Structure refers to the internal organization of units, e.g. into subject, predicator and complement if considered at clause rank, or into modifier and head if seen at group rank. An example provided by Catford for a shift at clause rank is the translation of the English sentence *John loves Mary* into Gaelic: *Tha gradh aig Iain air Mairi* (back-translated as 'Is love at John on Mary').

Class is a particular grouping or set that a given unit belongs to (e.g. nouns vs verbs or modifiers vs qualifiers). Translating the English *a medical student* into *un étudiant en médecine* in French involves a category shift in terms of the change from *medical* (a modifier) into *en médecine* (a qualifier) as well as the change from adjective (*medical*) into noun (*médecine*).

Finally, in relation to the category of *system* Catford identifies *intra-system shifts*, i.e. cases where the shifts occur within a closed set of alternatives, such as active/passive or singular/plural, between languages where these sets of alternatives largely correspond. The translation of *advice* (singular) with *des conseils* (plural) in French represents an intra-system shift as normally English singular nouns are translated with French singular nouns.

See also: **level shift, rank-bound translation, unbounded translation**.

Coherence

The related notions of coherence and **cohesion** concern the way utterances or texts are organized so as to constitute meaningful and integrated wholes. In particular, coherence refers to the ways in which an utterance is seen to establish meaningful relations between its parts from a conceptual (i.e. semantic or logical) point of view (cohesion, on the other hand, has to do with the connections established in the surface text by lexical and grammatical devices). Coherence depends on the organization of the utterance as much as on the receiver's interpretation of it, which in turn changes according to the receiver's expectations and knowledge of the world. Thus, a single sentence such as 'Have you bought it yet?' constitutes a coherent whole only inasmuch as the hearer can, according to the **context** or situation,

easily interpret the reference for 'it' (a DVD, a book, a house, etc.). In longer texts, coherence results from the relations established between sentences, which speaker or writers may organize according to different types of sequences (e.g. narrative, causal or argumentative). Again, however, the interpretation of such relations and sequences implies an active role on the part of readers, whose knowledge and presuppositions play a crucial role in establishing relations between different parts of a text. In translation, such knowledge and presuppositions may not be the same for ST and TT readers. This may affect the translator's decision as regards a variety of aspects, ranging from intersentential links (which may have to be made more explicit) to the treatment of elements as diverse as pronouns, metaphors and **culture-bound terms** which, if not transparent enough for the TT reader, may affect the way he or she makes sense of the text (for coherence and explicitation, see Blum Kulka 1986). In short, the notion of coherence has much to do with aspects of pragmatic equivalence in translation (see Baker 1992: Chap. 7).

Cohesion

The related notions of cohesion and **coherence** concern the way utterances or texts are organized so as to constitute meaningful and integrated wholes. In particular, cohesion refers to the ways in which an utterance establishes meaningful relations between its elements by using grammatical and lexical devices. An utterance is said to be *cohesive* when its elements can be interpreted with reference to other elements within the **co-text**. Cohesion thus establishes relations at the surface level of language, whereas coherence concerns conceptual relations underlying the surface text.

Following the model of cohesion elaborated by Halliday and Hasan (1976), two broad classes of cohesive devices can be identified: grammatical and lexical devices. Grammatical cohesive devices include *anaphora* (reference backwards in the text), *cataphora* (reference forwards in the text), *substitution* and *ellipsis* (i.e. reference to other elements in the text by replacement or by omission of certain elements respectively), and conjunctions. In the following exchange

taken from a hypothetical ongoing conversation:

A: *Have they moved?*
B: *No, but they will soon – to the more expensive one*

'they' is an anaphoric reference to people mentioned earlier in the conversation, 'will' is the auxiliary for the omitted main verb (a case of contrastive ellipsis), 'but' is a conjunction and 'one' is a case of substitution for a referent (a house or flat) that was mentioned earlier. In this other sentence:

As a boy, he would never watch football. Later, John became one of Aresenal's wildest supporters

the noun group 'a boy' and the pronoun 'he' are both cataphoric references to 'John'. Lexical cohesion is primarily established through *reiteration* and *collocation*. Reiteration comprises the repetition of lexical items (repetition of the exact form of a word or of morphologically distinct forms) or the use of items that are semantically related (through relations such as synoymy, hyponymy, meronymy and antonymy). **Collocation** is the tendency of words to occur in regular combinations and can be seen as a cohesive device in that it contributes to textuality and generates expectations in hearers/readers. Thus, in a text about journalism, mentions of *freedom* (and not *liberty*) *of the press* are very likely in English. As far as translation is concerned, the relevance of cohesion lies in the fact that different languages prefer certain sets of cohesive devices over others (see Baker 1992: Chap. 6).

