

Translation research terms – a tentative glossary for moments of perplexity and dispute

Working version 2.0. December 2010

Anthony Pym

Intercultural Studies Group
Universitat Rovira i Virgili
Tarragona, Spain

The following is a list of terms with recommendations for their use in research on translation and interpreting. The list has been compiled on the basis of doubts that have arisen in discussions with students completing doctoral research within the Intercultural Studies Group at the Universitat Rovira i Virgili in Tarragona, Spain. In some cases our notes merely alert researchers to some of the ambiguities and vagaries of fairly commonplace nomenclatures. In other cases, however, we have sought to standardize terms across research projects in a particular field (for example, translator training or risk analysis). For some particular terms we recommend abstinence, mostly because indiscriminate use has bereft the word of immediate specificity. In all cases, though, our basic plea is that researchers make their terms as clear and specific as possible, since the discipline of Translation Studies is currently unable to do that for them.

Accepted and variant usages of many terms can usefully be consulted in Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), although the references are now dated, and the MonAKO glossary (http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/monako/atk/glossary_ab.shtml), among other sources.

The abbreviation *q.v.* means *quod vide* (“which see”), indicating that you might like to go and look at the thing next to the abbreviation.

Our thanks to the following for their suggestions and additions: Christy Fung-Ming Liu, Şeyda Eraslan, Natasa Pavlović, Ignacio García and Diane Howard.

Here we go:

A language, B language vs. L1, L2: The terms “A language”, “B language” and “C language” are traditionally used in translator training institutions, where they indicate the language that the trainee has nominated as their primary or strongest (A), then the languages in which they need most training (B and C). A complete bilingual might thus request “double A” status of some kind, and many learners will effectively have a B1 and a B2 (i.e. two “second” languages at about the same level). More or less the same meanings

are used by interpreters when naming their working languages. On the other hand, the terms “L1”, “L2”, etc. are used in the study of language acquisition, sometimes to indicate the *order* in which languages are acquired, and more normally to separate the primary or “mother” tongue from the others. Although the two nomenclatures often overlap (the trainee’s A language is usually their L1), there is a certain logic in separating the criteria of language acquisition from those of translator training. Recommendation: **Leave as is.**

Agency: Term traditionally used in sociology and political science to describe the subject’s capacity to carry out actions, i.e. the subject’s relative **power** (*q.v.*). A group of translation scholars has agreed that it means “willingness and ability to act” (Koskinen and Kinnunen 2010: 6). The insistence on “willingness” introduces psychological dimensions that could seem peripheral to the sociological use of the term, inviting myriad confusions with *habitus* (*q.v.*). It nevertheless makes sense to ask not just what effective scope or permission a person has to bring about change, but also how that person can receive or conceive of the idea to bring about change, and that second dimension might concern “willingness”. As such, the problem of agency is largely the philosophical question of free will: if we are determined by our social environment, how is it that we are then able to change that social environment? The concept of agency evokes that problem but does not solve it. Solutions might nevertheless lie in the contradictory social determinations of the translatorial subject, especially given the many possible intercultural locations available and the capacity of people to move between locations. Recommendation: Refer to “agency” in the sense of “willingness and ability to act”, but do not assume that the concept in itself does anything more than name a problem.

Arguments: Term used by Pavlović (2010) for the self-evaluations and self-justifications translators use in Think Aloud Protocols (*q.v.*), such as “sounds better”, “this is what they wanted to say”, “this is what the reader will understand” or “the rule says this”. Recommendation: The term is clearer than the term “evaluation”, although the list of possible arguments still needs some formal shape.

Audiovisual translation: Translation that accompanies spoken language and visual communication, as in film, plays, opera, videogames, mobile telephony, computer games, indeed any electronic communication involving sound and images. Recommendation: Respect the term, but always with the awareness that the field is huge, subject to myriad constraints, and difficult to generalize about.

Autonomous vs. heteronomous recruitment: Terms proposed by Cronin (2002) to distinguish between recruiting intermediaries on the client’s side, and recruiting them from the “other” side. Thus, when Columbus went in search of the Indies he took a Jewish interpreter with him (on his side, hence “autonomous”); when that interpreter proved useless in the Caribbean, Columbus captured some natives to turn them into interpreters (from the other side, hence “heteronomous”, and subject to suspicion). The distinction is valid in many situations, and a general shift can be observed from the heteronomous to the autonomous, in order to ensure greater trustworthiness. The terms, however, are far from transparent (“autonomous” could also mean “independent”, which is far from the case

here). The more significant problem is that intermediaries often come from social groups that are wholly neither on one side nor the other: Jews and Mozarabs in Medieval Hispania, the Jewish interpreter with Columbus, or Diego Colón, the putative son of Columbus born of interaction with the cultural other. Recommendation: If you think there are only two sides, why not “home recruitment” vs. “foreign recruitment”? At least people stand a chance of knowing what you are talking about.

Bitext: Term proposed by Harris (1988, 2010) for aligned segments of start texts and target texts in their original textual order of presentation. That is, with the whole start text aligned with the whole of the target text. The difference between bitexts and aligned corpora is that the latter are designed for use without concern for textual linearity (i.e. the original order of the segments). The term “bitext” is nevertheless loosely used without reference to that linearity, such that it is applied to any pair or aligned segments. In this sense, it is used as a loose synonym for “translation memory” or “translation memory database”. Harris (1988) originally presented “bi-text” as a psychological concept describing the two texts existing momentarily in the mind of the translating translator, although there is scant evidence to suggest this actually happens. Recommendation: The term can be useful, although it is fraught with divergent usages and one can almost as easily talk about “aligned texts”, “aligned segments”, “translation memory database”, and so on. There would seem to be no overriding reason for the hyphenated form “bi-text”.

Brief vs. instructions: The term “brief” has commonly been used to render the German *Auftrag*, which is what *Skopos* theory uses to talk about the instructions that a translator receives from a client. A “brief” is more like what a lawyer receives from a client: a general open-ended mandate to reach a goal or solve a problem. Vermeer, writing in English, uses the term “commission”, which is like what an artistic painter receives: “fill this space up with whatever you like”. Gouadec, on the other hand, believes that the client should fix a maximum of aspects of the text to be produced; he thus proposes “job description”. The problem here is the translation profession never really uses the terms “brief”, “commission”, or “job description”. What you get, at best, is a set of instructions. The default term should thus be **instructions**.

CAT tools: The term “computer-aided translation” (or “computer-assisted translation”) is now a misnomer, since computers are involved in almost all translations jobs, and in a lot of interpreting as well. The term should be replaced by clear reference to the technologies actually involved (e.g. translation memories, machine translation, terminology database). Recommendation: **Avoid**.

Checking: Term used in European standard EN-15038 for changes made to the translation by the translator, as opposed to **revisions** (*q.v.*) and **reviews** (*q.v.*), which are carried out by people other than the translator (cf. **TEP**). This term does not seem to have gained standardized status in industry or research, and it has nothing within its semantics to suggest that only the translator can do this. Recommendation: Prefer “**self-revision**”, at least for the purposes of research.

Chuchotage vs. whisper interpreting: This is where the interpreter sits next to (or somehow behind) the person receiving the rendition, and speaks quietly so as not to disrupt the wider setting (e.g. a conference). Since “chuchoter” means “to whisper”, and not much else, there is no possible justification for the French term, unless you want to attract Mortisha Adams. Recommendation: **whisper interpreting**, although “whispered interpreting” can also be found and does make sense.

Collaborative translation: Synonym of “crowd-sourcing” (*q.v.*), “community translation” (*q.v.*), part of CT3 (*q.v.*), etc., used for group translating where the work is largely voluntary (i.e. unpaid in financial terms). “Collaboration” in English always sounds like illicit help given to the enemy, as in the case of the French who helped the Nazi occupation of France. More appropriate terms in English might be “participative translation” or “volunteer translation”. Then again, if the idea of collaboration connotes something illicit or underground, those values might not be entirely out of place in many situations. Recommendation: **Volunteer translation** (*q.v.*).

Collaborative translation protocol: Term used by Pavlović (2007) for the verbal report of a group of (student) translators who are working together on the one translation. This sense is not to be confused with “collaborative translation” (*q.v.*) as a synonym of “crowd-sourcing” (*q.v.*), “community translation” (*q.v.*), etc. Recommendation: Since the voluntary aspect is missing here, it might be better to refer to “group translation protocols”.

Community interpreting: Term used to cover language mediation in medical encounters, asylum hearings, and police stations, often extended to include court interpreting. Alternatives are “public service interpreting” (especially in the United Kingdom), “cultural interpreting”, “community-based interpreting”, and “dialogue interpreting”, which refers more to the triadic nature of the encounters rather than to their institutional settings and overlaps with the term “liaison interpreting”, which specifies two-way mediated communication. The problem with the reference to “community” is that all translating and interpreting involves communities of one kind or another, and should involve ethical issues similar to the ones dealt with here, so there is no substantial specificity indicated. Further, the interactions are hardly from within any pristine language community as such: they involve the provision or intrusion of government services, and thus encounters *between* communities. These ideological aspects are scarcely neutral. A further problem is current use of the term “community translation” (*q.v.*) in a very different sense (“community translation” usually involves voluntary participation; “community interpreting” can be carried out by professionals). Recommendation: use the more specific institutional terms wherever possible: **court interpreting**, **medical interpreting**, etc., refer to **dialogue interpreting** as the more general term, and refer to the ethical issues involved in all mediated communication.

