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While traditionally wedded to the written and oral text as the locus of translation activity and the primary object of investigation, the study of translation and interpreting has widened its scope considerably in recent years. It no longer reduces its primary object to textual material but has sought to incorporate within its remit various types of non-verbal material as well as the different agents who produce translated texts and mediate oral interaction, and the cultural, historical, and social environments that influence and are influenced by cultural agents and their production. The definition of “translation” itself has been extended to encompass a wide range of activities and products that do not necessarily involve an identifiable relationship with a discrete source text. Against this background, and given the ready availability of historical overviews and syntheses of theoretical trends, this essay will focus on a number of interrelated themes that have strong resonance in contemporary society and have received growing attention in translation studies and neighboring disciplines since the 1990s.

Representation

Translation is one of the core practices through which any cultural group constructs representations of another, as has been widely recognized and debated in the ethnographic context (Asad [1986] 2010; Sturge 2007). Translation-generated representations of Italy, a culture which has been “one of the most represented loci of
the Western imagination,” did not simply circulate within and influence the target culture’s understanding of its “heritage,” but also made their way back to Italy and influenced Italians’ own processes of self-representation (Polezzi [2000] 2009, 263). In the colonial context, translation served as an important vehicle for constructing representations of the colonized as “Europe’s ‘civilizational other’” (Dodson 2005, 809). The Indian colonial “subject” was constructed through European translations that provided educated Indians with a range of Orientalist images they came to internalize as their own (Niranjana 1990). Colonial translations presented Indian texts as specimens of a culture that is “simple,” “natural,” “other-worldly,” and “spiritual” (Sengupta 1995). The impact of such translations and the representations they generated can be seen in the self-translations of “native” works by the colonized themselves, as in the case of Rabindranath Tagore, who adapted his own works to conform to the image of the East as constructed by the English-speaking world at the time (Sengupta 1995).

Translation continues to generate powerful representations of other cultures long after the colonial encounter has officially come to an end. In the postcolonial context, the continued hegemony of the ex-colonizers ensures that the dominant representations of the ex-colonized remain powerful. The Orientalist tradition of translation continues to thrive in France and embraces a set of textual and paratextual techniques that “inscribes in the structure of language itself the image of a ‘complicated Orient’ . . . irremediably strange and different” (Jacquemond 1992, 149). Within the wider context of cultural and political imperialism, translations continue to exercise discursive power over “Third World” subjects by representing them in ways that cater for the expectations of the target audience (Venuti 1995); in the case of Muslim Arab women, the representations typically draw on one of three stereotypes: the Arab or Muslim woman as a victim of gender oppression; as an escapee from her intrinsically oppressive culture; and as the pawn of Arab male power (Kahf [2000] 2010). Global conglomerates play a vital role in propagating their own representations of marginalized communities and “enemy” cultures in venues such as advertisements (Nardi 2011) and news media (Campbell 2007), especially in the context of new information and communication technologies that harness the potential of multi-modality in genres such as televised newscasts to create powerful stereotypes (Desjardins 2008). Scholarly works, too, can generate and consolidate stereotypical representations of the other by (mis)translating key concepts such as intifada and shabada in ways that do not reflect their use among those being represented (Amireh 2005). Powerful political lobbies represent certain communities and regions as a source of threat to the free world, a threat that has to be monitored regularly through translation, primarily into English (Baker 2010a).

The dynamics of representation involved in the (post)colonial and imperialist contexts are more complex than the traditional model of unilateral imposition might assume, however. One aspect of this complexity concerns the diversity of attitudes on both sides, as well as the impact of the environment of reception, which may frustrate the intentions of translators who belong to the colonizing group but empathize with
the colonized and attempt to present them in a positive light, as in the case of George Staunton’s highly influential 1810 translation of the Qing penal code (St. André 2004). Staunton sought to persuade British readers that the Chinese had a concept of justice and that they were no better or worse than the British. And yet examination of published reviews suggests that the translation was read against the grain, so much so that it lent itself to later use by the British as part of a legal apparatus for governing Chinese residents of Hong Kong.