Colligation

The term refers to a particular form of **collocation** involving relationships at the grammatical rather than at the lexical level. In other words, a colligation is either the frequent co-occurrence between a given word or phrase and words belonging to a certain grammatical class or the association of a word or phrase with a particular grammatical function. For example, as

Empirical studies of translation

The term refers to the studies of translation based on observable data and carried out according to a scientific method of inquiry, i.e. one based on the testing of hypotheses (cf. Chesterman 1993, 1997; Toury 1995). Empirical studies can be both process and product oriented and are centred essentially around two sets of questions. On the one hand, they try to describe what goes on in the translator's mind as he or she is performing the translation task. In doing so, these studies make hypotheses on those elements pertaining to either the text or the context which lead translators to go beyond automatic or routine TL solutions and necessitate a problem-solving or decision-making approach (see also **process-oriented research**). Other studies are centred on translation as product and aim at a description of the regularities observed in translated texts, so as to identify either the **norms** adhered to by a given community of translators or the so-called **universals of translation** (see also **product-oriented research**). Both approaches are concerned with the identification of the strategies deployed by translators, either to achieve certain goals or in response to what they (or the researchers) perceive to be the problems found in the source texts or related to any other aspect of a given translation task (see **translation problem**). Note that the label 'empirical' has sometimes been used to describe what are otherwise known as **descriptive translation studies**.

Empowerment

In the context of translator training, empowerment is seen by Kiraly (2000) as the emancipation of students from teacher-centred models of education. This is presented by Kiraly as part of a wide-ranging programme aimed at 'transferring the responsibility of learning to the learners, individually and collectively' (Kiraly 2000: 18). Within such a programme, teachers should act as guides or consultants rather than distributors of knowledge and students should experience real or simulated translation activities. The term is also used in Tymoczko (2007),

the notion of translation by different communities (e.g. the general public vs practitioners), the self-image of professional translators or the **norms** adhered to by a given community of translators. The two perspectives, however, must not be seen as mutually exclusive. In areas of inquiry such as translation **competence** the methodology of research can be seen to alternate or integrate 'external' and 'internal' approaches: whether the focus is on the acquisition or the components of translation competence, research in this particular area is confronted with the elucidation of a diverse set of mental and relational processes and skills.

Process-oriented research

The term indicates the research concerned with aspects related to the cognitive, psycholinguistic and organizational processes involved in translation, i.e. the mental activity and the behaviour of a translator carrying out a given translation task (such research is at times also referred to as *protocol research*). Studies in this line of research try to characterize the behaviour and process of translation observed in professional translators (as opposed to other bilinguals or translation trainees), to identify the size of translation units or to describe how trainees develop translation **competence** (in which case the studies tend to be 'longitudinal', i.e. they are carried out over a certain period of time so as to observe how the participants change in relation to the aspect considered). To investigate such aspects, the studies employ empirical data coming from a variety of sources such as the translators' own introspection (see **verbal reporting**), the writing process (see **keystroke logging**), the searches performed by translators in dictionaries or in on-line environments and the focus of attention of the translators as revealed by eye-tracking devices. More recently, data collection methods from the neurosciences have also been used (e.g. electroencephalograms and imaging technologies) so as to gain insight into the neurophysiological processes in the brain which take place while an individual is translating.

Process-oriented research had already been identified by James S. Holmes in 1972 (see Holmes 1988) as one of the branches of

descriptive translation studies, but it is customary to mark the beginning of the process-oriented research tradition in translation studies with the publication, in 1986, of H. P. Krings' pioneering work *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht*, a study investigating the use of time and reference books on the part of translators (Krings' subjects were really language learners) and analysing the nature of both the problems translators encountered and the problem-solving strategies they employed. Krings' study was based on data gathered through verbal reporting, a method originally developed in cognitive science and human information processing. Most of the subsequent process-oriented research in translation has made use of this method, adopting one (or sometimes more) of its possible variants. More recent studies have complemented verbal reports with other data elicitation methods in an attempt to redress what some researchers thought were the limitations of verbal reporting (see **triangulation**).

See also: **product-oriented research**.