Community translation: Term used for the practice whereby non-professionals translate software or websites that they actually use (cf. collaborative translation, crowd-sourcing, fan translation, user-based translation, lay translation, citizen translation, etc.). The problem here is that the term can also (in the United Kingdom and Australia, at least) refer to the use

of written translation in the areas of “community interpreting”, which has so far been quite a different sphere. The ideological problems are moreover similar to those of “community interpreting” in that legitimacy is accorded to some kinds of community (often web-based virtual communities) but not to others. Recommendation: **Volunteer translation** (*q.v.*).

Comparable corpora vs. parallel texts; parallel corpora vs. bitexts: A terminological mess created when Mona Baker (1995) decided that corpus linguistics should use the term “comparable corpora” to compare a body of translations in a language (e.g. legal texts translated into English) with a body of non-translations in the same language (e.g. legal texts originally written in English). Translation scholars had previously adopted the term “parallel texts” to describe the same kind of comparison (e.g. to translate a sales contract into English, first find a sales contract written in English and use it as a “parallel text”), a term that Chesterman has since sought to replace with “non-translation” (NT) (*q.v.*). To make matters worse, Baker then decided to use the term “parallel corpora” for what previous scholars had termed “bitexts” (sets of texts where segments in one language are aligned with corresponding segments in another language). That was not a red-letter day for the unity of Translation Studies. Recommendation: If you are doing corpus work, define your terms. For more general work, stick to **non-translation** (NT) and **bitext**, when appropriate.

Competence: Currently popular term for the set of things that a professional knows (knowledge), is able to do (skills), and is able to do while adopting a certain relation to others (dispositions or attitudes). “Translator competence” would thus be the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to become a translator. The concept can be reduced to just two components: declarative knowledge (“knowing that”) and operational knowledge (“knowing how”). As such, the term “competence” has very little to do with the way the same term was used in (Chomsky’s) linguistics to indicate a set of rules that underlie performance. A further problem is that most models of translator competence include numerous components (such as “knowledge of Language A”, “knowledge of translation technologies”, “ability to apply translation strategies”, “confidence”, “speed”) without any assurance that the list is not open-ended or subject to radical historical change. There is no empirical evidence to indicate that the components are indeed separate, or that they are combined such that learning in one component entails progress in others.

Recommendation: Avoid assumptions that translator competence is a recognized unified and stable object; prefer, wherever possible, the more specific terms **skill**, **knowledge**, and **disposition**, with degrees of **expertise** operative within all three.

Constrained translation: Term proposed by Mayoral et al. (1988) for the basic view that all translations are subject to a number of non-linguistic constraints, from temporal and spatial restrictions through to the need to not contradict information conveyed by sound or image. This is a very neat view that seems not to have had the repercussion it merits, especially in the field of audiovisual translation (*q.v.*). The basic terminological problem is that all translating is constrained in one way or another, so the term is not really saying much. The boundaries between the linguistic and the non-linguistic have also been blurred by work in the area of pragmatics. Recommendation: Talk freely about “**translation**”

constraints”, no matter whether they are linguistic or not, in full awareness that some constraints are always present.

CT3: Siglum for “community, crowdsourced and collaborative translation” (cf. **community translation, crowdsourcing**). Here it looks like someone just gave up trying to find a name for the thing, then retreated into the comfort of brainless tech-talk. Recommendation: **Volunteer translation** (*q.v.*).

Crowdsourcing: Term coined in 2006 for the practice whereby non-professionals perform tasks that would otherwise be out-sourced to independent professional agencies. In the field of translation it functions as a synonym for community translation, fan translation, user-based translation, lay translation, self-organized citizen translation, etc. It has been used for translation practices at Google, Facebook, Microsoft, Adobe, Symantec, Sun, and Twitter. Although now widespread in technology businesses, the main disadvantage of the term is that it is a cheap mutation of the standard business practice of “out-sourcing”, which is the only way anyone could justify the word “crowd” (because it sounds like “out”). The term thus lacks specific reference. Recommendation: **Volunteer translation** (*q.v.*). The hyphenated “crowd-sourcing” has the virtue of marginally greater clarity and significantly smaller presumption of widespread acceptance.

Cultural translation: Term with many different meanings, most of them equally vague and ideological. Uses range from British social anthropology in the 1960s through to Bhabha and followers. The general notion is that translation is not just of texts, but of entire cultural representations and identities. When an ethnographer describes a tribe, they thus translate a culture into the language of ethnography; museums offer iconic and linguistic translations of entire cultures; migrants translate themselves, forming cultural hybrids, and so on. Recommendation: If you want to use the term, specify what you mean. If not, **avoid**. Our general preference here is for a discipline focused on communication across different cultures and languages, rather than processes that occur within just one culture or language.

Cultural turn: One of numerous “turns” (*q.v.*) that are supposed to have transformed the whole of Translation Studies. Since concerns with wider cultural issues can be found as far back as the Russian Formalists and the Prague School, there is little evidence of one unitary transformation having taken place at the time of the “cultural turn” promoted by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990). Recommendation: **Avoid** the term, but by all means consider cultures.

Culture: A word with notoriously numerous definitions, none of which can be wrong. One supposes that a culture comprises codifications seen as belonging to some people but not to others. It is difficult, however, to attempt to draw up lists of such codifications, and often hazardous to assume that they are specific to just one culture. A further problem is that some uses assume “national cultures”, where certain codes (dress, meals, hygiene, etc.) are believed to be associated with national languages. That sort of homogeneity or concurrence rarely hold up to empirical analysis. Others talk on the level of “group culture”, “company culture”, or “professional culture”, and it is here that it might make sense to talk about a “translation cultures” (*q.v.*) or “intercultures” (*q.v.*). A more elegant approach is to let

cultures define themselves, simply by positing that the limits of a culture are marked by the points in time and space where translations are required. Recommendation: Prefer more specific terms, or at least add adjectives to the word “culture”. More generally, try to test the existence and limits of cultures, rather than just assume them.

Culture-specific items: Linguistic references that are supposed to indicate a specific culture, such as names of people, names of streets, specific terms for food, or names for currency units; also known as “realia” (as if they were the only reality). The problem is that most of these items are actually specific to sets of cultures, so the term is misleading. Recommendation: We suggest **location markers** (*q.v.*).

Descriptive vs. prescriptive Translation Studies: A deceptive opposition, necessary at the time when translation was being taught and studied on the basis of prescriptions of how to produce a “good” translation. Descriptive studies would then set out to reveal the nature of actual translations, showing that what is “good” depends on culturally relative norms. The opposition is deceptive because 1) the act of description is never free of value judgments (we describe only the aspects we are interested in, and thus are not entirely free from prescriptive intent), and 2) prescriptions are inevitably based on experience of actual translations (and thus on elements of description). One way to retain the distinction is to suggest, as does Chesterman (1999), that prescriptions are in fact predictions of future success or failure, based on accumulated descriptive experience. Recommendation: Describe, but do not pretend to be neutral or unbiased; declare your interests, and reflect upon them.

Direct vs. indirect translation: “Indirect translation” is usually the historical process of translation from an intermediary version. For example, Poe was translated into French by Baudelaire, then from French into Spanish by a number of poets. The Spanish versions would then be called “indirect translations”, and the first translation, into French, could then logically be called a “direct translation”. Indirect translations are sometimes called “retranslations” (*q.v.*), which is simply confusing, or “mediated translations”, which makes some sense (except that translators themselves are mediators, so all translations could be mediated), or “relay translations” (on the model of “relay interpreting”), or “second-hand translations” (suggesting the inferiority of “second-hand cars”). These terms are sometimes mixed up with *traducción directa*, which is the Spanish term for work into the translator’s A language, and Gutt’s use of “indirect translation” to describe a translation that does not aim at interpretative resemblance to the source text. In short, we have created a mess. Dollerup (1998) argues that the term “indirect translation” is misleading and “should be kept for the situations where two parties must communicate by means of a third intermediary realisation which has no legitimate audience” (1998: 19). Dollerup proposes the term “relay translation” (calqued on “relay interpreting”, *q.v.*), defined as “a mediation from source to target language in which the translational product has been realised in another language than that of the original; the defining feature is that the intermediary translation has an audience, that is consumers of its own” (1998: 19). The problem here seems to be that the “relay” idea describes the action of the first translator (Baudelaire in our example), whereas what is significant is the action of the second translator (the

translators from French into Spanish). Recommendation: In the absence of any really happy solution, stick with **indirect translation** and accept **mediated translation**. Avoid the others.

Directional equivalence: The kind of equivalence for which there is no guarantee that translation of a textual item from language A to language B will follow exactly the same path as translation from Language B to language A. That is, back-translation cannot be a test of equivalence.

Disclosure communication: Term we propose for communication situations where one party finds it difficult to give sensitive information, as in rape cases or crime-related information. Disclosure may be enhanced by use of languages close to the subjects, and by technological alternatives to telephonic communication. It would be a particular kind of “sensitive communication” (*q.v.*).

Domestication vs. foreignization: Version of the classical dichotomy between “two methods of translation”, proposed by Schleiermacher (1813) and resurrected by Venuti (1995). When we try to organize translation shifts (*q.v.*), the most obvious macro-approaches are domestication and foreignization in the sense that most shifts privilege either the target culture or the source culture. But there are many solutions that do not fit comfortably into this dichotomy. It might pay to think in terms of a horizontal axis of possible cultural worlds, with foreignization at one end and domestication at the other. Then there is a vertical axis of “amount of information given”, with omission at the bottom and pedagogical translation (explicitation, footnotes etc.) at the top. So all the solutions find a place in relation to those two axes. Recommendation: Whatever you do, question the simple binarism.

Editing: The making of amendments to a text in a situation where linear progression is either absent (in the case of an automatically generated text, from MT for example) or completed (i.e. the drafting or translating has been completed). Editing may apply to translations or non-translations, although the term **revising** (*q.v.*) (self-revising or other-revising) is to be preferred for work on translations. When machine-translation output is being corrected or amended, the most appropriate term is **postediting** (*q.v.*) (since “revising” would imply that an entire human drafting process has been completed). The various types of editing can be found in standard textbooks (copy-editing, stylistic editing, structural editing) and can be adapted to suit the problem to be solved.