Representations generated through translation are often contested, undermined, exploited, and negotiated by the less powerful party in various ways (Rafael [1988] 1993; Israel 2006). As in the Chinese context, Orientalist translations of Indian vernacular literature were not always aimed at a simple “containment of representations” but were the product of negotiations between local scholars and Orientalists, with the “competitive, resistant and appropriative energies of local voices involved in defining and representing their literatures and traditions” (Boratti 2011, 88). The less powerful also use translation to generate competing representations that counter the stereotypes established by the colonizer and serve a nationalist agenda, as in the case of English translations of the medieval Irish text Táin Bó Cúalnge, which attempted to portray the Irish as a morally upright nation (Tymoczko 1999). There have therefore been calls for a shift in perspective to acknowledge that at times the translator functions as “an agent for subaltern resistance, instead of an extension of the long arm of the oppressor” (Rose 2002, 259).

Of particular interest are the mechanisms by which representations of a cultural other are generated through translation. These may include identification with a particular group through the choice of a dialect or sociolect, as in opting for an urban variety of German associated with working-class youths to dub African American English, thus aligning AAE speakers with German speakers of that variety “and in so doing constitut[ing] them ideologically along similar lines” (Queen 2004, 522–23). Discussion of less discreet mechanisms used to generate representations of a (post) colonial other through translation might explain how these representations come to exercise such a hold on the imagination of the represented. Shaden Tageldin talks of a “politics of translational seduction” that relies on affect rather than coercion by strategically “re-present[ing] the colonizer as the most flattering ‘likeness’ of the colonized” (2011, 17), thus binding the colonized to the colonizer through an inverted process of self-love.

Minority–Majority Relations

Minority languages are languages of relatively limited diffusion or languages spoken by politically and economically marginalized populations. In the latter sense, the hegemony of English and the economic and political power of the English-speaking world now mean that all languages other than English have become minority languages (Cronin 2003).
For minority groups such as the Scots, Welsh, Bretons, Catalans, or Corsicans, translation can serve a number of purposes. Translation into the minority language may be undertaken as a strategy of survival; translation from a variety of languages allows a minority language to expand its repertoire as a means of ensuring its survival (Woodsworth 1996). Where the source language is the majority language, translation may simultaneously function as a symbolic act of resistance to displace that language within a shared social space, especially in cases where translation is not needed because the minority group speaks the dominant source language. The mere act of writing or translating into the minority language then becomes a political statement against the majority language and culture. Examples include literary translations from French into Corsican (Jaffe [1999] 2010) and from English into Scots (Findlay 2004). Translation into a minority language can therefore have a perlocutionary function, as evident in the diglossic mixing of jounal in theater translations with the Standard French used to address readers in prefaces and producers and actors in stage directions in Quebec (Brisset 1989). The use of the minority language also has implications for representations of protagonists who are made to speak that language. Annie Brisset (1989) notes that because jounal is associated with the working classes, theater translations into jounal lead to a proletarization of language and a lowering of the social status of the protagonists.

Translation out of the minority language is usually undertaken to raise awareness of the minority language and literature and allow its writers to reach a wider audience. This is often achieved through English, even when the minority language’s relation to English is embedded in a history of oppression, as in the case of Scots, Welsh, and Irish. For some, however, translating their literature into a dominant language such as English only serves to add to the latter’s "already large canon . . . by translating what relatively little there is written in a minority language" into it (Krause 2008, 128). One form of resistance to the majority language therefore consists of refusal to be translated into it: Irish poet Biddy Jenkinson refuses to be translated into English as “a small rude gesture to those who think that everything can be harvested and stored in an English-speaking Ireland” (quoted in Kenny and Cronin 1995, 245). Resistance can also take the form of contaminating the majority language by mixing it with the minority language in such genres as bilingual poetry (Hedrick 1996; Mezei 1998).