Product-oriented research

Research into translation as product, i.e. into translated texts, is generally based on **corpora** of translations (either parallel or comparable) and aims either at establishing whether translated language exhibits features that set it apart from non-translated language (the so-called **universals of translation**) or at identifying regular linguistic patterns that can help to shed light on the strategies and techniques employed by translators in given language pairs, genres or text types. In a wider sense, the term product-oriented research encompasses any study of translated texts. Product-oriented research on translation is generally seen as distinct from **process-oriented research**. However, this identification of two separate strands of research should not be seen as pointing to two completely different and separate areas of investigation each having its specific object. The distinction between product and process should not 'ignore the fact that the one is the result of the other, and that the nature of the product cannot be understood without a comprehension of the nature of the process' (Holmes

1988: 81). The distinction between these two dimensions (product and process) has, in some cases, more to do with the methodological choices made by researchers than with the object of their research. So, for instance, a study such as Campbell (1998), although based on 'products' (more specifically, several translations of the same ST, each produced by a different translator), is aimed at shedding some light on some cognitive aspects of translation, i.e. on 'process'. By the same token, corpus-based studies of translation may lead to an identification of the (process) strategies employed by translators. Corpora, for instance, have been used to investigate the claim that **explicitation** is an inherent feature of translated texts.

Professional translation

A professional translator can be defined as someone who carries out remunerated translation work on a more or less stable basis. Acknowledging the difficulty to define translation as a true profession in the same way as medicine or law are, Chesterman (2001: 146) proposes to consider as a professional translator someone 'who is a translator' as opposed to someone 'who does translations (sometimes)'. It is a fact, however, that translation as a field of economic activity has in the last 50 years acquired traits that are comparable to those found in other such fields, at least in some countries: it is seen to require a certain set of technical skills, it is increasingly institutionalized, it increasingly adopts quality control systems and it relies on accreditation procedures (although these, in particular, are rarely binding). The elaboration of specific training curricula, often offered at university level, is another sign of professionalization, although specific educational qualifications are rarely a requirement with a view to recruitment. Professional organizations have been founded in many countries to represent translators (e.g. the Institute of Translation and Interpreting in the UK, the American Translators Association, the Société Française des Traducteurs and the Bundesverband der Dolmetscher und Übersetzer e. V. in Germany).

Professional translation is today practised as a freelancing activity, in international organizations and in translation agencies, or 'language

refer to such strategies include 'translation procedure' and 'translation shift'.

See also: **shift, translation strategy**.

Translation tools

This is a label commonly used to refer to the various software applications and systems that support the work of professional translators (see Quah 2006). A restrictive definition would include only such tools as **machine translation** systems, **translation memory** systems and terminology management systems (see **termbase**). Broader definitions might include other types of software applications or computerized systems normally used by all professional translators, e.g. word processors. In relation to the **localization** industry, the definition might be extended to include the tools more specifically related to the operational or management aspects of translation projects.

Whatever the definition and scope considered for the term, it is a fact that today all translation performed at professional level involves the use of computers, if only for word processing. Reference works for translators have also been remarkably transformed by the advent of computers. Traditional printed dictionaries are today usually accompanied by electronic versions (either on CD-ROM or, increasingly, as web sites), often offering new, and more effective, search capabilities. Terminological resources are today mostly available in electronic database format and are sometimes accessible through the internet (see **term bank**). It is often the case, however, that adhoc resources are entirely by-passed and translators seek relevant information on the internet using search engines (a modern way of arriving at what were once called **parallel texts**) – unless of course use of a given terminological resource is required by the client.

Translation types

Typologies of translation can be constructed with reference to different criteria and at different levels of generality. At its most general, such a typology may have the aim of delineating the category

of 'translation', identifying subcategories (with varying degrees of specificity) and describing the relations obtaining between these subcategories. A popular typology of a general nature is that proposed by Jakobson (1959), in which translation as a superordinate category is seen to comprise the subcategories of **intralingual**, **interlingual** and **intersemiotic translation**. Other typologies may not refer to what translation 'is' but, rather, to different modes of translation. The opposition **free vs literal translation** may be seen as a general typology in this respect. Other types identified following the same general criterion are House's (1977, 1997) **overt** and **covert translation**, Newmark's (1981) **semantic** and **communicative translation**, Nord's (1997) **documentary** and **instrumental translation** and Venuti's (1995) **domestication** and **foreignization.** Each of these types referring to a general mode of translation may also be seen to correspond to a particular **translation strategy**, described from the specific perspective of interest adopted by the scholar who has identified it. Besides these general distinctions, other typologies may be based on:

– the person who performs a translation, which can lead to a distinction between **natural** and **professional translation**;
– the type of text to be translated, so that broad distinction can be made between literary and **specialist translation**;
– the medium for the material to be translated (see e.g. **audiovisual translation** and **localization**);
– the particular tools employed to carry out a translation task (see e.g. **computer-assisted translation**, **machine translation**).