Empirical research: The creation of knowledge by observation, experience or experiment. Knowledge can also be created non-empirically through reason and speculation (thought experiments). Something between the two might be the creation of knowledge through the critical reading of texts, or the creative invention of new hypotheses that then have to be tested in some way. Translation research should have an empirical component because 1) the intercultural nature of translation introduces a high degree of cultural relativity, and 2) translational relations enter into the research process itself. On both these levels, the object

exceeds its theorization, and must thus be met with constantly. Recommendation: Think creatively and then try to test everything, as far as possible.

Equivalence: A widespread term for a relation that many believe in and no one can prove beyond the level of terminology (*q.v.*). We should accept that equivalence has no ontological foundation, since translation problems (*q.v.*) allow for more than one viable solution. This means that, in the field of translation problems thus defined, equivalence is always “*belief* in the translation as equivalent of an ST”. Recommendation: Always make it clear that equivalence means **equivalence-belief**, and indicate who is supposed to be holding that belief.

Escort interpreting: Term once used for services where an interpreter accompanies someone or a group of people to provide language mediation. In some countries the term seems to have died a natural death thanks to the rise of “escort agencies”, which provide prostitutes of one kind or another. Recommendation: Avoid the term (if not the sex workers) and look for something better, perhaps “**liaison interpreting**”.

Expert translator: According to Harris (2010), “expert translators are people who have had training for it”. But since we all know trainees who have little expertise, it seems difficult to justify the assumption that training alone leads to expertise. Recommendation: **Avoid**, unless you explain what you mean by expertise and you find all its elements.

Expertise: The performance of a task with a high degree of 1) socially recognized success, 2) efficiency and 3) holistic information processing. There are many variations on this definition. Recommendation: Use only in situations where at least these three elements are involved. Otherwise, be more specific. Do not assume that trainees and all professions have expertise.

Explicitation: Term for cases where a translation makes explicit something that is implicit in the ST. This may involve syntactic expansion (e.g. “the girl I saw” vs. “the girl *that* I saw”) and the provision of lexical information that is considered common knowledge to ST users but not to TT users (e.g. “Huesca” might become “the city of Huesca in northern Spain”). Care should be taken to restrict the term to the implicit/explicit criterion, so that it does not swallow up all forms of **explanation** (footnotes, translators’ prefaces, etc.). That distinction is perhaps only strictly tenable in the field of syntax, where grammar words may be optional. Some also see explicitation as the use of specific rather than general lexical items (e.g. rendering “brother” as “younger brother” or “older brother”, as is obligatory in Hungarian and Chinese), although down that road you soon run into trouble determining universal criteria for specificity. Recommendation: Reserve “explicitation” for optional operations involving syntactic expansion, since that is the only usage that might say something about the translator’s cognitive disposition. Use other terms (“explanation”, “more specific lexis”) for the rest.

Fluency: In translation process research, the “ability to produce (a large number of) tentative solutions for a given problem by relying on internal resources” (Pavlović 2007: 87, working from Kussmaul and others).

Fluency quotient: In Pavlović’s process research (2007: 88), the total number of proposed solutions divided by the number of problems.

Function: What a thing can do or be used for, as opposed to what it is: a pen is to write with, a book is to be read, and so on. A piece of language can be analyzed in terms of its structural properties or in terms of the actions in which it can be used, and the latter could broadly embrace a range of “functions”. Functions can be related to translation in several ways: 1) the pragmatic analysis of ST and TT as utterances (where “function” becomes a range of possible actions), 2) the relation of TT to an externally derived purpose or *Skopos* (where “function” equals a desired action or effect, expressed from a position of relative power), or 3) the position of the TT with a cultural system (where “function” is a property of systemic positioning, as in Bourdieu or Even-Zohar). Since these are three quite different senses, you should make your meaning clear. Note that a theory is “functional” if it works, and “**functionalist**” if it focuses on functions rather than forms. There is little historical reason to accept that German-language *Skopos* theory was at any stage the only functionalist game in town. Recommendation: If in doubt, avoid the term. If you must use it, say what you mean (and give at least one example).

Globalization: Term most useful when it refers to the incremental effect and consequences of greater efficiencies in communication and transportation systems, which increase movements of merchandise, labor and information to the extent that economies cannot be wholly controlled at the national level. Globalization is thus primarily an economic consequence of technological change. There seems little clarity in using the term in other senses, for example: 1) “going global” in a business, when preparing to market a product in other languages and cultures (thus making “globalization” a part of localization discourse), or 2) imperialistic impositions of just one culture or language on the whole world (thus leading to collocations like “fight globalization”). One of the technical problems here is that the economic process is supposed to lead to regional specializations, whereas cultural uses of the term tend to assume global homogenization. Recommendation: Stick to the **technological-economic** sense; use more specific terms for what communication companies, fast-food chains and activists do; adopt an empirical (*q.v.*) approach to iniquities, at least while doing research.

Habitus: Term used by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu to cover the individual’s dispositions to act in a certain way and adopt certain positions in a field. The term is frequently used in the sociology of translators, perhaps without adequate reflection on what it means. In Bourdieu, the concept has some serious advantages: 1) it overcomes sterile oppositions between objective social structures and the individual’s subjective views of the world (what people think is not just a set of illusions; it actually guides the way they construct social life), 2) *habitus* is not just in what people say, but in the way they act, feel, think, and move their bodies (i.e. it is “embodied”), 3) your *habitus* develops and changes

throughout your life, as you interact with different social structures, so the concept is very dynamic - a profession can be seen as a historically developing *habitus*. The term's serious disadvantages are: 1) it covers over the problem of agency (*q.v.*), without resolving it, 2) it is hard to pronounce (a Latin word pronounced in English in the French way, with a /y/ as the last vowel?), 3) it is not common language, so it sounds pretentious many situations, 4) translation scholars tend to use the term in a reductive way (e.g. "the habitus of translators is to be subservient") or as a surrogate for simpler and more understandable terms (e.g. "socialization", "professionalization", "disposition"), 5) its advantages are operative within the sociology of Bourdieu, and not all researchers might want to adopt that kind of sociology (since it says little about interculturality or cooperation; it is a sociology of a nation state comprising antagonistic groups), and 6) a lot of research lacks enough subject data to talk about *habitus* in any full way (e.g. if the textual analysis of translations suggests a tendency to adopt certain solutions, that says nothing about the thoughts, feelings or bodily aspects of the translator's activity – what you have is a tendency to adopt certain textual solutions; you cannot say anything interesting about *habitus*). Recommendations: Keep *habitus* in italics, to indicate a foreign technical term; use (set of) **dispositions** when appropriate; do not use *habitus* to avoid asking who has a degree of effective power (agency, *q.v.*).

Hypothesis: A simple, clear statement relating two or more variables in such a way that the relation can be tested empirically (*q.v.*). A good hypothesis contains no direct value judgments (e.g. you cannot talk about a "good translation" as if everyone agreed what the term means), no modals (e.g. you cannot say "retranslations *can* have more success than first translations" or "translators *should* be visible"), should not be obvious (e.g. it cannot be a definition or a tautology) and should be important to someone. Recommendation: It is not uncommon to find the form "*an hypothesis*", although it would seem to be supported by no good logic.

Intercultures: Secondary cultures that operate in the overlaps of primary cultures. Examples might be European royalty, diplomatic culture, monastic orders, international bureaucracies like the UN and the European Commission, and scientific communities at the higher levels. **Professional intercultures** are then those that use their intermediary position in order to provide communication services between those primary cultures. As such, translators and interpreters might belong to professional intercultures more than to just one primary culture. As such, the concept of intercultures is more sociological and specific than the association of translators with nomadic culture. Professional intercultures may conform to the following principles: 1) they tend to be transitory, 2) membership is based on *diversity* of provenance, 3) their agency grows with increasing technology, and 4) with increasing power, they enable agents to become principles. Some intercultures may evolve into primary cultures, as in the case of Spanish-speaking Mexican culture. Recommendation: Explore.

Internationalization: A clear misnomer for the preparation of documents for efficient translation (or localization) into several languages. In localization discourse this is sometimes expressed as the "removal of culture-specific items", which effectively places

the document in the technical interculture of the localization process itself (since there is no text outside of culture). Internationalization can involve disambiguation, other degrees of controlled language, the provision of glosses, and the removal of elements that are likely to create problems downstream (*q.v.*). In any case, nations have nothing to do with it.

Recommendation: One can think of several better terms (“delocalization”, “interlocalization”, “pre-localization”, perhaps), but the industry has chosen this one; it seems to have stuck, so we are stuck with it.

Interpreting vs. interpretation: Two terms for spoken mediation between languages. “Interpreting” began to replace “interpretation” in the 1990s, on the argument that it was slightly less likely to be mixed up with “interpretation” as the general making sense of texts. Many theorists and practitioners in the United States have nevertheless clung to “interpretation”, perhaps with the same self-sufficiency with which they measure the world in miles and gallons. Recommendation: **interpreting**.

Intervention: When a footballer is running fast, and you put your body in the way so that they run in a different direction or fall over screaming, you have intervened. In theory, every human action may influence some other human action, so we are intervening all the time. If the term is going to say something, it has to be restricted. Further, the intervening action (putting your body in the way) is itself the result of previous interventions (you want to help your team, or extract revenge for a kick in the shins), so it is difficult to say that we are studying anything in isolation. Ideological activists variously call on us to intervene, then point out that we are always intervening anyway. To become half-way meaningful, **translator intervention** should refer to sets of translation shifts (*q.v.*) that 1) are relatively patterned throughout a translation, 2) can be attributed to a conscious aim for which there is external evidence, and 3) may be the result of individual or collective agency (so there may be more than the “translator” involved).