Imbalance in patterns of translation flow between majority and minority languages and literatures reflects a history of political and cultural domination, with English in particular occupying a hegemonic position in relation to all other languages (Venuti 1995). From a Bourdieusian perspective, the translation of great literary masterpieces into a dominated/minority language allows it to import capital and prestige and hence constitutes a “diversion of capital” (Casanova 2004). Translation into the dominant/majority language of works by authors writing in the minority language, on the other hand, is a form of consecration: it introduces the periphery to the center in order to consecrate it and grants minority authors “a certificate of literary standing” (Casanova 2004, 135).
The deaf community has long resisted the disability model that framed its position in society in the past, and is now widely recognized as a minority group with its own language and equal rights of access to all aspects of social life. This includes the right to be provided with interpreters in day-to-day interaction and subtitled programs on television. In this context, interpreting between the relevant spoken and signed languages becomes a tool of empowerment for the deaf. At the same time, however, interpreting has the disempowering potential to create an illusion of access or independence that is not always actualized (McKee 2004). This also applies to other minorities in society, especially in the context of migration. In the Italian health-care system, interpreter mediation “mainly supports a doctor-centred communication, preventing the empowerment of linguistic and cultural minorities” (Baraldi 2009, 120); similar patterns that result in disempowering minority groups have been documented in the US hospital system (Davidson 2000). It has therefore been argued that the disempowered position of the deaf and other minorities “requires interpreters not simply to act as neutral professionals but to take on an empowering role” (Brennan and Brien 1995, 113–14), one of advocacy or active cultural mediation.

Interpreting for minority groups is often provided by members of the same minority culture, including young family members (Angelelli 2010). This has affective implications for young and ad hoc interpreters, and for professional interpreters. Interpreters who belong to the same minority group as the less powerful, non-institutional party are vulnerable to pressure from both sides: from the less powerful participant, who expects the interpreter to empathize with them and act as their advocate, and from the institutional representative, who may be concerned that the interpreter’s impartiality is compromised by proximity to the client and hence inclined to monitor his or her behavior and linguistic output closely.

Globalization, the Global Economy, and Global Resistance

One of the defining features of our age is the heavy interdependence of commercial, social, and political structures across the globe. From food chains to the film industry, and from news reporting to networks of political resistance, the world has become a dense web of interrelations that are continually being reshaped through various forms of linguistic and cultural mediation. The evolving position of translation and interpreting and their impact in this context have been examined from a variety of perspectives. Some studies have focused on specific venues such as the global publishing industry, news conglomerates, international and pan-national organizations, the film industry, or multinational companies. Others have focused on the translation strategies and impact of practices such as game localization, fansubbing, scanlation, crowdsourcing, and various forms of global resistance to the political world order.

Globalization has reinforced the dominance of English in the publishing industry: the number of books translated from English continues to rise, at the expense of other languages like Russian, Polish, Danish, and Czech (Sapiro 2010). Concepts drawn
from Pierre Bourdieu’s work can add nuance to this argument. Whereas large-scale production by conglomerates is dominated by English in the US and French markets, small-scale production by independent small firms “developed a strategy of resistance by translating literary works from an increasing number of languages, in order to promote cultural diversity” (Sapiro 2010, 420). At the same time, however, “conglomeratization has resulted in the de facto disappearance of a large number of independent publishers” (Hale 2009, 218), thus restricting the contribution of small-scale production to cultural diversity. Globalization has also led to more complex patterns of publication and work distribution, including co-publishing arrangements and increased involvement of translators in promoting books and authors in a wide range of venues, leading some scholars to call for new ways of theorizing the profession (Buzelin 2006). As in other areas of social life, one of the consequences of globalization in the publishing industry has been a blurring of the boundaries that traditionally separated the work of translators from that of others, in this case editors, publishers, and literary agents.

In the context of news dissemination and translation, two broad patterns may be identified (van Leeuwen 2006). One pattern involves globalizing the local, when local news is translated into a global language, usually English. Vietnam News is a case in point. Here, global English replaces local variants of English and the ideological perspective is adjusted to conform to the expectations of a global readership. Thus, for example, “privatization” replaces the local term “equitization,” and Communist terminology is either omitted or adjusted, with “cadres” being replaced by “officials” and “being enlightened” replaced by “being converted to the Communist cause.” Enough local vocabulary is nevertheless retained “to provide couleur locale” (van Leeuwen 2006, 230–31). The second pattern involves localizing the global, when globalizers such as CNN, Newsweek, and Cosmopolitan attempt to open up new markets for their newspapers and magazines and have to adapt the content to local requirements and sensitivities. Ji-Hae Kang (2010) demonstrates that adapting global content to local requirements can also be undertaken by local stakeholders, who may further recontextualize an imported news item in ways that question and undermine its foreign news source (Newsweek, in Kang’s example). Here again, a reductive pattern of unidirectional imposition would fail to account for the complexities of translation-mediated interaction between the more and the less powerful players in the global economy.