An example of a more detailed typology is provided by Gouadec (1990, quoted in Sager 1994: 184), who, for **pragmatic texts**, identifies seven possible types of translation: keyword translation, i.e. translation of the ST keywords; selective translation, i.e. elimination of all irrelevant information; abstract translation, i.e. a summary of the ST; diagrammatic translation, i.e. one conveying ST content in the form of diagrams; translation with reconstructions, i.e. a translation focusing on

content alone; absolute translation, i.e. a translation taking into account all aspects of the ST; and sight translation, i.e. a quick, unpolished reformulation of the ST made for informative purposes. As suggested in Chesterman and Wagner (2002: 50–51), recent typologies of translation have focused more on the criteria for classification than on the definition of types. Such criteria take into account aspects such as the intended function of the translation compared to that of the original, the extent to which content is translated in the TT (as in Gouadec's typology mentioned above), the style of the translation, the relative status of the ST and the TT, the naturalness of the language employed by the translator and so on. The aim in these descriptions is to make generalizations about typical features of a given type of translation.

Translationese

This is a term used, most of the time pejoratively, to refer to the unnatural or awkward style of translated texts, especially as produced by the influence of SL structural features.

Translatorial action (*Translatorisches Handeln*)

This is the label used by the German scholar and translator Justa Holz-Mänttäri (1984) for her theoretical model of translation, which is based on the process of translation as carried out at a professional level. Translation is seen by Holz-Mänttäri as involving a complex of actions in which extralinguistic factors play a crucial, controlling role (hence her rejection, in German, of the word *Übersetzung*, 'translation', felt to be too strongly associated with language transfer, and the decision to adopt the term *Translation* as a more specific label for the complex activity of translating). Holz-Mänttäri's model starts from the reality of translation work and sees the translator at the centre of a process in which other actors (the client, the TT readers) play important roles that have a direct bearing on the way translation is carried out. In particular, the translator is seen as an expert in *text-design*, which he or she carries out taking into account all the

that mix different cultural discourses, or even ones that are free and fluent. The two concepts of 'domestication' and 'foreignization' must be seen as showing contingent variability, meaning that their definition always depends on the specific historical and cultural situation in which a translation is made (see Venuti [1995] 2008: 19–20); see also **Lawrence Venuti** in the 'Key Thinkers' section.

Free vs literal translation

This is the binary opposition that has dominated the debate on translation over the centuries. Free translation is usually taken to concentrate on conveying the meaning of the ST disregarding the formal or structural aspects of the ST. Literal translation is normally taken to be a mode of translation that remains close to the form of the original.

'Literal' is an ambiguous term. It could mean *word-for-word*, i.e. a translation which gives priority to lexical correspondences and results in ungrammatical sentences, or it could also mean a translation that is as close as possible to the original while still ensuring TL grammaticality (but not naturalness). Barkhudarov (1993; quoted in Chesterman 1997: 12) correlates the free/literal opposition with the choice of the **unit of translation**, so that the smaller the unit, the more literal the result, and the larger the unit, the freer the result. Thinkers and scholars have had different views on the merits or disadvantages of literalness. Newmark (1981: 39) believes that literal translation should always be preferred where possible and 'provided that equivalent effect is secured' (see **equivalent effect**). Robinson (1991: 153), on the other hand, argues that the only valid criterion for translation is that the ST and the TT 'should stand in some way of recognizable relation to each other', a position that seems to reject the idea of **equivalence** and therefore the free/literal polarity altogether.

As regards free translation, this is sometimes taken to mean *sense-for-sense* translation but it has been seen as taking a variety of forms depending on the exact nature of the type (or types) of translation it is opposed to (cf. Robinson 1991, 1998). In fact, following the tripartite distinction proposed by Jerome in the 4th century AD, free translation has often been distinguished from both word-for-word and

sense-for-sense translation, where free translation is usually presented as being 'unfaithful' to the text, or a bad translation. This tripartite distinction is again found in John Dryden's differentiation between *metaphrase* (word-for-word translation), *paraphrase* (sense-for-sense translation) and *imitation*, which is defined as a translation that takes on very general hints from an original. As pointed out by Robinson (1998: 88–89) free translation, whatever it is opposed to, remains a difficult notion to define and probably the best way of characterizing it is to see it as translation that deviates from the 'hegemonic norms' that establish, in a given period or community, what faithful translation is. Thus, where faithful is equated with sense-for sense, a free translation will be one that takes greater liberties with the ST, but where the dominant norm sees faithful translation as word-for-word, then sense-for-sense will be seen as a form of free translation.

Functionalist approaches

This is a general label for those approaches that see translation as an act of communication and a form of action involving not only linguistic but also social and cultural factors. These approaches place particular emphasis on the *function* of the target text (hence the label), which they see as the essential factor in determining how choices are made in translating. They are also characterized by their detailed consideration of real-life scenarios of professional translation, which they take to be a fundamental aspect in providing theoretical descriptions of translation.