Intranslations vs. extranlations: Terms proposed by Ganne and Minon (1992) for the translations that come into a language (*intraductions*, in French) and those that go out of the same language (*extraductions*), particularly when you are charting the numbers of translations. Recommendation: The neologism “out-translation” might be clearer in English, but why quibble?

Inverse translation: Occasionally seen as a translation of “traducción inversa”, which is the way the Spanish language has sought to describe work into the translator’s non-native languages (L2, L3, etc.). Since the term suggests you are going the wrong way (when translators in smaller cultures often have to work this way), it is ideologically loaded and professionally indefensible. Recommendation: **L2 translation** (although it may also be L3, etc.).

Laws of translation: Term proposed by Toury (1995) for general tendencies that distinguish translations from non-translations, no matter what the language pair or directionality, and propose explanations for the distinctions. Toury proposes two laws. The law of growing **standardization** can be understood in the following way: “The bigger the

textual unit, the more the translation of that unit conforms to the standards of the target culture” (thus “growing standardization”). The law of **interference** might then run like this: “The more prestigious the source culture, the closer the translation will be to the source text” (hence greater “interference”). There are many rival formulations. Recommendation: Insist that the laws concern tendencies and explanations based on non-translational factors (e.g. prestige, size of units).

Laws vs. universals of translation: Rival terms for general tendencies for translations to differ from non-translations. The distinction is complicated by the use of the term “universal” in the Tel Aviv School in the 1980s, prior to Toury’s 1995 use of the term “law”. The so-called “universals” tend to concern specific linguistic variables that can be measured as such. A “law” would then be a generalization based on a series of proposed universals and related to an explanatory variable. Thus, the “universals” proposed by the Tel Aviv School in the 1980s would all seem to support Toury’s proposed law of increasing standardization, although they did not posit causal explanations. Recommendation: Consider the full range of translation activities before believing in any proposed law or universal.

Lay translation: Term sometimes proposed for non-professional translation, without great success, apparently. Recommendation: **Non-professional translation.**

Loan vs. calque: Terms used by Vinay and Darbelnet to describe two types of translation solutions (*q.v.*), although they call them “procédés”, “procedures” (*q.v.*). A **loan** is use of the same word (e.g. “bon voyage” as an expression in English); **calque**, on the other hand, is the borrowing of a grammatical pattern (e.g. the English term “Governor General”, on the model of “Gouverneur général”). This distinction opens a can of worms. “Loan” could equally be called “transference”, “transcription” or “borrowing”, and it is hard to say if it should include the Spanish translation of “football” as “fútbol”. As for calque, some see it as involving the generation of a translation by translating the *components* of a source-language expression (e.g. “football” translated as “balompié”, composed of “balón” [ball] + “pié”). [foot], or “Jederman” to render “Everyman”). Then what do we do for Asian languages rendering Western languages, where the main choice often concerns which script to use? Recommendation: Describe the linguistic level at which the transformation is observed, in an ad hoc way to suit the research project, without confusing the description with any cognitive process. Thus, for example: “transcription” (“McDonald’s” is written like that in many languages), script transformation (“Макдоналдс” is the name in Russian), phonetic imitation (マクドナルド in Japanese; “Jacques Chirac” becomes “Žaks Širaks” in Latvian), morphological translation (“balompié”), syntactic imitation (“Governor General”), or whatever linguistic levels suit your purposes.

Localization: Term used in the late 1980s to describe the commercial translation of software, and since extended to talk about a “localization industry”. In some usages, “localization” should only refer to work on digitized content. In others, it is a mode of translation paradoxically defined by the incorporation of “internationalization” (*q.v.*) into the workflow. Recommendation: Use with respect to the specific industry workflows.

Location markers: Term we propose for the linguistic elements that situate a scene in a specific historical period and/or geographical place: names of people, streets, currency, food, dress, etc. Sometimes called “culture-specific items” (*q.v.*) or “realia”, these items do nothing but mark a location. Recommendation: Privilege this term.

Loyalty: Term proposed by Christiane Nord (1988) for the translator’s ethical responsibility to the people and cultures involved in the communication act. The concept thus adds an interpersonal dimension to the notion of **fidelity**, which Nord believe refers only to relations with texts. Nord stresses that the communication participants should not be cheated, so if the translator departs from their expectations, then the nature of the departure and the reasons behind it should be explained. The main problem with the concept is that it does not really help the translator in cases where people make contradictory claims, such that the translator must side more with one party than the other. The concept underlies an ethics that seems very conservative (“give people what they expect”) and idealistic (as if compatibility and neutrality were easily attainable). Recommendation: Do not assume that this is a clear or uncontested concept.

Manipulation School: Term used for the translation scholars brought together in the book *The Manipulation of Literature* edited by Theo Hermans in 1985. The term has no technical status and no descriptive value in relation to the systemic thought of the literary scholars who came together at that stage to talk about translation. Recommendation: **Avoid**.

Marked vs. unmarked: In lexicography, the contrast between a neutral item (“unmarked”) and a less usual item (“marked”): so *host* would be unmarked and *hostess* would be marked. In more general translation theory this becomes a powerful but perhaps misleading shorthand for the opposition between low-frequency (“marked”) and high-frequency (“unmarked”) linguistic items, where frequency can be measured on the basis of a text or a wider corpus of the language concerned. The power of the concept resides in the idea that the translator intuitively picks out what is normal in a ST scene and renders it as what is normal in the TT scene, operating in terms of felt frequencies rather than linguistic transformations. The misleading part is that there are only two terms here, when frequencies obviously give us continuous variables. Recommendation: Talk about relative **markedness**, and explore the psychological possibilities.

Modulation: see “transposition”.

Multimedia translation: Translation that involves more than one medium (e.g. sound plus image). As a field, it is marked by a plurality of translation constraints (see “constrained translation”)

Native translator: Term coined by Toury and accepted by Harris (2010) for “people who have had no formal training in translating but who have picked up its skills by observation and experience and acquired its socially accepted norms”. Since the associations of nativism or indigeneity are unjustified here, some better term should be sought.

Recommendation: “**untrained translator**” or “**paraprofessional translator**” (*q.v.*), with recognition that they may attain high standards.

Natural equivalence: Deceptive term for the kind of equivalence that can be tested on the basis of back-translation. For example, “tomography” translates as “tomography”, which back-translates as “tomography”. This creates the illusion that equivalents exist in languages prior to the intervention of translations. The term is deceptive because these equivalents are almost always the result of technical or otherwise “artificial” languages. Recommendation: Handle with care, lest someone think you actually believe in naturalness or neutrality.

Natural translator: Term proposed by Harris (2010) for “people who do translation of a simple kind without having had any training in translation, either formal or informal.” This seems clearer and less leading than the alternatives “unprofessional translator” (*q.v.*) and “native translator” (*q.v.*), but the suggestion of innateness remains problematic. Recommendation: Prefer **untrained translator**.

Non-translation (NT): Term proposed by Chesterman (2004: 44) for texts in the target language on the same or similar topic as the translation. They are “called ‘parallel’ texts by some scholars, ‘comparable’ texts by others, and ‘original’ texts by still others. To avoid confusion, it is called ‘non-translated’ text; this gives the convenient abbreviation ‘NT’ to go with ST and TT” (2004: 44). The only problem here is that non-translations could also conceivably include texts in the source language, or indeed the ST itself. Recommendation: **NT**, in the strict sense offered by Chesterman.

Norm: Sociological term used by Toury (1995) to describe shared cultural preferences reinforced by sanctions for non-compliance. For example, translations of verse into French were traditionally in prose, and a translation that did not adhere to this norm would not be taken seriously as a translation (i.e. it would be penalized for not complying). Norms thus operate on a level between absolute rules and individual idiosyncrasies. The term is sometimes misused as 1) a synonym for “rule”, perhaps because the Spanish term *norma* does indeed mean rule or regulation, and 2) a statistical regularity, which in itself does not indicate anything about sanctions for non-compliance. Recommendation: **Use** the term but avoid the two misunderstandings.

Novice vs. professional translator/interpreter: The term “novice” usually refers to someone who has received training but lacks professional experience. In process studies, novices are often Masters-level students. Since the term is also sometimes used for people who have received no training at all, and given that some Masters students perform better than a lot of experienced professionals, care should be taken not to assume relative ignorance or non-professionalism. The translation profession also uses terms such as “untrained translator”, “junior translator”, or “inexperienced translator”, and Interpreting Studies might prefer “interpreter candidate”. Recommendation: State exactly what you mean by “novice”, and use a more specific term if possible (“untrained translators”, “natural translators” (*q.v.*), “final-year Masters students”, etc.).

Online revisions: Changes to a translation made by the translator while they are still translating (i.e. during the drafting phase). Does anyone really talk about “offline revisions”? Recommendation: Prefer “**in-draft**” **revisions**, or “in-draft revising”, since the term “online” can refer to many other things as well (for example, your computer having Internet access).

Optimization quotient: In Pavlović’s process research (2007: 88-89), a number that “shows which of the proposed tentative solutions – “in order of appearance” – is on average chosen as the selected solution. A higher number indicates that the translators tended to choose ‘later’ solutions rather than ‘earlier’.”

Orientation: The term “orientation” or “orientation phase” is used by Jakobsen and Alves to describe the set of actions (*q.v.*) the translator undertakes prior to the actual drafting of the translation. This is confusing, since the translator’s general approach to the project, their global strategy, might also be described as an “orientation”. Recommendation: “**Preparation**” or “preparation phase”, or “pre-drafting”, at a push.

