

## Translation and interpreting

Mona Baker & Luis Pérez-González

### Abstract

Increased globalization, growing mobility of people and commodities, and the spread and intensity of armed conflicts since the turn of the twenty-first century have established translation and interpreting more firmly in the public consciousness. Following a brief introduction and historical survey of translation and interpreting studies as a scholarly discipline, this chapter explores a range of issues that have interested both translation scholars and applied linguists in recent years. These include the contribution that translation and interpreting make to the delivery of institutional agendas in various settings; the negotiation of power differentials in a range of social settings; the role of translation in social movements and activist initiatives seeking to redress inequality; and the involvement of translators and interpreters as important political players in armed conflicts. The chapter then focuses on the role that translation and interpreting play in promoting cultural and linguistic diversity against the backdrop of the dominance of English as a lingua franca, examining the challenges posed by new multimodal genres arising from technological developments in digital culture. Future directions for the discipline of translation and interpreting studies are considered in the concluding section.

### Introduction

As language-based activities that have practical implications, translation and interpreting are often seen as falling within the remit of applied linguistics. This chapter focuses on key issues that have interested both translation scholars and applied linguists in recent years. The use of translation in language teaching falls outside the remit of this chapter; see Cook (2009) and Laviosa (2020) for an authoritative view of this issue.

Increased globalization, growing mobility of people and commodities, and the spread of armed conflicts since the turn of the twenty-first century have established translation and interpreting more firmly in the public consciousness. For one thing, translators and interpreters have become important economic players in the services sector worldwide in their capacity as facilitators and beneficiaries of increased interconnectedness. Between 2009 and 2019, global translation industry surveys reported a healthy compound annual growth rate of 7.76% (CSA 2019), and language services providers bounced back from

the downturn caused by the 2020 COVID pandemic faster than other economic sectors (CSA 2021). But translators and interpreters are now also widely recognized as important political players, with their involvement in Iraq, Afghanistan, Darfur and more recently in Ukraine receiving widespread media attention.

This chapter explores the growing pervasiveness of translation and interpreting in all domains of private and public life, with particular emphasis on their social and political relevance. It examines their contribution to the delivery of institutional agendas — from supranational organizations to judicial and healthcare services at community level; their role in the negotiation of power differentials in social life; and their growing visibility in various spheres of conflict, including protest movements and war zones. The chapter also examines the key role that translation and interpreting play in promoting cultural and linguistic diversity in the information society and in developing multilingual content in global media networks and the audiovisual marketplace, against the backdrop of the growing dominance of English as a lingua franca. Finally, it surveys the technological developments underpinning the proliferation of multimodal texts that require more complex forms of translation, including new modalities of intersemiotic assistive mediation to empower sensory impaired members of the community.

## Historical overview

Although the intellectual interest in translation goes back several centuries, the academic study of translation and interpreting dates back only to the middle of the twentieth century (Baker 2005). Initially focusing on short, often decontextualized stretches of text, much theorizing between the 1950s and the 1980s involved elaborating taxonomies of equivalence between source texts and their translations (Baker and Pérez-González 2011). During this period, translation equivalence was discussed in terms of semantic correspondence between original and translated texts (Rabin 1958); the extent to which the target version reproduced the effect that the source text had on its original readership (Nida 1964; Nida and Taber 1969; Larson 1984); the degree of alignment between the most prominent textual functions or communicative purposes in the original text and its translated version (Reiss 1971; House 1981); and finally in terms of translators' compliance with the commissioner's specifications (Vermeer [1989] 2000; Nord 1991).

By the late 1980s, cultural studies and literary theory in particular had come to exercise considerable influence on the study of translated texts as instances of interaction embodying the values a given culture attaches to certain practices and concepts (Venuti 1995; Hermans 1996; Tymoczko 1999). By then, too, translation scholars had begun to draw on an expanding array of theoretical strands and fields within linguistics — including but not limited to critical discourse analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, psycholinguistics and semiotics (Saldanha 2009). The work of Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) proved extremely influential in widening the remit of linguistically-informed studies of translation and interpreting, in particular by engaging with issues of ideology and positioning.

Since the mid-1990s, corpus linguistics has provided a robust methodology for studying translation (Laviosa 2002; Olohan 2004; Zanettin 2014). Initially, corpus-based translation studies sought to facilitate comparison between a computer-held corpus

consisting exclusively of translated text and one holding only non-translated texts produced *in the same language*. Such comparison aims to demonstrate the distinctive nature of translation as a genre in its own right by identifying recurrent patterns in the language produced by translators (Baker 1996; Laviosa 1998) and interpreters (Pérez-González 2006a). Baker (1993) first proposed that translation is constrained by a fully articulated text in another language that inevitably leaves traces in the language translators produce. But corpus-based studies of translation go further, providing evidence that translators tend to make explicit what is either implicit in the source text or would be implicit in a non-translated text in the same language — e.g., they have a tendency to spell out the optional *that* in reporting structures in translated English text compared to non-translated English in the same genres (Olohan and Baker 2000). De Sutter and Lefer offer a critical analysis of the current state-of-the-art and outline a revised research agenda based on ‘multi-methodological designs and advanced statistical modelling’ (2020: 18) that nevertheless focuses on the nature of translation as a form of ‘constrained communication’ (ibid.:19). Adopting a broader definition of translation, studies based on the AHRC-funded *Genealogies of Knowledge* project (2016–2020) have drawn on corpora to examine the cross-cultural mediation of key concepts in political and scientific discourse, such as *common people* (Jones 2019) or *sign* vs *symptom* in medicine (Karimullah 2020). A more recent extension of this methodology focuses on explaining controversies surrounding concepts which underpin the practice and ethos of modern medicine, such as *evidence* in Evidence-based Medicine (Buts et al. 2021).