Theories and models associated with functionalist approaches include ***skopos* theory** and the model of **translatorial action**, both developed (independently at first) in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These theories can be seen as part of the **cultural turn** that was taking place in translation studies at the time (cf. Snell-Hornby 2006: Chap. 2). Besides Hans J. Vermeer, who developed the *skopos* theory, the group of scholars usually associated with functionalist approaches includes Hans Hönig, Paul Kussmaul and Christiane Nord (see Hönig and Kussmaul 1982; Nord 1991, 1997), all of them from Germany. Historically, their work emerged as a reaction to the linguistically oriented approaches prevalent up to the

Indeterminacy of translation

The philosophical thesis of the indeterminacy of translation maintains that different translations of a sentence in a given original language can be incompatible with one another but at the same time all equally compatible with the semantically relevant facts expressed by the original sentence. In other words, the thesis maintains that, starting from one sentence in language A, two or more translations of the sentence can be provided in language B that, while being non-equivalent with each other, are nevertheless all equivalent to the original sentence. The thesis has been proposed by the American philosopher Willard V. O. Quine, who arrived at it through a thought experiment based on a case of *radical translation*, i.e. the interpretation of a completely unknown language with no historical or cultural links to the translating language (Quine 1960; see also Quine 1959). In particular, Quine imagines a field linguist coming across the member of a previously unknown tribe in the jungle. On noticing a rabbit scurrying by, the native says 'Gavagai' and the linguist starts asking what the utterance could mean. Possibilities of interpretation include 'Rabbit' or 'Lo, a rabbit' or even 'He is running fast'. To arrive at an interpretation of the utterance, the linguist can only observe the causal connections between the environment of the natives and their verbal behaviour. More specifically, he observes how the word 'gavagai' is used in various contexts and tests his interpretations against still other contexts, finally arriving at a translation. This, however, does not exclude that other, different translations/interpretations of the word 'gavagai' are possible, perhaps in contexts not yet observed by the linguist or because the stimulus conditions the utterance 'gavagai' is meant to respond to are of a different nature (i.e. because the utterance is polysemous). The thesis is thus that translation always implies a certain degree of indeterminacy, as meanings can only be interpreted with reference to actual contexts, that is, empirically. For Quine, the indeterminacy linked to translation is just a particular case of the indeterminacy associated with all interpretation of meaning, even within the same language.

Semantic translation

According to Newmark (1981: 22), this is a translation aiming at rendering the exact meaning of the original while taking into account the 'bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL'. For example, a semantic translation for the German *Frischer angestrichen!* would be *Recently painted!*, instead of the **communicative translation** *Wet paint!*, which in many contexts would be a more appropriate solution (Newmark 1981: 54). Semantic translation is presented by Newmark as the method to be preferred for texts in which the form is as important as the content, e.g. great speeches, autobiographical and literary works, but also philosophical, scientific and technical texts showing originality of expression (see also **Peter Newmark** in the 'Key Thinkers' section).

Sense-for-sense translation, see free vs literal translation.

Shift

A shift is a linguistic deviation from the original text, a change introduced in translation with respect to either the syntactic form or the meaning of the ST. Considering the differences existing between languages (even close ones such as French and Spanish) at the structural level as well as the different cultural background of audiences in any language pair, shifts can be seen as inevitable features of translations. Indeed, given their presence in any translated text, they have traditionally represented a focus of interest for scholars describing problems of formal correspondence and **equivalence** between originals and translations. In other words, among the basic questions translation theory has tried to give an answer to, two prominent interrogatives are: how can shifts occurring in translation be described and why do they occur?

Various descriptions and taxonomies of shifts have thus been proposed, adopting different perspectives and pursuing different aims. This is reflected in the varying, and sometimes confusing, terminology used by scholars. The term 'shift' itself is used in Catford's *A Linguistic*

notion that refers to an SL element (e.g. a metaphor) for which we investigate the possibility of establishing optimal correspondence with an appropriate TL element. This investigation is not linked to any actual translation act; rather, the nature of the translation act is only speculated on in idealized terms and a translator 'persona' is postulated who 'is often ascribed almost mythical qualities: full mastery of the languages and cultures involved in the act, unlimited resources, unlimited memory, an ideal capacity to analyze and interpret texts, and the like' (Toury 2002: 62). The second sense identified by Toury ('PROBLEM$_2$') refers to actual instances of translation: it is associated with individual translation acts situated in a particular time and space. This meaning features eminently in product-oriented studies, or discourses on translation which are retrospective and see translated texts as a reservoir of realized TL solutions. In particular, PROBLEMS$_2$ are 'reconstructed entities' (Toury 2002: 64) arrived at through an examination of pairs constituted by an ST segment and its correspondent TT segment. The third sense ('PROBLEM$_3$') is also associated with a single translation event but, unlike the second, it is not retrospective in nature; rather, it considers the event as it is unfolding. It is in this sense that the notion of translation problem is usually looked at in process-oriented studies, especially where they observe the various alternatives proposed by a translator before arriving at a final TL rendering (e.g. using data obtained through **verbal reporting** or **keystroke logging**).