Parallel text: For traditional translation scholars and trainers, a text in the target language on the same general topic as the ST. Such parallel texts are extremely useful sources for terminology and phraseology, and can be fed into small purpose-specific corpora. Unfortunately the term has been confused by the rival terminology of corpus linguistics (see “comparable corpora”) and it would seem prudent to withdraw from that tussle. Recommendation: If we use **non-translation** (NT), as recommended by Chesterman, “parallel text” may safely be put out to pasture.

Paraprofessional translators/interpreters: Term we propose for the wide range of people who engage in translation activities without having specialized training or for whom translation is not the main source of income. This term seems preferable to the alternatives “non-professional” or “unprofessional”. Many such translators have expert skills in fields associated with particular translation projects. They may thus participate in **collaborative translation** (*q.v.*).

Paratext: The “liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher and reader: titles, forewords, epigraphs and publishers’ jacket copy are part of a book’s private and public history” (Genette 1987). A paratext has two parts: the **peritext** is everything within the covers of a bound volume; the **epitext** is then everything beyond, stretching out to interviews, reviews, etc. The study of paratexts can reveal a great deal about the social context in which translations are carried out, especially with respect to target audiences. The notion of “epitext” is problematic because it could include any context of reception or repercussion, for which there are more adequate sociological terms. Recommendation: Use and explore, rather than just assume the unitary identity of “text” and “reader”.

Paratranslation: “The key concept of the School of Vigo”, apparently. Since all texts have paratexts (*q.v.*), all translations logically have “paratranslations”. This is the basis of a

research program that aims to study translations not just of and in words, but in constant relation to material supports, typography, images, voice, and the extensive repercussions of paratexts within societies, with large doses of deconstruction and French Theory. Some very praiseworthy work has been done at Vigo along these lines. The concept of “paratranslation” nevertheless seems inadequate to the research program, since 1) it says little about why translational paratexts should be different from any other kind, and 2) it ventures into the sociological without paying explicit attention to people. Recommendation: There are a lot of clearer terms available to cover the distance.

Personification: Term we propose for the translating translator’s mental processes when they use textual material alone to construct communication participants (authors, end-users, clients, other translators, editors) as people. Personification should indicate that the translating is communication with people rather than just work on an object. Recommendation: Explore.

Pivot language: The intermediary language in “relay interpreting” (*q.v.*) and localization processes, i.e. without being the language of original production, this is the one that many versions are produced from simultaneously. The pivot language may or may not also be available to end-users. The MonAKO glossary suggests that a pivot language is the same thing as an **interlingua**. We suspect, however, that an “interlingua” is an artificial or controlled language able to map all the concept and terms in a specific field, and used as such in interlingua machine translation. A pivot language may also be natural. It may also be called a “bridge language”. Recommendation: “**Pivot language**” seems clearer than the alternatives, although it should not be considered equal to “interlingua”.

Plicitation quotient: A fun term proposed by Kamenická for “the ratio of the number of occurrences of translation-inherent implicitation to the number of occurrences of translation-inherent explicitation in a representative sample of translated text” (2009: 112). That is, you can see if a translator uses more implicitation than explicitation (*q.v.*).

Postediting: The most appropriate term for the process of making corrections or amendments to automatically generated text, notably machine-translation output. The term works in opposition to **pre-editing** (*q.v.*), which is the main alternative means of enhancing MT output quality (by editing the ST language prior to the MT process). These two terms do not make much sense in situations where there is no automatic text generation involved. Recommendation: Use, and that use can also legitimately be of the hyphenated form “post-editing”.

Power: Classically, the ability to make someone else perform actions in accordance with your wishes. For example, “clients have power over translators”, or “authors exert power over translators”. This definition becomes slightly more problematic when we propose, for example, that “translation exerts power over the global configuration of cultures”, or “re-translation can be used to combat the power of the colonizer”, etc. In some cases we can see the workings of power because there are specific wishes, actions, and potential resistance to those actions. In the more global cases, however, it is difficult to see what the

specific wishes, actions, and resistances are, and why power should be assumed to go more one way than the other (the definition does not fit in well with phrases like “the power of resistance”, “the power of non-cooperation”, the “power of representation”, or the general recognition that all actors in social interactions have some degree of power).

Recommendation: Before buying into the language of one-way absolute causes, seek out the actual **evidence** of power relations, and ask yourself if there are not clearer, less ambiguous terms like **agency** (*q.v.*), hegemony, or even “intellectual energy”.

Pre-editing: The preparation of ST language prior to an automatic translation process, mainly with respect to standardized lexis, simplified syntax and the removal of any other causes of ambiguity. Pre-editing might be seen as a form of translation into a controlled language.

Procedures vs. methods vs. strategies vs. techniques: The terms available for describing what translators do when they translate (i.e. translation processes) are a mess. Here we propose stripping the entire field down to the essentials and rebuilding from scratch. We might do so as follows: 1) **translation actions** (*q.v.*) are what we can actually observe translators doing (e.g. typing, correcting typographical mistakes, looking up terms in glossaries, etc.); 2) **translation problems** (*q.v.*) are what translators identify and try to solve; 3) **translation solutions** (see “solution”) are what translators produce as potential or final end-points of the problem-solving actions; 4) **solution types** are categories of solutions, which might be described in terms of the language level on which they operate (typographical, morphological, terminological, referential, etc.), on the classical cline going from literal to free; 5) **procedures** would then be pre-established sequences of actions leading to a solution; and 6) **strategies** (*q.v.*) can then refer to inferred macrotextual plans or mind-sets that organize procedures in terms of a **purpose** (*q.v.*) involving potential loss and gain. Note that “solution types” might also be called “solutions” without any great loss of accuracy, and that both those terms actually categorize observed products rather than observed processes. Recommendation: Reserve “**procedures**” for when there is a pre-established set of actions that have to be carried out, as in localization workflows. In general, do not confuse the terms for processes with observations based on comparisons of textual products (cf. process vs. product research).

Process vs. product research: A fundamental distinction between attempts to analyze the way people translate or interpret (i.e. their mental processes) and studies of their final translations or renditions (i.e. their products). The distinction makes sense against the background of methods that offer specific insight into processes (think-aloud protocols, eye-tracking, key-logging, interviews, potentially EEG mapping), and these methods do not assume product analysis. The distinction is nevertheless tenuous because there are many cases of overlap: when we have a series of intermediary products (e.g. draft translations), we can use them to infer process, and in the case of interpreting, products are perhaps still the clearest window on processes. The danger, however, is to assume that product analysis alone can give solid data on translation processes. If we can see that X has been rendered by Y, we do not know if this has occurred through a number of transformations of X (as structuralist or transformational linguistics might have it), through imagination of possible

worlds, through intuition based on frequencies of use, or through the projection and discounting of renditions A, B, and C. Recommendation: Do not assume that products reveal cognitive processes with any degree of surety.

Product analysis: The analysis of what translators produce and exchange for value (money or prestige). The term is to be preferred to “text analysis” to the extent that texts also include interviews, TAPs, successive drafts, etc. Product analysis is broadly opposed to process analysis.

Professional translators: According to Harris (2010), “people who do translating for a living”. Alternative usages assume that there is a state of grace called “the profession” within which everyone has complete experience, shared norms, equal expertise, full-time employment as translators or interpreters, and absolute honesty. The existence of that state is to be questioned. Recommendation: If a translator is paid, they are professional, no matter how bad (and a lot are rotten). If a high level of performance is what you want to talk about, prefer **expertise** (*q.v.*) or perhaps professionalism, if you can say what that means.

Program vs. course vs. curriculum vs. syllabus: In traditional English education parlance, with many variations, a **program** is a set of courses (e.g. undergraduate program, Masters program in Technical Translation); a **course** is a sequence of classes on the same topic and evaluated together (e.g. course in Medical Terminology for Chinese-English Translation); a **curriculum** is the outline of things to be done in a program; a **syllabus** is the set of things to be done in a course. A lot of trouble is caused by false friends in many European languages. Recommendation: Stick to this, unless there are good reasons to the contrary.

Proofreading: The reading and correction of a completed text, usually by someone other than the drafter. The term is more commonly associated with editors than with the work of translators.

Proper nouns vs. proper names: A proper noun is an individualizing name, written with a capital letter (e.g. Suzanne, San Francisco). All names are proper nouns. Recommendation: Ditch the redundancy of “proper names”, please.

Purpose: Good clear term for what pretentious theorists call *Skopos* (*q.v.*). Recommendation: Unless you are referring to German-language theory, **avoid** *Skopos*.

Quality: With respect to translations, a variable held to increase as a result of **repairs** (*q.v.*), **revision** (*q.v.*), **review** (*q.v.*) or other modes of evaluation. The concept is notoriously problematic, since the notion of absolute “high quality” sets up the ideal of the perfect translation. However, we know that translations can and should be different for different **purposes** (*q.v.*) and under different work conditions (e.g. a translation done on-time might be more acceptable than one that is more accurate but late). Just as beauty is in the eyes of the beholder, quality is in the eyes of the reviser or reviewer. Recommendation:

Since quality is operative subjectively, always state for whom the concept is operative. For instance, “pedagogical quality” is operative for the instructor or educational institution; “localization industry quality” might be calculated by applying the LISA grid, and so on.