Since the 1990s, many studies have focused on the influence of ideology and power on translators’ decision-making. The extent to which translational behaviour facilitates the use of language as an instrument of ideological control is a recurrent object of enquiry in studies informed by critical discourse analysis (CDA), including corpus-based CDA (Kim 2020). Other research strands informed by the social sciences explore how different types of narrative, understood not as a genre but as our primary means of making sense of the world, impact the way in which translators mediate texts as well as how readers/listeners interpret translations (Baker 2006; Bassi 2015; Boukhaffa 2018). On the whole, this critical body of research interrogates how the professional conduct of translators and interpreters is negotiated against the backdrop of existing norms of translation as a social institution, and have challenged the widely held perception of translation and interpreting as routinized, uncritical activities.

## Current research issues in translation and interpreting

### *Translation and interpreting as institutionalized and institution-building practices*

The role of translation in effecting institutional change has long been documented by translation and interpreting historians (e.g., Lung 2016). Drawing on Koskinen’s (2008: 17) definition of institutions as forms of ‘uniform action governed by role expectations, norms, values and belief systems’, this section examines the impact of translation on two types of contemporary institutional settings: local/national organizational systems and supranational bureaucratic cultures.

With increased globalization, migration and other forms of mobility, interpreters and translators have come to play a prominent role in encounters between institutional representatives and lay citizens. In bilingual common law courtroom proceedings, for instance, barristers use sophisticated questioning strategies whose effectiveness is heavily dependent on the interpreters' mediation (Berk-Seligson 1999; Hale 2001; Pérez-González 2006a). The legal profession has attempted to regulate the impact of such mediation by means of codes of practice that require interpreters to refrain from explicating or clarifying verbal elements deliberately left ambiguous, implicit or unclear in the counsel's questions. In doctor-patient interaction and interviews of asylum seekers and political refugees, interpreters are expected to exercise their discretion in organizationally sanctioned ways and have been found to enforce rigid question-answer exchanges aligned with institutional agendas. Medical interpreters, for example, focus on eliciting and interrogating diagnostically relevant information while excising patients' own personal concerns (Bolden 2000). Interpreters similarly prevent political refugees from launching into a narrative of their personal tragedies while their asylum claims are being assessed (Jacquemet 2005).

However, even interpreters bound by the strictest codes of ethics often fail to provide the sort of straightforward, unedited renditions which their organizational co-interactants expect (Angelelli 2004). Lack of syntactic and semantic equivalence between languages, together with the stress under which they operate, often lead interpreters to inadvertently alter the tenor of the original utterance, for example by downgrading the suggestive and intimidating nature of key questions and statements. Conference interpreters working in highly formal contexts have also been shown to depart from their canonical roles as conduits and speak in their own voice to defend themselves against charges of misinterpreting by other interactants wishing to use them as scapegoats (Diriker 2004). It has therefore been argued that interpreting studies should refrain from 'comparing the propositional meaning of utterances and their interpretation' and seek instead to challenge the conceptualization of interpreters as neutral conduits by describing 'the behaviour of all parties in terms of the set of factors governing the exchange' (Mason and Stewart 2001: 54). Such arguments have paved the way for the emergence and consolidation of dialogue interpreting studies, a distinct sub-field within interpreting studies which approaches face-to-face encounters as triadic exchanges between the institutional representative, the client and the interpreter (Mason 2001).

The power imbalance inherent in interpreter-mediated institutional encounters makes politeness theory an attractive framework to draw on. In these settings, interactants realign themselves as required by the turn-by-turn unfolding of the conversation and exploit the politeness and face-saving strategies available at each stage to maximize the effectiveness of the ongoing interview or interrogation, occasionally mitigating face-threatening acts — for example, when a lay interactant refuses or fails to comply with the requirements of the institutional representative. Goffman's (1981) 'participation framework' has proved helpful for researchers working on interpreter-mediated interaction (Wadensjö 1998; Roy 2000; Marks 2012). Studying shifts in footing may reveal the interpreters' alignments with lay people and institutional representatives, highlight their role as institutional 'gatekeepers' (Wadensjö 1998), and yield insights into the repair and bridging work they carry out using an array of hedging, downtoning, amplifying and turn-taking managing devices. For example, to ensure that doctor-patient

interviews unfold successfully, medical interpreters may offer their own answers to patients' questions, acting as covert co-diagnosticians (Davidson 2000). This body of scholarship has shown that interpreters may claim a participatory role for themselves 'as speaking agents who are critically engaged in the process of making meaningful utterances that elicit the intended response from, or have the intended effect upon, the hearer' (Davidson 2002: 1275).

