

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Perspectives
Studies in Translation Theory and Practice

ISSN: 0907-676X (Print) 1747-6623 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rmps20

Convergence and divergence in recent Chinese translation and interpreting studies

Binhua Wang, Callum Walker & Jeremy Munday

To cite this article: Binhua Wang, Callum Walker & Jeremy Munday (2023) Convergence and divergence in recent Chinese translation and interpreting studies, Perspectives, 31:6, 987-995, DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2023.2221914

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2023.2221914

Published online: 01 Dec 2023.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 3000

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Citing articles: 3 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rmps20

PERSPECTIVES
2023, VOL. 31, NO. 6, 987–995
https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2023.2221914

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

INTRODUCTION

Check for updates

Convergence and divergence in recent Chinese translation and interpreting studies

Binhua Wang, Callum Walker and Jeremy Munday

Centre for Translation Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Trends in Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS) have often been stated in terms of convergence and divergence. One of the early efforts in this regard was a volume edited by Bowker et al. (1998), which summarised the main currents in TIS as 'unity in diversity'. Starting in 2000, the issue of diversity was debated in *Target* (Volume 12.1 onwards) in a forum led by Rosemary Arrojo and Andrew Chesterman; the conclusion from that debate was that there was relatively little common ground between different approaches to the study of translation. Subsequently, Chesterman (2005, 2019) has revisited the question using the biologist Wilson's (1998) concept of 'consilience', or unity of knowledge, as a valuable counterweight to fragmentation of the discipline. General introductions to Translation Studies (Munday, 2001 and later editions) and to Interpreting Studies (Pöchhacker, 2004 and later editions) have also pointed to the existence of both trends in TIS. The apparently similar themes might suggest convergence across the two main sub-disciplines of TIS, but divergences can also be identified between them: while Translation Studies initially drew heavily on discussions about the translation of sacred and literary texts (Chiaro, 2008), Interpreting Studies originated mainly from reflections on interpreting practice and training; and while Translation Studies has been shaped by liberal arts and humanities, as well as linguistics, the trajectory of Interpreting Studies seems to have resembled more that of the natural sciences and social sciences.

In terms of research perspectives and methodologies, convergence in the development of TIS has long been represented by the paradigm 'shifts' or 'turns' (Snell-Hornby, 2006), such as the linguistic turn, the cultural turn, the post-colonial turn, and more recently the empirical turn, the sociological turn, the cognitive turn and the technological turn, which were shaped largely by concepts, theories and methodologies from adjacent disciplines. However, more recently, the rich diversity in the topics of TIS and in its vast number of publications have made it difficult to cover its dynamic development on various fronts with a unified term that can be labelled as a distinct 'turn'. Also, geographical diversity and cultural relativity have contributed to the divergence. In the past two decades, TIS 'has expanded geographically, as training programmes have been created in countries like China, South Korea and Australia, and academically, as TIS has engaged in dialogues with the academic Other' (Valdeón, 2017). There has been an exponential growth of the translation and interpreting (T&I) industry globally and, in particular, in emerging markets. For example, in China the demand for T&I services has been growing rapidly

CONTACT Binhua Wang B.H.W.Wang@leeds.ac.uk
© 2023 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

since its entry into the World Trade Organisation in 2001. Driven by demand, the year 2006 saw the initiation of specialised T&I programmes at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels in China's universities; these programmes increased rapidly and currently number over 300. This has not only established the disciplinary status of TIS in higher education institutions in China but also contributed to the fast expansion TIS research in China.

It is noticeable that there has been a growing trend of convergence between Chinese TIS and TIS in the West in recent years, which is represented by the increasing number of Chinese TIS scholars, especially of the younger generation, in their enthusiastic pursuit for 'going global'. There has been a rapid growth in the number of articles published by them in international journals. A search in the 'Web of Science' for English-language articles in TIS by authors from China shows significant growth from the beginning of the century to the present day: from about 10 during the period of 1999–2008 to about 50 during the period of 2009–2018, then to over 100 articles during the most recent five-year period (2019–2023). Based on the topics of the recent five years, most articles converge on five areas: audio-visual translation, cognitive processes in T&I, aspects of T&I training, corpus-based analysis of T&I products, and critical discourse analysis of translated and interpreted political and news discourse. In terms of methodology, most of the articles converge on empirical studies; these include observational studies based on digital corpora, experimental studies based on data collected by state-of-the-art equipment such as eye-trackers and fMRI, quantitative analyses based on survey data, and qualitative analyses based on interview data.

However, the articles published on T&I in Chinese journals in China seem to suggest a trend of divergence from Western influences. Prior to recent developments, contemporary theorisation of T&I in China had been largely shaped by Western theories. Despite the long history and tradition of translation in China, traditional Chinese discourses on translation that can be dated as far back as the Han Dynasty (202 BCE – 220 CE) had not been reflected adequately in the modern theorisation of T&I. In recent years, there has been an eagerness or anxiety among some scholars in China to propose new 'theories' in the name of 'disciplines' or 'studies'. According to the survey by Fang (2023) in the database of the China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI, the biggest database of Chinese journal articles, theses and conference proceedings), dozens of new names of 'disciplines' or 'studies' related to TIS have appeared. While some names were translated from the West, such as Corpus-based Translation Studies, Descriptive Translation Studies, Applied Translation Studies, Cognitive Translation Studies and Sociology of Translation, others seem to originate locally, such as 生态翻译学 (Eco-translatology), 和合翻译学 (Harmonizing Heterogenerative Translatology) and 知识翻译学 (Transknowletology). The penultimate entry in this list, 和合翻译学 (Harmonizing Heterogenerative Translatology), was proposed as a 'theory' organised around five concepts of traditional Chinese philosophy: 意 (idea, the ontological view of harmonious translation), 诚 (sincerity, the ethical view of harmonious translation), 心 (mind, the cognitive view of harmonious translation), 神 (spirit, the aesthetic view of harmonious translation) and 适 (adaptation, the cultural view of harmonious translation) (Wu, 2018). 知识翻译学 (Transknowletology) was proposed as the exploration of the acts, relations, movements and laws in cross-linguistic knowledge processing, reconfiguration and retransmission, with the focus on the production and