Translation procedure, see **translation technique**.

Translation strategy

The term strategy is used by scholars to refer either to a general mode of text transfer or to the transfer operation performed on a particular structure, item or idea found in the source text. The formal or theoretical status of the concept varies greatly as do the perspectives adopted in approaching it: some scholars have used the notion of strategy with explicitly prescriptive intentions, offering models for either the production or the assessment of translations; others have looked

at translation strategies from a descriptive point of view; others still have resorted to mixed approaches, describing certain modes of text transfer and then discussing their respective merits in accordance to a given socio-cultural programme – as does, for instance, Venuti (1995) with his distinction between **domestication** and **foreignization** as general modes of text transfer.

A broad definition is provided by Jääskeläinen (1993: 116), who sees strategies as 'a set of (loosely formulated) rules or principles which a translator uses to reach the goals determined by the translating situation in the most effective way'. Other definitions (cf. Krings 1986: 175; Lörscher 1991: 76; Chesterman 1997: 92) take a narrower view and relate the notion of strategy to that of 'problem'. A translation strategy thus becomes a procedure or method used to solve a particular kind of problem posed by the text to be translated or linked to the translation task. Different kinds of strategy are used for different kinds of problems (cf. Chesterman and Wagner 2002: 57): *search* strategies are used in order to solve search problems; *creativity* strategies are those resorted to when a 'blockage problem' emerges, i.e. when the translators 'gets stuck' on some element of the ST; finally, *textual* strategies are required for solving textual problems. This last category is the one that has so far received the most attention on the part of scholars and researchers.

Textual strategies 'have to do with how the translator manipulates the linguistic material in order to produce an appropriate target text' (Chesterman 1997: 92) and can be applied at global or local level (cf. also Jääskeläinen 1993: 116). Global strategies are applied in more than one part of a text and amount to a particular approach followed by the translator in consistently solving problems encountered throughout an ST. They can be seen as general modes of text transfer: examples include **adaptation** or the opposing strategies of **overt** and **covert** translation (House 1977, 1997). Local strategies concern shorter textual segments; they have variously been characterized as transfer operations, **shifts** or **translation techniques** and are the subject of many classifications (e.g. in Vinay and Darbelnet [1958] 1995; Nida

1964; Catford 1965; van Leuven-Zwart 1989/1990; Chesterman 1997). As noted by Chesterman (1997: 93) himself, whatever the formal or theoretical status of the notion, strategies 'provide useful conceptual tools for talking about translation, for focusing on particular things that translators seem to do, and for improving translation skills'.

Translation studies

Translation studies is a wide and varied area of enquiry having the study of translating and translations as its core. It emerged as a distinctive field of academic study over the last 50 years and, in the English-speaking world, received its current denomination by the Dutch-based American scholar James S. Holmes, in a paper delivered in 1972 (the paper, however, only gained wide circulation in the 1980s; it is reprinted in Holmes 1988). Before the current denomination, the label 'translation theory' was common. As regards other languages, denominations include *Translationswissenschaft* in German and *traductologie* in French.

Most scholars would today agree that translation studies constitutes a discipline in its own right, but opinions differ as regards both its internal structure and the nature of its connections with neighbouring disciplines such as linguistics, semiotics, comparative literature, cultural studies and anthropology. Venuti (2004: 2–6) sees translation studies as a fragmented 'emerging discipline', having different centres and peripheries and encompassing several sub-specialties; he recognizes, however, that the various approaches adopted by scholars have also been capable of 'productive syntheses'. Others scholars (e.g. Hatim 2001: 8–10), while recognizing the plurality of approaches, the diversity of their aims and objectives and some permanent scepticism on the part of both practising translators and applied linguists, see the discipline as consolidating. Others scholars still (e.g. Snell-Hornby 1988) emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies. An attempt at a unifying definition is provided in Chesterman (2004a), where translation studies is presented as having as its object of research the *relations* that

notions such as **theme/rheme** come to the fore, while at a pragmatic level utterances can be seen as units realizing **speech acts**. The consideration of one or the other aspects will influence the way a text is seen to be segmented into units for purposes of translation. Within the same concrete translation act, units of processing may be seen to differ even markedly from one another. At one point the translator may be observed to consider possible TL lexical equivalents for an individual word, while later in the process s/he may enlarge the focus of attention or processing to longer stretches of text, possibly to consider their functional or pragmatic values (e.g. in the case of proverbs or fixed expressions).