While acknowledging interpreters' active involvement in the management of institutional interaction, scholars investigating institutions that regulate the flow of asylum seekers and political refugees (Barsky 1996; Inghilleri 2007), journalists reporting on the involvement of interpreters and translators in armed conflicts (Levinson 2006; Packer 2007), and professionals concerned about the welfare of interpreters operating in war zones (Kahane 2007) have also addressed the interpreters' vulnerability to exercises of power by institutional representatives. Interpreters working in the asylum system are often co-opted into the relevant institutional cultures and made to assume responsibilities that lie outside their canonical role, for example by participating in the evaluation of the asylum applicant's credibility, thus exacerbating their shifting perceptions of their own position as mediators within these structures of power. Similarly, interpreters working for the American troops in Iraq in the first decade of the twenty-first century were often assigned intelligence-gathering tasks that further alienated them from their local community and put their lives at greater risk (Packer 2007).

Beyond nationally-based systems, international and pan-national organizations also rely heavily on translators and interpreters. Multilateral institutions address their respective constituencies through translated and interpreted texts, such that 'in a constructivist sense, the institution itself gets translated' (Koskinen 2008: 22). These organizations often attempt to hide their translational character, and subsequently to efface the role played by translators and interpreters at different levels. On the one hand, translators' and interpreters' individual identities and contributions are diluted through the enforcement of collective workflow processes which serve to strengthen the public perception of the organizational voice. On the other hand, translators' and interpreters' ability to exercise their professional discretion is significantly restricted by means of institutional guidelines which seek to effect a gradual routinization and mechanization of translational behaviour and ensure that the language they produce 'functions seamlessly as part of the discourse' of the institution in question (Kang 2009: 144). Despite the efforts of international organizations to develop translational cultures of their own, scholars have identified a slippage between what translators and interpreters are officially expected or asked to do and what they actually do. This has been attributed to mismatches between institutional doctrine and 'interpreting habituses' (Marzocchi 2005) and to the growing impact of the economics of translation (i.e. time/costs factors), rather than socio-cultural policies, as the driving force behind institutional agendas (Mossop 2006). Mason ([2003] 2004: 481) also reports on the 'little uniformity of practice or evidence of influence of institutional guidelines on translator behaviour' in his analysis of data from the European Parliament and UNESCO. His study suggests that institutional translators are responsible for numerous 'discoursal shifts', i.e. concatenations of small shifts in the use of transitivity patterns throughout the translated text, which result in attenuating or intensifying the message conveyed in the original text. Mason's contention that such discoursal shifts display traces of the ideologies that circulate in the translators' environment reinforces

their interactional status as agents who are actively engaged in the production of institutional discourses, rather than simple mouthpieces whose role consists of consolidating 'habitualized' discourses through mechanistic practices of mediation. Duflou's (2016) ethnographic research on the socialization of Dutch conference interpreters at the European Union institutions shows how the development of their competence in applying the practical and setting-determined know-how required in the booth influences their production of institutional discourses.

### *Power, inequality, minority*

Much of the current literature in the field approaches cross-cultural encounters involving an element of interlinguistic mediation as a space of radical inequality. Translators and interpreters mediating these encounters are involved in asserting, questioning and sometimes forcefully resisting existing power structures, suggesting that translation does not resolve conflict and inequality by enabling dialogue but rather constitutes a space of tension and power struggle in its own right. Casanova (2010) examines translation as a factor in the struggle for legitimacy in the literary and political fields — a factor that participates in consecrating authors and works, both nationally and internationally, and in the distribution and transfer of cultural capital. In her model, structural inequality evident in the imbalance between dominating and dominated languages and literatures reflects the struggle within any field in Bourdieu's terms. Inghilleri similarly draws on Bourdieu's notions of habitus, field, capital and *illusio* to demonstrate that interpreters working in the asylum system 'act within and are constituted by ... power-laden macro-structures ... that impact directly and indirectly on the interpreting activity' (2003: 261).

Growing interest in issues of power and inequality has naturally drawn attention to the role played by translation and interpreting in shaping the relationship between minority and majority groups in any society. Translation has always been a powerful instrument of the nation-state, not only in colonial and postcolonial contexts (Niranjana 1990; Dodson 2005) but also in the context of more modern, multicultural and multi-ethnic societies. Minority issues become particularly acute, with translation and interpreting acquiring increased significance in diglossic situations where the dominant, colonial or majority language inhabits and has monopoly on official, public life, and where the native language is relegated to the realm of the home, the casual, the ephemeral. Cronin (1998) was among the first to stress the urgency of exploring the effects of translation on various minority languages given their diminishing numbers across the world. He distinguishes between translation efforts that seek to obliterate the minority language by assimilating it to the dominant language and those which seek to retain and develop the minority language and resist its incorporation into the dominant language. Examples of the former abound in the Irish experience and are brought to life vividly in Brian Friel's *Translations* (Friel 1981), a play that depicts the process of anglicizing Ireland through the British Ordnance Survey in 1833. Examples of the latter include translation both from and into Welsh in many official contexts today, and translations undertaken from a wide range of prestigious literatures and languages into Scots in order to 'raise its status and establish its validity as a literary medium' (Corbett 1999: 3). Beyond the mere survival of the dominated language, translation into a minority language like Corsican is sometimes also 'a way of demonstrating a new confidence in [that] language and identity by acting *as if* it were a language of power' (Jaffe [1999] 2010: 264; original emphasis).