Relay interpreting, pivot interpreting: Terms for a process where one interpreters works from Language A into Language B, and other interpreters simultaneously render the same speech from Language B into Languages C, D, E, etc. This is especially used when A is a lesser-known language and B is a well-known language (since it effectively functions as a lingua franca here). The term “relay” (or the French *relais*) is misleading, because in a relay race (or when stage coaches worked in relays) one leg follows the other; you do not have the idea of a central hub from which many renditions are produced simultaneously. The interest of the “central hub language” idea is that this is the basic production model in the localization industry, so there might be some advantage in having the terminology of interpreting coincide with the discourse of localization. Recommendation: Try **pivot interpreting** and **pivot language** (*q.v.*); do not be a slave to AIIC recommendations.

Repair: Term for instances of what some term “in-draft revision” or “online revision” (*q.v.*), usually involving the quick fixing of typographical errors, terminology, and syntactic recasting, without initiation of a separate revision stage. The term “repair” has the added advantage of being used in the study of interpreters’ performances, for much the same thing. Recommendation: Use **repair** wherever appropriate.

Retranslation: Term used to describe a translation for which the same ST has been rendered into the same target language at least once before. The retranslation may return to the ST and start from scratch, or modify existing translations but with significant reference to the ST (i.e. a retranslation is not just a modified or corrected edition of a previous translation). The term should not be confused with “indirect translations” (*q.v.*), even though that is precisely the confusion made in the Nairobi Recommendation.

Review / reviewing: Term used in European quality standard EN-15038 (2006) for when a person *other than the translator* corrects the translation. The standard defines “review” as “examining a translation for its suitability for the agreed purpose, and respect for the conventions of the domain to which it belongs and recommending corrective measures”. The review may thus be monolingual, without reference to the source text. According to the standard, all translations must be reviewed. The term “review” is sometimes more loosely used for any process of revision (*q.v.*) performed by a person other than the translator, and ambiguously also refers to things like book reviews and general proofreading. Recommendation: Use in the EN-15038 sense: monolingual correction by a person other than the translator.

Revising: The process of producing a revision (i.e. a revised text). Revising can be divided into several time phases: in-draft revising occurs prior to the translator rendering the end of the text; post-draft revising comes after the end of the text has been translated. “In-draft revising” could also be broken down into “in-sentence revising”, “in-paragraph revising”, and so on, as needed. Recommendation: **Avoid “online revisions”** (*q.v.*).

Revision / revising: Making of changes to a translation, either by the translator (“self-revision”) or someone else (“other-revision”). European standard EN-15038 uses the term in a more specific way to refer to corrections made by *a person other than the translator* on the basis of comparison of the source and target texts. Changes made by the translator would be “checking” (*q.v.*). Recommendation: Since the EN-15038 usage seems to represent neither industry nor research on this point, stick with “**revision**” as the term covering two practices: “**self-revision**” (i.e. “checking” *q.v.*), “**other-revision**” (i.e. bilingual revision by another person). In addition to revision you would then have “**review**” (*q.v.*) (i.e. monolingual correction by a person other than the translator).

Revision vs. editing: Mossop (2001) proposes that “revising” is done to a translation, whereas “editing” is done to a non-translation (or to a text treated as such). This is clear, but it seems not to be common in professional discourse. The distinction is also difficult to maintain in situations where the translator reads through the final version and perhaps only once looks at the source text. It was also formulated prior to the boom of postediting (or revising?) MT as a way of translating. Recommendation: **Do not insist** on the distinction too much.

Revision vs. review: European standard EN-15038 uses “revision” for corrections made by someone other than the translator, on the basis of comparison between the source and target texts, and “review” then refers to corrections made on the basis of the target text alone. This sense of “review” would thus come under Mossop’s use of “editing”, and both terms are used for procedures carried out by people other than the translator. Recommendation: Do not insist on the EN-15038 use of revision (i.e. restricted to people other than the translator), but do explore the virtues of “review” (*q.v.*) in the EN-15038 sense, as monolingual editing by a person other than the translator.

Revision vs. revising: A revision should be the result of the process of revising. So we should strictly talk about “post-draft revising”, etc., rather than confuse the product with the process.

Risk: The probability of an undesired outcome as a consequence of an action. Applied to communication, risk could be the estimated probability of non-cooperation. The concept should be used in such a way that the running of high risk can be a rational, calculated option associated with the attainment of high benefits. This is to be opposed to conceptualizations that associate risk only with the making of decisions in situations of relative ignorance or uncertainty (which leads to facile positions such as the assumption that beginners take more risks because they know less).

Screen translation: A sub-category of audiovisual translation (*q.v.*) for work involving the specific spatial constraints of screens (cinema, television, DVD, telephones, hand-held computer devices of all kinds). The field is thus narrower than audiovisual translation (*q.v.*), as are many of the spaces available for translations.

Self-revision vs. other-revision: Self-revision is where the translator revises their own work; other-revision is where someone else does the revision, with at least some reference to a source text (i.e. this involves more than reviewing or editing). Other-revision is sometimes called “bilingual proofreading”, “bilingual editing” or simply “revision” (in EN-15038).

Sensitive communication: Communication that involves high risks, usually in political or legal settings.

Shift: Observed difference between the two sides of a bitext (*q.v.*). This definition attempts to summarize the descriptive work done in Prague, Bratislava, Nitra and Leipzig, and can be compared with Catford’s description of shifts as “departures from formal correspondence” (1965: 73). Shifts concern **product analysis** (*q.v.*), not process studies, so they should not be seen as the sum of everything a translator does in order to produce an equivalent. The problem, of course, is that we cannot happily define what a “non-shift” might be, except as the idealist assumption of absolute equivalence. Nevertheless, the term “shift” is undeniably useful when analyzing products. It might be salvaged as follows: for each bitext we describe the relations that we tentatively accept as invariant (in order to save time, if nothing else), then we describe all remaining relations as “shifts”. Note that this does not assume that the term corresponds to any psychological reality on the part of the translator or the user of the translation.

Sight interpreting: The practice of speaking out a translation while you read the written source text, often as a pedagogical activity (although the situation is not infrequent in dialogue interpreting). Since both written and spoken communication is involved, there would seem to be no overwhelming reason not to call the practice “sight translating” as well. This is one of a number of overlap situations that are badly served by the artificial division between translation and interpreting.

Significance: Term used in statistics to describe the probability of a finding not being the null-hypothesis (i.e. the thing you do not want to find). Significance is succinctly expressed as a p-value, where high significance is a very small probability, but never zero probability (hence $p < 0.001$). The value above which a finding is considered non-significant is the alpha value, usually established as $p = 0.05$). Recommendation: If you do not understand this, **do not use** the word “significance”.

Skills vs. competence: Since the term “competence” (*q.v.*) has come to mean many quite different things, the general preference should be for lists of “skills” and for degrees of “expertise” with those skills.

Skopos: Greek term used in German (thus with a capital, since all nouns have capitals in German) to designate the aim, function or purpose of an action, and thereby of a translation viewed as an action. There is no discernable semantic difference between this term and the good old English word “purpose”. Recommendation: **Use purpose** if you want to be

understood by translators; and *Skopos* only if you are referring to the German-language theorists who used this term.

Social turn, sociological turn: A research orientation proposed by Wolf (2006), broadly to undertake the sociology of translation, as one in a series of “turns” (*q.v.*). The terms falsely suggest that sociological concerns were somehow absent from the rich history of European descriptive studies. They also lack some precision in that they tend to cover several different things: 1) attempts at a sociology of translators as members of mediating groups, 2) descriptions of the role played by translations within societies (closer to the traditional concerns of descriptive studies), 3) applications of Bourdieu’s concepts of *habitus* and capital to describe the way translators interact with other social actors, 4) a general view of all social interactions as modes of translation (after the actor-network theory of Callon and Latour), 5) attention to translating as a mode of social activism (cf. community translating). All in all, this is anything but a simple “turn”. Recommendation: Use a clearer term for the thing you want to talk about.

Solution, type of solution, solution type: Any of these terms might denote the text that a translator produces as a tentative or final end of a problem-solving process. There are so many conflicting ways of naming different solution types that here we leave that task open to ad hoc categorizations: the researcher should adopt a nomenclature suitable to the evidence before them and the research problem they want to address. The categories proposed by the pioneers of Translation Studies (Vinay and Darbelnet, Vázquez Ayora, Malone, among others) would generally seem too complex, too metaphorical, and perhaps too related to European languages to be offered as definitive descriptions. Chesterman (1997) recommends a basic categorization in terms of the linguistic levels on transformation is assumed: semantic, syntactic and pragmatic. This mode of categorization could be carried much further (cf. loan, modulation, etc.). Although Chesterman calls these things “strategies” (*q.v.*), there is little reason to believe that the simple comparison of products reveals cognitive processes. Recommendation: Work on the shifts in front of you; describe them in way suited to your project; do not confuse the comparison of solutions (products) with the analysis of processes.

Source text (ST): Standard term for the text that you translate from. The theoretical problem is that all texts incorporate elements from previous texts, so in principle no text can be a primal “source”. Common parlance refers more readily to “the original”, which promotes the same illusion of primacy. A more logical term, unfortunately never used, would be “start text” (ST), which at least indicates that we are only talking about the text from which a translation process begins. Recommendation: **ST** (but think “start text” as you write it).

Strategies: Inferred macrotextual plans or mind-sets that organize translator’s actions in terms of potential loss and gain with respect to the attainment of a purpose. This whole area is a terminological mess (see “procedures”). There seems to be no possible justification for using the term “strategy” to refer to a simple action, technique, step, method, or pattern of behavior that you just discern from looking at a set of bitexts. A strategy is better seen as an

action that aims to achieve a **purpose** (*q.v.*) where: a) there is no certainty of success (i.e. it is not a mechanistic application of a rule), and b) there are viable alternative actions (i.e. other ways of aiming to achieve the same or similar purpose). If these two conditions do not apply, then there are probably better terms available (action, solution).

Subject: Term used in philosophy and experimental research to refer to the individual person.