The concentration of news reporting in the hands of a small number of global agencies like Reuters, Associated Press, and Agence France-Presse has had a number of consequences for translation. These include the use of standard, homogenizing criteria and style codes that facilitate translation but blunt the translator’s creativity (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009, 69), as well as a blurring of role boundaries because of the integration of translation within news reporting, which leads to considerable overlap of the functions of journalist and translator and renders the contribution of the latter largely invisible.
Global news agencies’ increased control of the circulation of news has been challenged by a number of different groups. One such group is Inter Press Service, “an international communication institution with a global news agency at its core.” IPS reports news from civil society and the developing world. Unlike the large global agencies, its limited resources restrict it to reporting mostly in English. It has nevertheless managed to expand its language offerings recently through a grant from the European Union, allowing it translate some content into Czech, Hungarian, and Polish, and a licensing agreement signed with an academic blogger from Jerusalem that allows it to publish his Hebrew translations of its own (IPS) news. This pattern of collaboration among groups and individuals with limited resources is typical of the global justice movement; similar examples of collaboration exist among groups of activist translators and interpreters, such as Babels and ECOS, and between them and other activist groups, for example, between Translator Brigades and Adbusters (Baker, 2013).

IndyMedia, the Independent Media Center, poses a more radical challenge to global news agencies. It is more firmly embedded in the culture of collective, autonomous movements, having been specifically established in 1999 to offer grassroots reporting on the World Social Forum. Its site offers interfaces in a wide range of languages, and individual news items are translated into different languages depending on the availability of volunteers. Users are invited to add translations to any news item on the site. This non-hierarchical, participatory pattern of generating news and translations in different languages is radically different from the workings of news agencies, and positions translators as equal, visible participants in activist movements.

Globalization has brought with it a major technological revolution that has enabled the emergence of a non-hierarchical, participatory culture in which numerous individuals, both translators and non-translators, collaborate to produce free translations for public consumption. This type of “user-generated translation” is “based on free user participation in digital media spaces . . . [and] undertaken by unspecified self-selected individuals” who are also part of the user community (O’Hagan 2009, 97). “Gamers” are committed video game users who have the relevant language skills and work closely with hackers to extract the text from a video game and replace it with a translated version. Fansubbers started out as fan groups who subtitled Japanese animated films and made them freely available on the Internet; they “intervene[d] in the traditional dynamics of the audiovisual industry by acting as self-appointed translation commissioners” (Pérez González 2006, 265) and by undermining traditional conventions of subtitling. Among the innovative subtitling practices they introduced are the use of a wide range of fonts and typefaces, color to distinguish speakers, and glosses to explain cultural references (emulating the use of footnotes in written translations). Fansubbing has now been extended to other audiovisual genres and cultures, and has become more mainstream in its practices and more open to collaboration with industry. Scanlators, who scan, translate, and distribute unofficial editions of manga (Japanese comics) on the Internet prior to their publication in
print (Zanettin 2008, 9), similarly do not abide by existing professional norms of translation in the industry, whether in terms of copyright issues or translation strategies. Globalization has empowered both translators and non-translators to experiment with new ways of bridging the language and digital divide and to reconfigure the relationship between service providers and service users, leading to further blurring of boundaries between different types of actor and between translation and other types of text production. Strictly speaking, unsolicited, community-initiated practices like gaming, fansubbing, and scanlation are illegal. Nevertheless, they are usually tolerated, and in this sense have effectuated a different relationship between translators and commercial stakeholders at a global level. Unlike these practices, crowdsourcing is a form of solicited community translation (O’Hagan 2009) used by large Internet-based groups such as Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia, and TED, and often considered an effective alternative to machine translation (Anastasiou and Gupta 2011). Crowdsourcing is a potentially useful means of reducing the digital divide, but unlike unsolicited, fan-initiated translation, its ethics have been questioned from the perspective of its impact on the profession. Published research has identified different levels of concern about providing free translation for for-profit organizations: some translators consider such initiatives unethical and damaging to the profession, whereas others are motivated to participate for a variety of reasons (McDonough-Dolmaya 2012). An undated petition against crowdsourcing translation initiated by Translators for Ethical Business Practices suggests that many continue to consider the practice unethical and damaging to their status as professionals.4