The deaf and hard-of-hearing are often treated as a minority group: their interaction with the hearing community constitutes a site of power struggle in which translation and interpreting can play either an oppressive or empowering role. Those who are born deaf generally do not acquire the majority language, or do not acquire it to native-speaker level, and because of their inability to hear they rely on interpreters throughout their life across a range of contexts. Although access to interpreters allows this particular minority group to participate more fully in various aspects of social life, the mere provision of interpreting services has been shown to have a disempowering effect by creating an illusion of access or independence without necessarily putting the deaf person on an equal footing with their hearing co-interactants (McKee 2003). Together with the issues arising from the low number of native sign language entrants (Napier and Leeson 2016) and the under-representation of certain ethnic groups within the interpreting profession (Leeson and Sheridan 2020), the need to increase deaf political participation has emerged as an important research theme (Turner et al. 2017).

### *Activism, protest and social movements*

Research on translation and political activism was given impetus at the turn of the century by Tymoczko's (2000) critical analysis of discourses on translation and engagement that are aimed at a literary elite. Against the then dominant understanding of resistance in translation as a question of adopting a disruptive, or foreignizing, translation strategy (Venuti 1995), she argued that '[t]rying to prescribe a single translation strategy [to effect political change] is like trying to prescribe a single strategy for effective guerrilla warfare' (2000:42). Instead, for translation to be politically effective translators have to work together as a group with a common agenda, select texts for translation with that agenda in mind, and vary their strategies for tactical purposes. A number of studies have since analysed the working practices of groups of translators and interpreters with a declared activist agenda, such as Babels and Tlaxcala (Boéri 2008, Baker 2013). Halley (2019) examined the practices of a group of volunteer American sign language interpreters which formed around the 1988 Deaf President Now protest movement at Gallaudet University, focusing on the way it developed a collective identity with the deaf protestors. Recently published collections (e.g., Gould and Tahmasebian 2020) bring together further important contributions from settings as varied as Iran, Palestine, Japan and Mexico.

The global spread of protest movements in late 2010/early 2011 drew further attention to the role of translation in political activism. Baker (2016) examined the subtitling practices of collectives active during the Egyptian Revolution, focusing on the extent to which they undercut the political project by failing to reflect its goals, or enhanced it by providing additional space for actualizing these goals. By claiming visibility and exercising agency in pursuit of prefigurative agendas, these activist communities aim to put into practice values such as 'solidarity, diversity, non-hierarchy, horizontality and non-representational models of practice' and to bring 'the world they aspire to create into existence' (Baker 2019:460). The most extended investigation into the role of translation in contemporary social movements to date is Fernández (2020). The study highlights the centrality of translation in various types of political activity during the Spanish 15M movement, concluding that it did not necessarily constitute a "beneficial contribution to political transformation" in this context. Instead, as in many other sites of

interaction, translation is revealed to be “a complex and unpredictable process that is subject to multiple ‘partisan’ engagements” (Fernández 2020:132).

### *Translators and interpreters in the war zone*

Scholars of translation have only recently begun to engage in a sustained manner with various aspects of the role and positioning of translators and interpreters in the war zone. Their focus has varied from an interest in the impact of interpreter and translator behaviour on other parties in the conflict, and the way they align or do not align with the institutions that employ them (Baker 2010; Salama-Carr 2007), to the impact of the war situation and proximity to violence on the interpreters and translators themselves (Inghilleri 2008, 2009; Maier 2007), especially “non-professional and untrained mediators” (Tryuk 2021:399). Todorova and Ruiz Rosendo’s (2021) *Interpreting Conflict* brings several of these themes together and examines a wide range of contexts (military, humanitarian, activist) and cultural locations, from Korea and Japan, to Afghanistan, Iraq, the Sahel, Spain and Argentina, among others. Focusing on mourning walls in Aleppo, Bader Eddin (2020) is one of very few studies to offer an extended analysis of specific strategies of translation and their impact on the reception of textual and visual messages from war zones in western media. Haddadian-Moghaddam and Scott-Smith (2020) bring together a number of important studies of translation and interpreting during the Cold War.