Traditionally, scholars of translation have tended to equate the unit of translation with individual words (as in Newmark 1981) or with textual segments identified syntactically (Wilss 1982). Koller (1979) notes that the greater the structural difference between two languages, the longer the units are likely to be, and vice versa. Bassnett ([1980] 2002) emphasizes how whatever unit is considered, it is to be related to the text as a whole. Using process-related data obtained through **verbal reporting** or **keystroke logging**, some studies (cf. those reported on in Alves 2003) have looked at how, in concrete translation acts, source texts are segmented by translators.

Universal of translation

The term is used to indicate a linguistic feature typically observed in translated texts and occurring as a consequence of the translation process, i.e. independently from the pairs of languages involved and not as the result of **interference** between different linguistic systems. The search for universals began in the mid-1990s (see Baker 1996) drawing from developments in translation studies and the emergence of corpus linguistics in the previous decades. In translation studies, the attention of many scholars had moved away from the relationship between the ST and the TT to the translations themselves. Meanwhile, thanks to advances in computer storage capacities, language **corpora** of increasing size were being compiled, providing material where hypotheses

about large-scale linguistic patterning could be tested. Among the first features to be hypothesized as universals of translation were **explicitation**, **simplification** and **normalization**. More recently, features such as **untypical collocations** and the under-representation of TL unique items (see **unique items hypothesis**) have been added to the list of hypothesized universals (cf. Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004; Mauranen 2007).

Most research on universals has been linguistically oriented and has relied on corpus-based methods, often starting from hypotheses that had been put forward in earlier, small-scale studies. There have also been suggestions that, beneath universals, there may be underlying processes of a cognitive nature, i.e. that translations present certain features as a result of the workings of the brain when it is engaged in translation. Such suggestions, however, still lack a rigorous application of cognitive models capable of giving reliable accounts of the translation process (Mauranen 2007: 37).

Over the years, both the concept of translation universals and the research approaches to be used in investigating them have been the object of intense debate. Further qualifications have been introduced in testing new and earlier hypothesis. Chesterman (2004b), for example, has pointed out that some hypotheses (e.g. explicitation) concern the relationship between source and translation, while others (e.g. normalization) mainly have to do with the difference between translated and non-translated texts. The former he calls *S-universals*, while the latter are termed *T-universals*.

Strong objections to the idea of translation universals have come from some scholars looking at translation from a historical point of view or drawing from socio-cultural research (cf. Mauranen 2007: 37). Such objections mainly regard the real comparability of translated and non-translated texts. Historically, there have been periods where a clear-cut distinction between translations and non-translations could not be drawn, which would make it problematic to make sweeping generalizations about *universal* features of translations. More generally, those scholars who see translation as an 'open field' (Tymoczko 2005) where different conceptualizations of translation co-exist tend

to resist the idea that translated texts may be looked at in terms of universal features.

See also: **laws of translation, norms**.

Untypical collocations

Research carried out on comparable corpora has found that translated texts tend to display collocational patterns that deviate from the patterns observed in non-translated texts in the same language. Untypical collocations have thus been proposed as a hypothetical **universal of translation**. In particular, it has been found that, at both collocational and colligational level, translations tend to favour combinations that are infrequent or absent in non-translated texts. Conversely, translations seem to have fewer instances of combinations that are frequent in native TL texts.

See: **collocation, colligation**.

meaning in the TL or is impossible for structural reasons, oblique procedures should be used. Because they are presented in relation to isolated elements, Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures are today seen as 'atomistic and prescriptive' (Snell-Hornby 2006: 24). Especially in translation teaching, however, they enjoy continued success, in that they are felt to provide a flexible set of conceptual tools to describe translating and translated texts at the linguistic level.

Other scholars have looked at shifts focusing on their role in the process of translation. Chesterman (1997), referring to them with the general label of 'strategies', sees shifts as changes made on a TL solution that is felt to be problematic or as ways of manipulating the linguistic material of the ST in order to produce an appropriate target text. He distinguishes between syntactic, semantic and pragmatic changes and sees them as ultimately motivated by the **norms** adhered to by the translator, who in the TT may variously prefer to, say, enhance communicative effectiveness, conform to the expectations of TL readers or give priority to the formal aspects of the ST.

In general, the various description and taxonomies of shifts proposed so far are probably one of the 'success stories' of translation theory: as acknowledged by Toury (1995: 85), although they cannot be used to explain why translations are the way they are, these taxonomies have nevertheless provided the field with an 'apparatus for describing all types of relationship which may obtain between target and source items'. To go back to the two questions mentioned at the beginning ('How can shifts be described and why do they occur?'), it can be said, with gross approximation, that while linguistically oriented theories have focussed on the categorization of shifts and have tended to explain them with recourse to the way different languages encode meanings, target-oriented and cultural approaches to translation use shifts as an instrumental notion to characterize different concepts of translation, which in turn are seen as motivated by a wide range of socio-cultural factors.

