ

DAM, Helle Vrønning, BRØGGER, Matilde Nisbeth, and ZETHSEN, Karen Korning, eds. (2019): *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 237 p.

Jinxin Qi

See table of contents

Explore this journal

Cite this review

érudit

(p. 209). Whether this prognosis will be fulfilled or not remains uncertain for now, but there is no doubt that this volume brings forward reasons to believe in such a future scenario.

Javier Adrada
Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

NOTES

1. Ghosh, Amitav (2008): *Sea of Poppies*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
2. Vale de Gato, Margarida (Last update: 30 June 2019): *PEnPAL in Trans - Portuguese-English Platform for Anthologies of Literary Translation*. Centro de Estudos Anglísticos da Universidade de Lisboa. Consulted on 15 May 2020, <www.penpalintranslation.com>.
3. Highway, Tomson (1998/2004): *Champion et Ooneemeetoo*. (Translated from English by Robert Dickson) Sudbury: Prise de parole.
4. Highway, Tomson (1998/2008): *Kiss of the Fur Queen*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
5. El Hachmi, Najat (2008/2016): *El Último Patriarca*. (Translated from Catalan by Rosa María Prats) Barcelona: Planeta.
6. El Hachmi, Najat (2008): *L'Últim Patriarca* [The last patriarch]. Barcelona: Planeta.
7. *Coco* (2017): Directed by Unkrich, Lee. Walt Disney Pictures/Pixar Animation Studios. United States of America.

Dam, Helle Vrønning, Brøgger, Matilde Nisbeth, and Zethsen, Karen Korning, eds. (2019): *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 237 p.

Recent decades have witnessed a myriad of new approaches and concepts in translation studies. Some burgeoning activities like crowdsourcing, transediting and translanguaging, to name just a few, have gained momentum in translation studies. Concepts, like intralingual and intersemiotic translation, which are considered peripheral to translation studies have gained renewed focus. Translation studies is embracing ever-expanding boundaries. It is against this backdrop that this current volume is published. To recapitulate briefly, this book touches on the following two major trends in translation studies: the internal boundaries are blurring and the external boundaries are expanding.

Due to the upsurge of various translation activities, the internal boundaries of translation have blurred and have become fuzzy. Consequently, conceptual innovation should be prioritized. Chesterman (Chapter 1) suggests four ways for the creation of new categories and names. Platypus concepts are for the kind of new concept that is proposed when a new empirical phenomenon is confronted. Examples include *fansubbing* and *translanguaging*. Splitter concepts refer to focusing on differences and dividing related concepts into different entries. Professional vs. non-professional and literary vs. non-literary translation are typical splitter concepts in translation studies. Lumper concepts focus on similarities and tend to lump different concepts under a single entry. A case in point is the concept of *translation* itself. Rebranding concepts pertain to endowing an existing concept with a new term. A typical example is *localization* which illustrates how the notion of translation has been downgraded to a small corner of a rebranded larger practice, to highlight something presented as radically new. Chapter 3 focuses on the conceptual boundaries of interpreting. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of using any single criterion as a basis to define interpreting is well noted by the author. Thus, the author adopts the concentric-circle model of the conceptual territory of interpreting, with an *inner circle* representing established practices and *outer circle* phenomena that differ in some criteria and are therefore regarded as being less prototypical. Additionally, the *expanding circle* incorporates novel forms that have been driven by technology, such as *transpeaking*. Chapter 7 explores the fuzzy boundaries between professional and non-professional translation and interpreting. Traditionally, professional and non-professional translators and interpreters were regarded as disparate categories. However, incremental studies have been accounting for a range of mediation activities required in multifarious communicative contexts, irrespective of the question of professionalism. By looking beyond professional activities and approaching the miscellaneous phenomenon of translation and interpreting, translation studies is embracing new conceptual tools and new definitions for established frameworks. What's more, scholars can take cognizance of translation and interpreting activities in contemporary society by looking at the broader practice rather than through the narrow prism of professional practice all alone. Chapter 9 argues that the borders between literary and non-literary translation should be fuzzy and moveable. First, the binary distinction is detrimental because it presupposes an exclusive non-reciprocal relationship. Second, a negative suffix suggests lower status and less complexity. Thirdly, the disciplines on which literary and non-literary translation draw are themselves constantly changing. Fourthly, technological and professional developments have overtaken such a simplified view of the world of translation. Concepts such as adaptation, localization, and transcreation have been much discussed in recent years. Divergent opinions of these con-