Baker (2006) demonstrates how the discursive negotiation of competing narratives of wars and armed conflicts is realized in and through acts of translation and interpreting in the media, literature, scholarly articles, documentary film, political reports and web sites. Rafael (2007) argues that in the case of armed conflicts, interpreters can become particularly involved on the ground and find themselves occupying precarious positions, often exposed to extreme discursive violence and distrusted by the very parties that deployed them as instruments of surveillance. Despite their essential function in fighting insurgents, he argues, locally hired interpreters are also feared as potential insurgents themselves. Indeed, distrust of local interpreters and translators in the context of imperial expansion has been documented elsewhere, for example by Niranjana (1990) for colonial India and Takeda (2009) in relation to US concerns about employing second-generation Japanese Americans in code-breaking work during the Second World War.

Research on the role of translators and interpreters in mediating armed conflict suggests that they typically assume a wide range of tasks that extend well beyond any canonical definition of their responsibilities and obligations. Takeda (2009: 52) explains how Japanese Americans recruited and trained by the US military during the Second World War ‘translated captured enemy documents, interrogated Japanese prisoners of war, persuaded Japanese soldiers and civilians to surrender, and participated in propaganda activities’. Based on interviews with British and French journalists who worked in Iraq following its invasion by US troops in 2003, Palmer (2007) confirms that interpreters often selected the individuals to be interviewed by the media representative and advised on whether it was safe or practical to travel to a particular place to secure an interview.



### *Translation and interpreting in the globalized information society*

Recent technological developments have brought about a ‘de-materialization of space’ (Cronin 2003) and sped up the circulation of information, facilitating the creation of supraterritorial readerships and audiences. Translation scholars have explored the dynamics of language flows in the global deterritorialized space, demonstrating how the dominant *lingua franca* influences other languages via processes of translation and multilingual text production (House 2013), and how translation can serve as a strategy of resistance against the linguistic and cultural dominance of English (Chan 2016).

Bennett (2007) examines the role of translation in strengthening the position of English as *lingua franca* in academic discourse, and hence in configuring knowledge and controlling the flow and format of information. The ‘predatory’ discourse routinely employed by academics is hierarchically organized into sections with a clear introduction, development and conclusion. Impersonal structures, such as passive and nominalized forms, are preferred to create the illusion of impartiality, while material and existential processes are used to enhance objectivity. Bennett draws on examples of Portuguese academic articles translated for publication in English to demonstrate the extent to which the ideological framework that informs the original articles is disrupted and replaced by a positivist structure inherent to English academic discourse. She concludes that translators’ complicity in enforcing ideologies embedded in English academic discourse must be questioned since it can lead to the systematic destruction of rival forms of knowledge.

House (2004, 2008) investigated the communicative norms that operate in a wide range of texts translated from English and those operating in comparable texts written originally in the target language. According to House (2008: 87), textual norms in languages other than English are likely to be adapted to Anglophone ones, ‘particularly in the use of certain functional categories that express subjectivity and audience design’. Such adaptations include shifts from the ideational (message-oriented) to the interpersonal (addressee-oriented) function of language, from informational explicitness to inference-inducing implicitness, and from ‘densely packed information to loosely linearized information’ (House 2004: 49).

Technological advances have stimulated interest in the variety of multimodal texts that circulate in a growing range of professional and recreational settings. Boria et al.’s (2019) *Translation and Multimodality* explores how the simultaneous occurrence of multiple semiotic modes – including but not limited to the spoken and written word, gestures, visuals, music and colour – across textual genres calls for a retheorization of translation practices. While the study of multimodal translational behaviour has traditionally focused on subtitling, dubbing and assistive forms of intersemiotic translation such as audio description and subtitling for the hard of hearing (Pérez-González 2019), scholarly attention is increasingly shifting towards new research themes and settings, such as embodied multimodal meaning-making and museum accessibility (Pérez-González 2020).

The emergence of new patterns in the distribution and consumption of audiovisual content in digital space has drawn scholarly attention to networked communities of translators seeking to effect aesthetic or political change. Unhappy with the paucity and cultural insensitivity of commercial translations of their favourite audiovisual programmes

and genres, networks of fans, known as fansubbers, produce their own subtitled versions which are then circulated globally online (Dywer 2019). To allow their fellow fans to experience the cultural ‘otherness’ of the content they subtitle, these amateur translators exploit traditional meaning-making codes creatively and criss-cross the traditional boundaries between linguistic and visual semiotics in innovative ways. For example, they use ‘headnotes’ and written glosses at the top of the screen to expand or elaborate on the meaning of ‘untranslatable’ cultural references in the film dialogue; the cultural references in question still feature untranslated within the ‘traditional subtitle’ displayed simultaneously at the bottom of the screen. Fansubbers also favour the ‘dilution’ of subtitles within the image: technological developments allow them to display subtitles in unusual angles, perspectives and fonts which blend in with the aesthetics of the film, thus maximizing the viewer’s enjoyment of the visuals (Pérez González 2006b).