An additional pattern of participatory, collaborative translation characteristic of the era of globalization involves loose groups of individuals with diverse skills coming together to confront a particular challenge and then dispersing. Similar to autonomous political movements described by social movement theorists, these groups function as “biodegradable networks,” “dissolving and regenerating into new forms of organization and action” as the need arises (Flesher Fominaya 2007, 339). In the context of translation, Luis Pérez González (2010) refers to them as “ad-hocracies,” because of their ad hoc nature and transient status. Translation is not the central activity of these groups, but it is becoming increasingly important in their work, with some capitalizing on the potential of networked communication to produce and circulate subtitled versions of televised interviews and other political audiovisual content as a form of resistance to the global order (Pérez González 2010).

Whatever area of social or political life is examined from the perspective of globalization, translation and interpreting can be clearly seen to play a major role in shaping patterns of dominance and of resistance within it. The mainstream industries of cinema, news, and publishing rely on translators and interpreters to reach and influence global publics, as do political lobbies and government bodies. At the same time, amorphous groups of fans and activists who wish to pose a challenge to the dominant world order also use translation and interpreting to undermine existing structures of power. The evolving technological landscape continues to shape the opportunities
available to both. Technological advances, especially new information and communication technologies, are crucial to sustaining the non-hierarchical, participatory culture that makes many of the challenges posed through translation and interpreting possible.

**Future Directions**

Ethical considerations have received growing attention in recent years (Chesterman 1997; Koskinen 2000; Jones 2004; Bermann and Wood 2005; Goodwin 2010; Baker and Maier 2011; Inghilleri 2011, among others) and are likely to occupy a more central place in the discipline for a number of reasons. These include the increased involvement and visibility of interpreters and translators in situations of violent conflict (Baker 2006; Inghilleri and Harding 2010), the “weaponization” of translation in the counterinsurgency agenda (Rafael 2012), increased awareness of the role played by translation and interpreting in suppressing or promoting aspects of the lived experience of marginalized groups such as women (von Flotow 2011) and gays (Mira 1999), awareness of the affective dimension of translation and interpreting (Cronin 2002; Maier 2002; Robinson 2011), and the threat to the profession posed by new technologies and practices, such as machine translation and crowdsourcing.

Closely connected to questions of ethics is the issue of trust, especially, but not exclusively, in the context of conflict and its aftermath, and in dialogue interpreting, given the immediacy and intensity of both types of mediated interaction. In the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (1946–48), uncertainty about the trustworthiness of interpreters led to the use of three ethnically and socially different groups: Japanese nationals as interpreters, Japanese Americans as monitors, and US military officers as language arbiters (Takeda 2009). Similar levels of mistrust have been noted in more recent conflicts, particularly in relation to locally hired interpreters (Baker 2010b). In community interpreting, users’ assessment of the personal character of an interpreter and their ability to trust him or her as a person influences their understanding of good interpreting, often leading them to prefer interpreters drawn from their own informal networks (Edwards et al. 2005, 2006). Lack of clarity about expectations and anxiety over role boundaries in social work can similarly lead to an erosion of trust between interpreters and social workers, with social workers being reluctant to share expert knowledge with the interpreter for fear of losing control of the interaction (Tipton 2010).

The impact of new media cultures and new technologies on all aspects of translation and interpreting is among the most promising new lines of research in the field. New media cultures and practices, such as the running subtitle on television (Cazdyn [2004] 2010), configure new ways of seeing and experiencing global realities. New media also create new readerships and the translators and translation strategies to serve them (Littau 2011). Like other areas of social and political life, the interaction between translators and their tools follows a complex dialectic of resistance and accommodation.
(Olohan 2011) and reflects the tensions that shape the evolving face of the profession and the discipline.

See also Chapter 2 (Kristal), Chapter 7 (Saldanha), Chapter 9 (Pérez González), Chapter 12 (Tymoczko), Chapter 28 (Ghazoul), Chapter 32 (Connor)

Notes

1 http://www.ips.org/institutional/
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