S-universals: Term proposed by Chesterman (2004) to describe universals (*q.v.*) that are identified by comparing translations with their corresponding STs (*q.v.*). Recommendation: Use the term for as long as you think universals are actually universal.

Systems: Term used to assume that many elements are somehow related such that a change in one element will bring about changes in all others. Quick reference is thus made to “language systems”, “genre systems”, “cultural systems”, etc., and to societies as “systems of systems” (i.e. “**polysystems**”). The problem with the term is that there is mostly very little evidence that the relations do actually mean that a change in one element affects all others. Most apparent systems are highly segmented, allowing changes only to affect limited sets of items. Recommendation: Ask yourself if you really need the term, or can you make do with “language”, “culture”, “society”, etc.?

Target text (TT): The text that the translator produces. Normal people talk quite happily about “translations”, and there seems to be no good reason for abandoning that word (as long as it carried an article, to indicate that we are talking about the product rather than the process). In technical writing, however, the quick abbreviation TT has serious virtues mainly because it sits well alongside ST and NT (*q.v.*). Recommendation: Try “**a translation**”, or **TT** if you must.

TEP: Acronym for “translation, editing, proofreading”, mostly in the context of localization. The good idea is that there should be three people involved: the translator translates, the editor reviews the work (“tasks such as checking terminology use, language use, grammar”), and the proofreader goes over the work as a whole (according to the manual Open Translation Tools). It is not clear how the terms “revision” (*q.v.*) and “checking” (*q.v.*) should fit into this process; nor is it clear whether editing and proofreading involve reference to the source text. All in all, this is a vague term well suited to the minds that think with acronyms

Terminology vs. translation: If a distinction must be made, let us propose the following: translation involves the obligation to select between more than one viable solution to a problem, whereas terminology seeks situations where there is only one viable solution.

Think Aloud Protocols (TAPs): Transcriptions of the words spoken by subjects as they perform a task, for example translators as they translate. This is one of the tools used in process research. The word “protocol” is used here in the sense of “written record”, as in the protocol of a treaty”. The term “**talk aloud protocol**” is sometimes used in experiments

where subjects only describe the actions they are performing, and not the reasons. Recommendation: The term “think aloud protocol” is well established in process research, so we will accept it. Strict stylists might like to add a hyphen “think-aloud”, but since “aloud” is clearly adverbial here and cannot be misattributed, there would seem to be no work for the hyphen to do.

Translating: Convenient term for the translation process; can render verbs-as-nouns such as “le traduire” (used by Meschonnic) or “das Übersetzen” (as in the name of many training programs). The corresponding adjective could be “translative”.

Translation: Word that can refer either to the product, process or entire institution of translators’ activities. When used with an article (“a translation”, “the translation of this text”) it refers to the product, and is a more accessible term than “target text”. The corresponding adjective would then be “translational”. When used without the article, it usually refers to the social institution (for which the same adjective could be used). Reference to the process is more elegantly made by the term “translating”.

Translation actions: If “actions” in general are external movements and expressions by which the subject interacts with the outside world, “translation actions” are the external movements and expressions what we can actually observe translators performing as part of their job (e.g. typing, correcting typographical mistakes, looking up terms in glossaries, speaking on the telephone, etc.).

Translation culture: In German (*Translationskultur*), defined by Erich Prunč (2000: 59) as a “variable set of norms, conventions and expectations which frame the behavior of all interactants in the field of translation”. This is fair enough, except that Prunč strangely assumes that a translation culture exists within a national culture, whereas we suspect they might be configured more like intercultures (*q.v.*). An alternative definition (actually of the term *Übersetzungskultur*) is proposed by the Göttingen group (see Frank 1989) to describe the cultural norms governing translations within a target system, on the model of *Esskultur*, which would describe the way a certain society eats. This concept applies to what a society does with translations and expects of them; it seems to assume that the function of translations depends on a national culture or system. Recommendation: Given the ambiguity, **specify** what you mean. Our personal preference is for the term related to the “interactants in the field of translation” (i.e. Prunč), since it seems to imply fewer nationalistic presuppositions than the alternative.

Translation problem: A situation where a target-text element must be sought to correspond in some way to a source-text element and more than one solution is viable (solutions may include omission or transcription). If only one solution is viable, then you are probably dealing with terminology (*q.v.*). The relative **difficulty** of a translation problem is a complex value that depends on many subject variables (what is difficult for one translator may be easy for the next), in addition to the number of viable solutions to be discarded.

Translation Sociology vs. the Sociology of Translation: We propose that “Translation Sociology” be used to render the “sociologie de la traduction” developed by Callon, Latour, Law and others, otherwise known as “actor-network theory”. This is a sociological method that uses the term “translation” to describe complex interpersonal interactions where someone manages to “speak on behalf of” someone else. This sense of “translation” is obviously far wider than the interlingual sense we are assuming here.

Translation Studies vs. Interpreting Studies: If translation and interpreting are completely separate activities, then it makes sense to have two separate academic disciplines to study them. If the two activities overlap, however, then the separation of disciplines is difficult to defend and a superordinate becomes justified. Recommendation: Translation Studies should be used as covering both written and spoken communication, such that “Interpreting Studies” becomes a part of “Translation Studies”. But we might be biased by our background.

Translation Studies: After Holmes (1972), the academic discipline that carries out research on all aspects of translation. There is some debate about whether this also covers spoken communication. Since Translation Studies is considered the name of a discipline, it should be written with capitals. The term should not be confused with “studies carried out in order to become a translator”, although that very confusion has occasionally surfaced in Nordic environments, in Masters programs that misleadingly suggest that research on translations will somehow create professional translators, and in occasional mistranslations from Spanish (note that *estudios de traducción* tends to imply a translator-training process, whereas *estudios de la traducción* might more clearly refer to the academic research discipline, but we leave that problem to Hispanophones). Recommendation: Given the ambiguities, a clearer term for academic research on translation and interpreting would be “**translation research**”. We nevertheless have no reason to refuse the decades of effort (and relative success) invested in the term Translation Studies, with the capitals, as the name of an academic discipline.

Translation vs. interpreting vs. localization: There is a tendency to distinguish between these terms on the basis of the medium of communication used: “translation” would really mean “written translation”, “interpreting” is “spoken translation”, and “localization” is in some usages restricted to work on digital content. This falls in line with further terms like “audiovisual translation”, “screen translation”, etc., except that in these last-mentioned cases the term “translation” is a clear superordinate. From this distance, it seems crazy to suggest that the process of cross-language communication should be given entirely different terms solely on the basis of the medium employed. Is the activity really so different when you speak rather than write, or you work on a website or piece of software? Recommendation: **It is all “translation”**, which can then be divided up into “written translation” (or indeed “read translation”, since we always forget about reception), “spoken translation”, “sight translation” (*q.v.*), “digital translation” (if you must), “audiovisual translation”, etc.

Translational: Adjective used to describe aspects of translations as *products*, or aspects of translation as a social institution.

Translative: Adjective that can be used to refer to aspects of the translating process. Time will tell if we really need it.

Translatology: Possible name for the scientific study of translation, proposed by Harris and others in the 1970s. Since it is far less frequent than Translation Studies, the term survives as a translation of Romance-language terms like the French *traductologie* or the Spanish *traductología*. The aspiration to a unified science, with its own recognized terms and procedures, is as noble as it is vain in this field. What we have is far more like a loose collection of ideas and procedures, most of which are drawn from neighboring disciplines. Recommendation: **Translation Studies** (*q.v.*) wherever possible (and corresponding terms, if possible, in languages other than English).

Translator training institutions: General term to cover all the institutionalized arrangements by which translators and interpreters are trained (i.e. schools, programs, courses, apprenticeship arrangements, public examination systems). English can happily bear a hyphen here (“translator-training institutions”), but since the risk of ambiguity is minimal, we can survive without it.

Translator training vs. translator education: Opposition set up by Bernadini (2004) to distinguish between the strict training of professional translators (“training”) and the wider set of skills and attitudes required in order to perform well as a translator (“education”). This would map onto Kiraly’s 2000 distinction between “translator competence” and “translation competence” (*q.v.*). The argument at stake was that only a program lasting four or five years would develop all the skills, attitudes and background knowledge needed by a professional translator. Translators would thus require a complete “education” in order to acquire all the components of “translator competence”. The weak point in the argument was that much of that education can happen in any humanistic discipline, and a lot of it can occur in some workplaces. The suggestion that purely technical training can occur without incurring any elements of humanistic development would seem similarly spurious. Recommendation: Prefer **translator training**, recognizing that it can include a lot of education.

Translator-training institutions: Term we propose for all the durable social structures in which translator training is formalized in some way (apprentice arrangements, short-term courses, long-term courses at all levels). Recommendation: The hyphen in “translator-training” does not hurt, but the term can survive without it.

Translatory: Adjective used to describe aspects of the translator and their performance; calqued on the German *translatorisch*, used for the same thing. The term is technical and should not be infiltrated into the world of work.

Translatum, translat: Terms used by Vermeer for the product of the translation process. Most other researchers call this the “target text”, and the wider world calls it the “translation”. Why would anyone need a Latin word here? Recommendation: **Avoid**; prefer “a/the translation”.