### *Future directions*

As it continues to develop in the twenty-first century, the next and most consequential challenge for translation studies is to shed its Euro-centric origins and prepare to embrace the variety of theoretical perspectives, experiences and traditions that the West’s many ‘others’ have to offer. This challenge is already being undertaken, with a growing number of voices of non-Western scholars continuing to gain strength and calling into question much received wisdom in the field (Hung and Wakabayashi 2005; Cheung 2006; Bandia 2008; Selim 2009; Gould and Tahmasebian 2020). Cronin’s notion of ‘eco-translation’, understood as ‘all forms of translation thinking and practice that knowingly engage with the challenges of human-induced environmental change’ (2017: 2), is also bound to play a central role in the development of disciplinary discourses in translation studies, as the consequences of the climate emergency become irreversibly lodged in public consciousness. Eco-translation is not only enabling a reconceptualization of the past, present and future of translation itself, but also yielding new insights into the ‘tradosphere’, a notion encompassing the study of various regimes of control and attention, the sustainability of minoritized languages and the circulation of information and knowledge within global linguistic ecologies.

### Related topics

Institutional discourse; The media; Medical communication; Culture; Identity; Migration; Linguistic imperialism; Corpus linguistics; Critical discourse analysis; Discourse analysis; Multimodal communication.

### Further reading

Baker, M. (ed.) (2010) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.

A thematically organized reader which prioritizes developments in the field rather than foundational texts and features detailed summaries of each article, follow-up questions for discussion and recommended further reading.

Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds) (2020) *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, third edn, London: Routledge.

A standard reference in the field which features extended entries on core concepts, types of translation and interpreting and theoretical approaches.

Munday, J. (2016) *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn, London: Routledge.

A balanced and accessible overview of the main theoretical strands in the discipline, supported by illustrative case studies in different languages, suggestions for further reading and a list of discussion and research points.

Pöchhacker, F. (2016) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, London: Routledge.

An accessible introduction to interpreting studies as an academic discipline, outlining its origins and development to the present day.

Venuti, L. (2021) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 4th edn, London: Routledge.

A chronologically organized reader which focuses largely on foundational texts. Extended introductions to each section clearly outline the main trends during the relevant period.

## References

Angelelli, C. (2004) *Re-visiting the Role of the Interpreter*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bader Eddin, E. (2020) 'Translating mourning walls: Aleppo's last words', in R.R. Gould and K. Tahmasebian (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism*, London: Routledge, 147–64.

Baker, M. (1993) 'Corpus linguistics and translation studies. Implications and applications', in M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 233–50.

Baker, M. (1996) 'Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead', in H. Somers (ed.) *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering, in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 175–86.

Baker, M. (2005) 'Linguistic models and methods in the study of translation', in H. Kittel, A. P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul (eds) *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 285–94.

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

Baker, M. (2010) 'Translators and interpreters in the war zone: Narrated and narrators', *The Translator* 16(2): 197–222.

Baker, M. and L. Pérez-González (2011) 'Translation and interpreting', in J. Simpson (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 1st edn, London & New York: Routledge, pp. 39–52.

- Baker, M. (2013) 'Translation as an alternative space for political action', *Social Movement Studies* 21(1): 23–47.
- Baker, M. (2016) 'The prefigurative politics of translation in place-based movements of protest: Subtitling in the Egyptian revolution', *The Translator* 22(1): 1–21.
- Baker, M. (2019) 'Audiovisual translation and activism', in L. Pérez-González (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*, London: Routledge, pp. 453–67.
- Bandia, P. (2008) *Translation as Reparation: Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Barsky, R. (1996) 'The interpreter as intercultural agent in convention refugee hearings', *The Translator* 2(1): 45–63.
- Bassi, S. (2015) 'Italy's Salman Rushdie: The renarration of "Roberto Saviano" in English for the post-9/11 cultural market', *Translation Studies* 8(1): 48–62.
- Bennett, K. (2007) 'Epistemicide!: The tale of a predatory discourse', *The Translator* 13(2): 151–69.
- Berk-Seligson, S. (1999) 'The impact of court interpreting on the coerciveness of leading questions', *Forensic Linguistics* 6(1): 30–56.
- Boéri, J. (2008) 'A narrative account of the Babels vs. Naumann controversy', *The Translator* 14(1): 21–52.
- Bolden, G. (2000) 'Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: Interpreters' involvement in history taking', *Discourse Studies* 2(4): 387–419.
- Boria, M., A. Carreres, M.N. Noriega-Sánchez and M. Tomalin (eds) (2019) *Beyond Words: Multimodal Encounters in Translation*, London: Routledge.
- Boukhaffa, A. (2018) 'Narrative (re)framing in translating modern Orientalism: a study of the Arabic translation of Lewis's *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*', *The Translator* 24(2): 166–82.
- Buts, J., M. Baker, S. Luz and E. Engebretsen (2021) 'Epistemologies of evidence-based medicine: A plea for corpus-based conceptual research in the medical humanities', *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-021-10027-2>
- Casanova, P. (2010) 'Consecration and accumulation of literary capital: Translation as unequal exchange', translated from French by S. Brownlie, in M. Baker (ed.) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 285–303.
- Chan, L.T. (2016) 'Beyond non-translation and "self-translation": English as lingua academica in China', *Translation & Interpreting Studies* 11(2): 152–76.
- Cheung, M. (ed.) (2006) *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation. Volume 1: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Cook, G. (2009) 'Foreign language teaching', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 112–15.