cepts often exist between translation academia and industry. Chapter 12 attempts to turn the spotlight on the field of translation practice which has been criticized by scholars for introducing the above concepts that devalue the notion of translation. By drawing on data elicited in face-to-face interaction with the practitioners in the field, translators and translation project managers in particular, the chapter identifies some similarities and differences between translation practitioners' and scholars' understandings of what constitutes, on the one hand, the translation field and, on the other, a prototypical translation. In line with the view of translation scholars, translation as an umbrella concept is also disputed by practitioners. Which concepts lie within the translation category and are regarded as prototypical models are moot questions. The fuzzy boundaries between localization and adaptation as well as the overlap between localization and transcreation noticed by practitioners are also echoed by scholars. The practitioners' partial rejection of intralingual translation and full rejection of intersemiotic translation seem to be in contradistinction to scholarly endeavors to incorporate them into translation studies. Discrepancies notwithstanding, it is encouraging to note that so many discussions in the industry seem to have found their way to academia and vice versa, which indicates that more cross-border exchanges between industry and academia are needed. Whether translation studies should focus only on interlingual replacement or whether it might be better served by a broader concept that encompasses new extensions is propounded in Chapter 13. The dominant view on translation in other disciplines is that it is a language-based practice that designs methods for translation on a normative basis. It has recently been exploding due to the incremental use of translation technology. While academic research has tended to broaden the term, the outside world restricts it to an apparently simple practice. Confronted with this paradox, the discipline can stress the division between the scholarly research and practitioners' practices, by accepting that translation is only one of the many practices scholars study in the field of research. Consequently, a new and broader designation for the discipline can open up new perspectives in the long term. The author argues that "if it were not for the fact that popular discourses might associate it with transgender or transport, trans-studies could have covered many of the alternative terms for translation" (p. 229). The discussion of renaming translation studies, even tentatively, suggests a paradigm change in the discipline.

Translation boundaries have also been greatly expanded. As an invisible part of modern life in non-English speaking contexts, localiza-tion (Chapter 2) has contributed to expanding "the limits of translation studies and crossfertil-ise interdisciplinary connections" (p. 40). This definition crystallizes the necessary and sufficient conditions for interpreting, namely, human agent, bilingual competence, interlingual task, immediate performance, and faithful rendering. Arnt Lykke Jakobsen touches upon self-revision, other-revision, editing and post-editing in Chapter 4. The boundary between writing and (post-)editing has shifted due to freely available MT systems. Professional translation nowadays has less writing and less translation than editing and post-editing of text suggested by TM/MT systems. Our use of words is motivated by our will to "represent and convey the flux of our thoughts, emotions, and ideas, and so we keep on formulating, reformulat-ing, paraphrasing, and revising them to make our meaning shareable" (p. 77). What distinguishes human translators from computers is our ability to construct relevant meaning from the text or message. Sharon O'Brien and Owen Conlan argue that the traditional boundaries between TM and MT technology are blurring, which leads to the dif-ficulty in treating them disparately (Chapter 5). The translation profession has witnessed many changes in machine translation from translation memory, to data-driven statistical machine translation and, most recently, neural machine translation. The authors advocate that the concepts of personaliza-tion and adaptation can be deployed in e-com-merce and e-learning and the most important inputs: context, motivation, user modelling, trust, and well-being. Chapter 6 focuses on translation in virtual environments, translation blogs to be specific. By adopting social network analysis and the graph visualization and manipulation program Gephi to examine three translation blog networks, the study finds that not every blog network forms a community and the three blog networks do not seem very interconnected with each other. The study also demonstrates that translation blog networks are composed of diverse actors, including non-blogging translators, non-translators who blog about other topics and organizations such as SDL Trados. Furthermore, the findings suggest that blog networks are not restricted to the geographic regions in which a blogger is based. Chapter 8 adopts the term *ergonomics* to describe the natural laws of work, focusing on the people involved in a situated activity. It explores the survey results of two multilingual countries and reflects on how an ergonomic perspective can provide insights into the reality of professional translation as trans-lators cope with the translation of their work becoming increasingly machine-driven. Taking an ergonomic perspective can unearth translation-related issues and have practical implications.