Transposition vs. modulation: Terms used by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1972) for two kinds of translation solutions (*q.v.*). **Transposition** is where grammatical categories are changed. For example, on an envelope, the French “Expéditeur:” (sender) is apparently translated by the English “From:”, thus rendering a noun with a preposition. Or again, “Défense de fumer” is a noun phrase, rendered by the strange imperative structure “No smoking”. **Modulation**, on the other hand, is where the grammatical category can remain the same but the one object is seen from a different perspective: “shallow” is thus rendered as “peu profond” (not very deep), and “No Vacancies” becomes “Complet” (Full). The problems with this distinction are: 1) the names “transposition” and “modulation” are hardly clear descriptive terms, 2) every grammatical shift (“transposition”) could also involve a semantic change of perspective (“modulation”), especially if we adopt Halliday’s notion of “grammatical metaphor”, 3) the notion of grammatical shift only seems useful in the case of highly cognate languages like English and French; for work between English and Chinese, for example, most translating is occurring at this level, to the extent that transposition and modulation are not distinct or even special operations, and both may become subordinate to criteria of marked vs. unmarked (i.e. low-frequency vs. high-frequency items). On the other hand, work between English and Korean or Japanese seems to require transposition in every sentence, such that it might become relatively easy to spot instances of modulation. Recommendation: **Avoid**; prefer ad hoc descriptive terms suited to your research project, probably based on the linguistic levels that are involved, e.g. “grammatical shift”, “shift of semantic perspective”, etc.

Triangulation: The use of different methodologies to establish findings, by analogy with the way geographic points are mapped by several different measurements. For example, a finding about a translation process might be confirmed by think-aloud protocols (TAPs) (*q.v.*), eye-tracking, product analysis, and post-performance interviews with subjects. The term is often used in a rather glib way, as if all three measurements will indeed confirm the same result with the same validity. However, you should not naïvely believe that translators are not justifying themselves in TAPs, that all eye gaze indicates thought, that products can reveal processes, and that interviewees tell the truth. Recommendation: Talk about triangulations, if you must, but use it to *discount* the aberrant findings that sometime ensue from the nature of particular methods, rather than to expect multifarious joyful confirmation.

T-universals: Term proposed by Chesterman (2004) to describe universals (*q.v.*) that are identified by comparing translations with comparable non-translations (*q.v.*). Recommendation: Use the term for as long as you think universals are actually universal.

Turns: “To have a turn”, in colloquial British, Australian and Irish English (we take this from Michael Cronin), means to feel sick and giddy. Translation Studies has been having

quite a lot of turns, it seems: from the “cultural turn” announced by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990), the “social or sociological turn” heralded by Wolf (2006), a more hopeful than effective “return to ethics” (Pym 2001), a “performative turn” (Hardwick 2003), a “creative turn” (Perteghella and Loffredo eds 2006), a hypothetical “linguistic re-turn” (Vandeweghe et al. 2007), and much else is possible. This suggests that translation scholars are like a flock of sheep, being led now one way, not the other. There is no easier intellectual sleaze than to pretend that everyone should take up what you want to do. Recommendation: **Avoid**, if you have any sense of self-respect or collective integrity.

Universals of translation: Features held to occur with higher frequencies in translations rather than in any other kind of language use. The term refers to surface-level phenomena such as type-token ratios (relative richness of vocabulary), explicitation, and simplification. The term “universals” thus refers to surface-level phenomena that have nothing to do with the deep-seated universals sought by Chomsky – principles that would underlie the production of syntax. A better term would be “translation-specific tendencies”, but even that does little to hide the dearth of testing on any range of translations (interpreting, subtitles, or indeed on any range of language uses (spoken retelling in the same language, summarizing in the same language, etc.)). Testing so far has only been on straight written translations and straight written non-translations (see T-universals and S-universals). Recommendation: **translation-specific tendencies**, plus a lot more thought about whatever intellectual interest might be involved.

Unprofessional translation: Term used by Harris (2010) apparently as a superordinate for the various things that untrained translators do. But the term “unprofessional” seems unnecessarily derogatory; “non-professional” would be more neutral, if you must; “paraprofessional” (*q.v.*) is better in some cases. Recommendation: The term “**untrained translation**” seems to cover the main bases; “**paraprofessional translation**” (*q.v.*) would be more suitable for cases where the person has expert skills in a field related with particular translation projects.

User-generated translation: Possible alternative term for “community translation” (*q.v.*), “crowdsourcing” (*q.v.*), “collaborative translation” (*q.v.*) or TC3 (*q.v.*). The problem here seems to be that the translators are by definition not the people who need the translation. Recommendation: **Volunteer translation** (*q.v.*).

Violence: Term used by some French and French-inspired writers to describe the role of translation and/or translators in communication acts, e.g. “the violent effects of translation”, “the violent rewriting of the foreign text”, “the ethnocentric violence that every act of translating wreaks on a foreign text” (Venuti 1995: 19, 25, 147, and there is a lot more there). The problem here is that, if violence is by definition involved in all mediated communication, there are not many terms left for the kind of violence where people experience severe lasting harm to their minds and/or bodies. Further, non-violence would seem to become the perfect non-communication or immediate telepathy of angels between themselves. Recommendation: Reserve violence for actions resulting in serious lasting harm to minds and bodies, and do not be afraid to act in the world.

Visibility: Term popularized by Venuti's 1995 critique of "the translator's invisibility". If we read a translation and are not aware of the fact that it is a translation, then the translator can be said to be "invisible". However, the exact meaning of "visibility" is far from clear. For Venuti and the tradition of textual criticism, visibility would be associated with locating the translator's voice in the text, or the translator disrupting the deceptively smooth flow of language. But visibility might also involve the presence of prefaces, translators' notes and the translator's name on the cover. Another mode of visibility could concern the translator's personal contacts with authors, clients and end-users, which in some cases allow direct feedback. Yet another discussion might concern who can actually see interpreters. Recommendation: Consider all modes of visibility; do not use this term as if it meant just one thing.

Volunteer translation: Recommended alternative to "community translation" (*q.v.*), "crowdsourcing" (*q.v.*), "collaborative translation" (*q.v.*) or TC3 (*q.v.*). The term assumes that the fundamental difference at stake is the monetary payment received (or not received) by the translator. If a professional translator is one who receives monetary reward, then the opposite term should be "volunteer" (qualifying the person, not the action). The alternative terms here seem shot through with activist ideologies, all of which are very well meant, and none of which highlight the most problematic feature concerned.

References

- Baker, Mona. 1995. "Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research", *Target* 7(2): 223-243.
- Bernardini, Silvia. 2004. "The theory behind the practice. Translator training or translator education?". Kirsten Malmkjær, ed. *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1997. *Memes of translation. The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1999. "The Empirical Status of Prescriptivism". *Folia Translatologica* 6. 9-19.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2004. "Beyond the Particular". Anna Mauranen and Pekka Kujamäki, eds *Translation Universals. Do they Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 33-50.
- Cronin, Michael. 2002. "The Empire Talks Back: "community translation" (*q.v.*), "crowdsourcing" (*q.v.*), "collaborative translation" (*q.v.*) or TC3 (*q.v.*). Orality, Heteronomy, and the Cultural Turn in Interpretation Studies". In Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler (eds) *Translation and Power*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press. 45-62.
- Dollerup, Cay. 1998. "Relay and Support Translations". In *Translation in Context: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress*. Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo and Yves Gambier, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 17-26.

- European Committee for Standardization. 2006. *Standard EN-15038: Translation services – service requirements*. Brussels: European Committee for Standardization.
- Ganne, Valérie, and Marc Minon. 1992. “Géographies de la traduction”. In Françoise Barret-Ducrocq, ed. *Traduire l’Europe*, Paris: Payot. 55-95.
- Genette, Gérard. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil.
- Hardwick, Lorna. 2003. *Reception Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Brian. 1988. “Bi-text, a new concept in translation theory”. *Language Monthly* 54. 8-10.
- Harris, Brian. Visited 2010. *Unprofessional translation*. Blog: <http://unprofessionaltranslation.blogspot.com/>.
- Hermans, Theo, ed. 1985. *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Holmes, James S. 1972/1988. “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies”, expanded version in *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi. 66-80.
- Kamenická, Renata. 2009. “The *as-if* game and literary translation”. Anthony Pym and Alexander Perekrestenko, eds *Translation Research Projects 2*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group. 121-131.
- Kiraly, Donald. 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Koskinen, Kaisa, and Tuija Kinnunen. 2010. “Introduction”. In Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen, eds *Translators’ Agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. 4-10. <http://tampub.uta.fi/tup/978-951-44-8082-9.pdf>. Accessed August 2010.
- Lefevre, André, and Susan Bassnett. 1990. “Introduction: Proust’s Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The ‘Cultural Turn’ in Translation Studies”. In Susan Bassnett and André Lefevre, eds *Translation, History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter, 1-13.
- Mayoral, Roberto, Dorothy Kelly, Natividad Gallardo. 1988. “Concept of Constrained Translation. Non-Linguistic Perspectives of Translation”. *Meta* 33. 356-367.
- Open Translation Tools*. Accessed November 2010: <http://en.flossmanuals.net/OpenTranslationTools/>
- Pavlović, Nataša. 2007. Directionality in collaborative translation processes. A Study of Novice Translators. PhD dissertation. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group. http://www.tdr.cesca.es/TESIS_URV/AVAILABLE/TDX-1210107-172129//THESIS.pdf. Accessed August 2010.
- Pavlović, Nataša. 2010. “What Were They Thinking?! Students’ Decision Making in L1 and L2 Translation Processes”. *Hermes* 44. 63-87.
- Perteghella, Manuela, and Eugenia Loffredo, eds. 2006. *Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Shuttleworth, Mark, with Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Vandeweghe, Willy, Sonia Vandepitte, Marc Van de Velde. 2007. “Introduction: A Linguistic ‘Re-turn’ in Translation Studies?” *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 21/1, 1-10.

- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1958/1972. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction*, nouvelle édition revue et corrigée, Paris: Didier.
- Wolf, Michaela, ed. 2006. *Übersetzen - Translating – Traduire: Towards a 'Social Turn'?* Münster, Hamburg, Berlin, Vienna, London: LIT.