- Corbett, J. (1999) *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation: A History of Literary Translation into Scots*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cronin, M. (1998) 'The cracked looking glass of servants: Translation and minority languages in a global age', *The Translator* 4(2): 145–62.
- Cronin, M. (2003) *Translation and Globalization*, London: Routledge.
- Cronin, M. (2017) *Eco-translation: Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*, London: Routledge.
- CSA Research (2019) *The 2019 Language Services Market: 15th Annual Review of the Services and Technology Industry that Supports Translation, Localization, and Interpreting*, USA. Available at <https://csa-research.com/>
- CSA Research (2021) *Annual Study of the Language Services and Technology Market 2021*, USA. Available at <https://csa-research.com/>
- Davidson, B. (2000) 'The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(3): 379–405.
- Davidson, B. (2002) 'A model for the construction of conversational common ground in interpreted discourse', *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1273–300.
- De Sutter, G. and M.-A. Lefer (2020) 'On the need for a new research agenda for corpus-based translation studies: A multi-methodological, multi-factorial and interdisciplinary approach', *Perspectives* 28(1): 1–23.
- Diriker, E. (2004) *De-/Re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower?*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dodson, M.S. (2005) 'Translating science, translating Empire: The power of language in Colonial North India', *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 809–35.
- Duflou, V. (2016) *Be(com)ing a Conference Interpreter: An Ethnography of EU Interpreters as a Professional Community*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dywer, T. (2019) 'Audiovisual translation and fandom', in L. Pérez-González (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*, London: Routledge, pp. 436–452.
- Fernández, F. (2020) *Translating the Crisis: Politics and Culture in Spain after the 15M*, London: Routledge.
- Friel, B. (1981) *Translations*, London: Faber & Faber.
- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gould, R. and K. Tahmasebian (2020) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism*, London: Routledge.
- Haddadian-Moghaddam, E. and G. Scott-Smith (eds) (2020) *Translation and the Cultural Cold War*, Special issue of *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 15(3).

- Hale, S. (2001) 'How are courtroom questions interpreted? An analysis of Spanish interpreters' practices', in I. Mason (ed.) *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*, St. Jerome, Manchester.
- Halley, Mark (2019) 'Interpreting as ideologically-structured action: Collective identity between activist interpreters and protesters', *New Voices in Translation Studies* 20: 54–85.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*, London: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (1996) 'The translator's voice in translated narrative', *Target* 8(1): 23–48.
- House, J. (1981) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- House, J. (2004) 'English as lingua franca and its influence on other European languages', in J. M. Bravo (ed.) *A New Spectrum of Translation Studies*, Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- House, J. (2008) 'Global English and the destruction of identity?', in P. Nikolaou and M.-V. Kyritsi (eds) *Translating Selves: Experience and Identity between Languages and Literatures*, London: Continuum.
- House, J. (2013) 'English as a lingua franca and translation', *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7(2): 279–98.
- Hung, E. and J. Wakabayashi (eds) (2005) *Asian Translation Traditions*, Manchester; St. Jerome.
- Inghilleri, M. (2003) 'Habitus, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially situated activity', *Target* 15(2): 243–68.
- Inghilleri, M. (2007) 'National sovereignty versus universal rights: Interpreting justice in a global context', *Social Semiotics* 17(2): 195–212.
- Inghilleri, M. (2008) 'The ethical task of the translator in the geo-political arena: From Iraq to Guantánamo Bay', *Translation Studies* 1(2): 212–23.
- Inghilleri, M. (2009) 'Translators in war zones: Ethics under fire in Iraq', in E. Bielsa and C. W. Hughes (eds) *Globalization, Political Violence and Translation*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 207–21.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005) 'The registration interview: Restricting refugees' narrative performance', in M. Baynham and A. De Fina (eds) *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement*, Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 197–220.
- Jaffe, A. (1999) 'Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics', in J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter; reprinted in M. Baker (ed.) (2010) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 263–82.
- Jones, H. (2019) 'Shifting characterizations of the "Common People" in modern English retranslations of Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*. A corpus-based analysis', *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 5(135).