For example, the basic aspects of a translator's working environment such as temperature, airflow, and noise levels should be taken seriously. Disturbances from emails, chats and phone calls should also be taken into consideration. This study demonstrates that an ergonomic perspective can provide a framework for conceptualizing research concerning the realities of the translation workplace. By investigating two examples of intralingual translation within the 19th-century Turkish literary context, Albachten (Chapter 10) finds that interlingual, intralingual translation, writing, summarizing, etc. were parts of text production in Turkish written with a different alphabet, and the boundaries between these strategies were not always clear-cut. Thus, translation scholars should be more circumspect in handling various text production strategies that were not necessarily labelled as *translation* according to present-day criteria. The author argues that various modes of intralingual translation are an integral part of translation history and should be incorporated into translation studies to expand the boundaries of the discipline and its research domain. Sara Laviosa (Chapter 11) expands the boundaries of pedagogic translation, an area of interdisciplinary enquiry that has recently attracted the interests of translation scholars and educationalists, by introducing the notion of translanguaging into translation studies. In order to address the issue as to what we can give to and take from the multilingual approach in educational linguistics, given our shared scholarly interests in translation and second language learning and teaching, the term *translanguaging* should be introduced in translation studies and become an object of study in its own right. The knowledge and expertise we have gained in the theory and practice of teacher-directed and student-directed translanguaging in bi/multilingual education would facilitate interdisciplinary cooperation incontrovertibly, which would enrich language and translation teaching in higher education.

With the advent of the information age, translation borders have been ineluctably expanded as well as blurred. This volume makes a laudable attempt to propound this trend in translation studies. It provides a quite comprehensive discussion on the expanded and blurred boundaries, catalyzed not only by some nascent translation activities, like localization and transediting (Chapter 2 and 4), but also some traditional activities, like pedagogy (Chapter 11) and literary translations (Chapter 9). The expanding boundaries of translation studies demonstrate that many scholars subscribe to a broad interpretation of some central concepts in translation studies, such as *transfer* or *language*. *Transfer* does not necessarily mean a close lin-guistic copy of the source text (Chapter 2 and 4). *Language* can mean the language of two dialects (Chapter 10) and two levels of formality (Chapter 7). Instead of focusing only on translation, as done by many other volumes on translation studies, this book also takes interpreting into consideration (Chapter 3 and 7). It also tries to bridge the gap between academia and industry (Chapter 12). What's striking about the volume is its inclusion of some translation activities which are regarded as "marginal" or "peripheral." Non-professional, non-literary translation, and intralingual translation, occupying an infinitesimal place in traditional translation studies, are elaborated in detail in the book. Scholars usually prioritized professional, literary, and interlingual translations to the detriment of the discipline. Researchers in this volume have been cognizant of the fact that translation studies will benefit from insights emanating from academic inquiries into prototypical as well as peripheral translation activities. Thus, this volume greatly expands our notions of translation.

Nonetheless, it should also be noted that the great expansion of translation boundaries should also be attributed to the nurturing of neighboring disciplines, such as sociology, philosophy, and historiography, to name just a few. Translation studies, which purports to be interdisciplinary, should not only look inwards but also outwards. Concepts and tools borrowed from other disciplines will provide brand-new prisms through which different insights can be gained. What's more, cultural factors should also be noted. Nowadays translation studies often adopts a postpositivist perspective that considers "parameters and features of translation that go far beyond the practices, products, and perspectives of a single culture" (Tymoczko 2014: 57). Lefevere once claimed that translations in China after Zhi Qian, a Buddhist scripture translator in ancient China, were done in the elegant style because "the translators realized that was the only style that would be taken seriously by the target audience of officials, literati, and intellectuals" (Lefevere 1998: 12). Although sometimes form was as important as content, or even more important, the form of translation "was to be a Chinese form, not a form that tried to carry across even a suggestion of the form of the original" (Lefevere 1998: 22). This historical example in China stands in contrast to the Western understanding of *faithfulness* to the form that pertains to the source text form. It is demonstrable that there is no universal definition of translation and it should be explored in different cultures across different times because "ideas and practices of translation in different cultures are not necessarily a replica of translation elsewhere, so Western models and theories of translation cannot simply be applied uncritically to other contexts"

(Hung and Wakabayashi 2014: 1). Therefore, the concept of *translation* should be examined cross-culturally, synchronically as well as diachronically.

Jinxin Qi
Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China

REFERENCES

Hung, Eva and Wakabayashi, Judy (2014): *Asian Translation Traditions*. London/New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, André (1998): Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation. *In*: Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, eds. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 12-24.

Tymoczko, Maria (2014): *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. London/New York: Routledge.

Martins, Marcia A. P. y Guerini, Andréia, eds. (2018): *Palavra de tradutor. Reflexões sobre tradução por tradutores brasileiros. The Translator's Word. Reflections on Translation by Brazilian Translators*. Florianópolis: Editora UFSC, 206 p.