Simplification

The term refers to the hypothesis that translated texts tend to be simplified, linguistically, compared to non-translated texts. This is one of

the so-called **universals of translation**. Features that would testify to the simplification occurring in translated texts include (cf. Laviosa 2002): a narrower range of vocabulary; a lower ratio of lexical to running words; a lower average sentence length. Not all studies have confirmed this hypothesis. Where untypical TL usage (e.g. unusual word combinations) is found in translated texts, this could be interpreted as the opposite of simplification. In studying simplification, care should also be taken in considering the different levels of language involved (cf. Mauranen 2007: 40). For example, where translations are seen to simplify sentence structure by using fewer subordinate clauses, this could also lead to increased complexity in the TL at the textual level, as the TT becomes more fragmented and less coherent.

Skopos theory (*Skopostheorie*)

Within the **functionalist approaches** to translation that emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s, a key role was played by what has come to be known as *Skopostheorie* in German and '*skopos* theory' in English. The theory, developed by **Hans J. Vermeer** (see the 'Key Thinkers' section) with the contribution of Katharina Reiss (Reiss and Vermeer 1984; for accounts in English, see Vermeer 1989, 1996), sees translation as a form of *action*. As all action, it is governed by a certain aim or purpose, labelled *skopos* (Greek for 'purpose' or 'goal'). The *skopos*, in other words, is the overriding factor governing either the choices and decisions made during the translation process or the criteria based on which a translation is assessed. Translating is thus seen as a purposeful activity: it essentially means 'to have a skopos and accordingly transfer a [text] from its source-culture surroundings to target-culture surroundings, which by definition are different from the former' (Vermeer 1996: 39). More specifically, translation is seen by Vermeer (1986: 33) as an 'offer of information', or **Informationsangebot**, in the target language which imitates an offer of information in the source language.

As regards in particular the formal aspects of the ST, these are preserved as far as possible in the TT as long as they conform to the *skopos*. In some cases, the *skopos* may have to do precisely with the preservation of ST form, as happens in some types of **documentary**

(Kiraly 2000: 31), which has to do with the deontological aspects of the profession, such as the commitment to meet deadlines and the charging of appropriate fees.

Explicitation

The term refers to the phenomenon whereby a translated text is seen to convey information in a more explicit form than in the original text, for example by adding connectives or explanatory phrases. This can be seen either as the result of a conscious **translation technique** used by the translator (as in Vinay and Darbelnet [1958] 1995) or as a tendency inherent in translated texts. The observation of such tendency has led some scholars to formulate the so-called *explicitation hypothesis* (first proposed by Blum-Kulka 1986), which claims that translators universally tend to make things more explicit, linguistically, in the TT than they are in the ST. Compared to other **universals of translation**, this claim has received so far the most attention by researchers. It is based on the observation of how translators treat aspects such as ambiguity and unclear structures in the ST, how they use pronouns and connectives or how they tend to add explanations to obscure and **culture-bond terms** found in the ST. Care should be taken, however, in interpreting a given feature as an instance of explicitation, as other factors (such as the temporal or cultural distance between the languages involved) may have played a role in the process of translation (Mauranen 2007: 39).

Natural translation

This term is sometimes used to indicate translation as carried out 'by bilinguals in everyday circumstances and without special training for it' (Harris 1977: 99). What position does this type of translation have in translation studies? While Harris himself assigned it a central position, other scholars (e.g. Krings 1986) have rejected this view. The tendency today is indeed that of assigning **professional translation** (in a wide variety of fields) primacy as an object of study, although room is sometimes made for the study of translation as performed or discussed by individuals who would not, strictly speaking, fall within the category of professionals (think, for one, of newspaper reviewers who assess translations).

Non-binary error, see **error**.
Non-essentialism, see **essentialism**.

Normalization

Also called 'conventionalization', normalization is the hypothesis that translated texts universally tend to make use of the typical features of the TL to a greater degree than comparable non-translated texts. Translations, in other words, would appear more standardized than texts written in the TL, in that they use certain lexical items with higher frequency, tend to replace dialect in the SL with standard language in the TL, prefer unmarked grammatical constructs and tend to normalize other aspects such as punctuation. Although a few studies have given support to this hypothesis, normalization is seen by some scholars as a controversial notion. As pointed out in Mauranen (2007: 41), when normalization is discussed, it is not always clear whether it is treated as an S-universal or a T-universal (see **universals of translation**). Also, translation is frequently described as language usage characterized by untypical constructs (e.g. in terms of **collocation**), which runs counter the idea of translations as normalized texts.