- Kahane, E. (2007) 'Interpreters in conflict zones: The limits of neutrality', *Communicate!* (AIIC's Online Journal). Available at [http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm?page\\_id=2691](http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm?page_id=2691).
- Kang, J.-H. (2009) 'Institutional translation', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 141–45.
- Karimullah, K.I. (2020) 'Hippocrates transformed: Crafting a Hippocratic discourse of medical semiotics in English, 1850–1930', *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 7(27).
- Kim, K.H. (2020) 'Critical discourse analysis', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3rd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 119–24.
- Koskinen, K. (2008) *Translating Institutions*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Larson, M. (1984) *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*, Lanham, New York: University Press of America.
- Laviosa, S. (ed.) (1998) *L'approche basée sur le corpus/The Corpus-Based Approach*, special issue, *Meta* 43(4).
- Laviosa, S. (2002) *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Laviosa, S. (2020) 'Language teaching', in M. Baker and S. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3rd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 271–75.
- Leeson, L. and S. Sheridan (2020) 'Sign language interpreting', in M. Baker and S. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3rd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 526–530.
- Levinson, C. (2006) 'Iraq's 'terps' face suspicion from both sides'', *Christian Science Monitor*, 17 April. Available at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0417/p01s01-woiq.html>
- Lung, R. (2016) 'The Jiangnan Arsenal: A microcosm of translation and ideological transformation in 19th-century China', *Meta* 61: 37–52.
- Maier, C. (2007) 'The translator's visibility: The rights and responsibilities thereof', in M. Salama-Carr (ed.) *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 251–66.
- Marks, A. R. (2012) 'Participation framework and footing shifts in an interpreted academic meeting', *Journal of Interpretation* 22(1). Available at <http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol22/iss1/4>
- Marzocchi, C. (2005) 'On a contradiction in the discourse on language arrangements in EU Institutions', *Across Languages and Cultures* 6(1): 5–12.
- Mason, I. (2001) *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

- Mason, I. (2003) 'Text parameters in translation: Transitivity and institutional cultures', in E. Hajicova, P. Sgall, Z. Jettmarova, A. Rothkegel, D. Rothfuß-Bastian and H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds) *Textologie und Translation*, Tübingen: Narr. Reprinted in Lawrence Venuti (ed.) (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 470–81.
- Mason, I. and M. Stewart (2001) 'Interactional pragmatics, face and the dialogue interpreter', in I. Mason (ed.) *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*, Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 51–70.
- McKee, R. (2003) 'Interpreting as a tool for empowerment of the New Zealand Deaf community', in S. Fenton (ed.) *For Better or For Worse: Translation as a Tool for Change in the South Pacific*, Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 89–132.
- Mossop, B. (2006) 'From culture to business: Federal government translation in Canada', *The Translator* 12(1): 1–27.
- Napier, J. and L. Leeson (2016) *Sign Language in Action*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nida, E.A. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E.A. and C. Taber (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Niranjana, T. (1990) 'Translation, colonialism and rise of English', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 14 April, 773–79.
- Nord, C. (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Olohan, M. (2004) *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Olohan, M. and M. Baker (2000) 'Reporting *that* in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation?', *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2): 141–58.
- Packer, G. (2007) 'Betrayed: The Iraqis who trusted America the most', *The New Yorker*, 26 March. Available at [http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2007/03/26/070326fa\\_fact\\_packer](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2007/03/26/070326fa_fact_packer).
- Palmer, J. (2007) 'Interpreting and translation for Western media in Iraq', in M. Salama-Carr (ed.) *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 11–28.
- Pérez-González, L. (2006a) 'Interpreting strategic recontextualization cues in the courtroom. Corpus-based insights into the pragmatic force of non-restrictive relative clauses', *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 390–417.
- Pérez-González, L. (2006b) 'Fansubbing anime: Insights into the butterfly effect of globalisation on audiovisual translation', *Perspectives* 14(4): 260–77.
- Pérez-González, L. (ed.) (2019) *The Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*, London: Routledge.
- Pérez-González, L. (2020) 'Multimodality', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3rd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 346–351.



- Rabin, C. (1958) 'The linguistics of translation', in H. Smith (ed.) *Aspects of Translation: Studies in Communication*, Secker & Warburg: London.
- Rafael, V. L. (2007) 'Translation in wartime', *Public Culture* 19(2): 239–46.
- Reiss, K. (1971) *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*, München: Hueber.
- Roy, C. (2000) *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salama-Carr, M. (ed.) (2007) *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Saldanha, G. (2009) 'Linguistic approaches', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edn, London: Routledge, pp. 148–52.
- Selim, S. (ed.) (2009) *Nation and Translation in the Middle East*, Special Issue of *The Translator* 15(1).
- Takeda, K. (2009) 'War and interpreters', *Across Languages and Cultures* 10(1): 49–62.
- Todorova, M. and L. Ruiz Rosendo (2021) *Interpreting Conflict: A Comparative framework*, London: Palgrave.
- Turner, G. H., J. Napier, R. Skinner and M. Wheatley (2017) 'Telecommunication relay services as a tool for deaf political participation and citizenship', *Information, Communication and Society* 20(10): 1521–38.
- Tryuk, M. (2021) 'Translating and interpreting in conflict and crisis', in K. Koskinen and N. Pokorn (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Ethics*, London: Routledge, 398–414.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999) *Translation in a Postcolonial Context. Taming the Wild Irish*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Tymoczko, M. (2000) 'Translation and political engagement: Activism, social change and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts', *The Translator* 6(1): 23–47.
- Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H.J. (1989) 'Skopos and commission in translational action', in A. Chesterman (ed.) *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab; reprinted in L. Venuti (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 221–32.
- Wadensjö, C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, London: Longman.
- Zanettin, F. (2014) *Translation-driven Corpora*, Manchester: St. Jerome.