Es bastante notable el auge adquirido en los últimos años por las antologías de textos teóricos y críticos concentrados en el hecho traductor. Para comprender esta circunstancia hay que acudir a razones de naturaleza historiográfica, pero también es preciso tener en cuenta el beneficio que tales aportaciones acostumbran a deparar desde un ángulo pedagógico[1]. En la actualidad, resulta factible identificar fundamentalmente dos tipos de obras elaboradas según esta concepción: por una parte, las que remiten al ámbito universal[2]; por otra, aquellas que se circunscriben a un marco cultural determinado[3].

De acuerdo con el segundo tipo, en lo que atañe concretamente a los territorios de expresión portuguesa, hay que citar, con respecto a Portugal, dos antologías forjadas poco menos que de modo simultáneo. En primer lugar, el compendio *Teoria diacrónica da tradução portuguesa. Antologia (Séc. XV-XX)* [Teoría diacrónica de la traducción portuguesa. Antología (Siglos XV-XX)] (1997), de Carlos Castilho País, con alrededor de sesenta textos desde 1437 hasta 1996. La segunda entrega es el repertorio *O Discurso sobre a Tradução em Portugal* [El discurso sobre la traducción en Portugal] (1998), de José Antonio Sabio Pinilla y M.ª Manuela Fernández Sánchez, con cincuenta documentos desde inicios del siglo XV hasta 1818. Editado en Portugal, si bien referido únicamente a Francia, debe hacerse alusión todavía al volumen *Tradutor Dilacerado. Reflexões de Autores Franceses Contemporâneos sobre Tradução* [Traductor lacerado.

Reflexiones de autores franceses contemporáneos sobre traducción] (1997), dispuesto por Guilhermina Jorge.

En el mundo de habla portuguesa, en lo que concierne al espacio brasileño, es indispensable traer a colación la serie de contribuciones alentadas por el denominado Núcleo de Tradução [Núcleo de Traducción], dependiente de la Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, con escritos pertenecientes a combinaciones lingüísticas específicas o a ciertos períodos históricos. La primera compilación fue preparada por Werner Heidermann, bajo el título *Antologia Bilíngüe. Clássicos da Teoria da Tradução I. Alemão-Português* [Antología bilingüe. Clásicos de la teoría de la traducción I. Alemán-portugués] (2001). Tras ella vinieron más: *Antologia Bilíngüe. Clássicos da Teoria da Tradução II. Francês-Português* [Antología bilingüe. Clásicos de la teoría de la traducción II. Francés-portugués] (2004), de Claudia Borges de Faveri y Marie-Hélène Catherine Torres; *Antologia Bilíngue. Clássicos da Teoria da Tradução III. Italiano-Português* [Antología bilingüe. Clásicos de la teoría de la traducción III. Italiano-portugués] (2005), de Andréia Guerini y Maria Teresa Arrigoni; y *Antologia Bilíngüe. Clássicos da Teoria da Tradução IV. Renascimento* [Antología bilingüe. Clásicos de la teoría de la traducción IV. Renacimiento] (2006), de Mauri Furlan[4].

Una vez expuesto el anterior panorama introductorio, pertinente como cuadro contextual, conviene poner de relieve que la nueva antología ante la que nos encontramos ha sido proyectada por Marcia A. P. Martins –docente en la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Río de Janeiro y coeditora de la publicación *Tradução em Revista*– y Andréia Guerini –adscrita a la Universidad Federal de Santa Catarina y responsable de la revista *Cadernos de Tradução*–, ambas con acreditada competencia. A nuestro juicio, la principal virtud que ofrece su tarea recopiladora estriba en que constituye una excelente novedad que presta un servicio indudable para ahondar en el saber historiográfico de la traducción en Brasil. En esencia, nos acerca el punto de vista de varias personas de dicho entorno que con contrastada experiencia traductora han meditado lúcidamente sobre su quehacer.

A este particular, no cabe dejar de apelar a la amplia tradición traductológica de Brasil. Verdaderamente, tal prodigalidad está fundada en la peculiar conformación del propio país americano, cuya identidad cultural multiforme se asienta en la incuestionable amalgama de muchas diversidades. Parece oportuno recordar, por otro lado, el número tan generoso de escritores brasileños de renombre a la vez traductores alógrafos. En un repaso de urgencia es de justicia evocar a Manuel Bandeira, por cuanto su tomo *Poemas Traduzidos* [Poemas