transformation of local knowledge to world knowledge (Yang, 2021). By doing so, it is hoped that the scientific, social and humanistic nature of knowledge may resolve the long-standing disciplinary myths and categorisation anxieties of Translation Studies, and that Translation Studies will become a super-discipline or meta-discipline encompassing the three major knowledge categories of natural sciences, social sciences and humanities (Yang, 2021). However, based on our search in the 'Web of Science', for most of the new names of 'disciplines' or 'studies' proposed by scholars in China no publications have yet appeared in English for international readers, with the exception of 生态翻译学 (Eco-translatology) (Hu, 2020).

After this overview of convergence and divergence between Translation Studies and Interpreting Studies, between 'the centre' and 'the periphery', between the West and the East, it is necessary to note that the evolution of Chinese T&I practices and their training, combined with the idiosyncrasies of the Chinese language compared with other global languages, may embody not only universals of T&I theories and practice, but also specificities in the practice and theorisation of Chinese T&I. Of course, this special issue cannot possibly cover every element in a fast-growing field, but it can provide a useful snapshot of both convergence and divergence in the recent development of Chinese TIS on various fronts: conceptual discussion of research orientations in TIS, reflection on methodology in TIS, (typical) corpus-based analysis, examination of new aspects of T&I, renewed discussion about classical principles, tapping new frontiers of T&I as socially relevant activities, and analysing new issues in T&I training.

The articles in the special issue originated from the selected keynote speeches and conference papers presented in the 1st UK–China Symposium on Translation Studies, which was held in August 2021 by the Centre for Translation Studies of University of Leeds to mark its 25th anniversary, jointly with Beijing Foreign Studies University. The contributions, all double peer-reviewed for this volume, range from philosophical musings on themes permeating Chinese translation theories, to investigations of national translation capacity, and macro- and micro-level studies on Chinese/English interpreting, with methodologies spanning conceptual (meta)analysis, corpus linguistics, experiment-based research, and discourse analysis. In bringing this diverse spectrum of research together, the special issue aims to contribute to the long-standing calls for unity and diversity in TIS and to provide fresh insights on universal features and specific features, thereby furthering the dialogue between scholars of T&I in the wider context of Chinese T&I and beyond. It is these contrasting, but complementary, focal points that sit at the heart of the articles in this special issue.

Binhua Wang's article on 'Exploring Information Processing as a New Research Orientation Beyond Cognitive Operations and Their Management in Interpreting Studies' provides a conceptual overview of research trends in Interpreting Studies alongside a new orientation ripe for further research. Beginning with a review of literature on the cognitive dimension of interpreting and how cognitive load is managed by interpreters, it traces the broad outlines of the last fifty years of research, culminating in a discussion of six distinctive features of interpreting. Noting the co-presence of participants, multitasking, immediacy, singular delivery of the ST and TT, multimodality, and orality, Wang highlights convincingly the importance of aspects beyond the cognitive approach that should be deserving of further attention in Interpreting Studies. He argues that information processing, in particular, should be a core focus of research in

this field, given the multifaceted dimensions of the very notion of 'information' in an interpreting context. With these conceptualisations laid out, Wang concludes the article with a framework agenda for research, in which he proposes focusing on multimodal processing of information as a hyper-discourse, strategic processing of information due to the immediacy and singular presentation of the interpretation and how information is processed in interpreting in the wider context of interpersonal communication and sociocultural interaction. All these elements are bound together by a common strand of research pertaining to the specificities of the language pair with respect to information processing. This conceptual overview provides rich food for thought in how to better understand the mechanisms by which interpreting takes place, both on a micro- and on a wider macro-level, and will surely serve as an important point of reference and 'call to action' for researchers in the field of Interpreting Studies.

In **Chonglong Gu**'s article 'A Layered Methodological Framework on the Main Ideologically Salient Categories to Explore in TIS, Drawing on CDA and Corpus Linguistics', he proposes a triangulation of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and corpus linguistics methods, with a particular focus on the unique specificities and challenges of *bilingual* CDA. While existing approaches have focused on specific discursive categories, Gu attempts to investigate the mediation of translators and interpreters in their work, offering a toolkit which he dubs a 'stratified framework'. The framework is broken down into three main categories (encompassing four 'prongs'). The first is 'low-hanging fruits', which he describes as 'obvious lexical labelling and naming strategies relating to the representation of key socio-political actors and historical and current events and the rendering of sensitive and disputable topics that might potentially be ideologically interesting'. The second category is referred to as 'the usual suspects', in which he proposes a focus on 'preconceived *a priori* linguistic categories and discursive toolkits', marking a shift towards a more bottom-up lexically- or syntactically-driven analysis of textual features that have 'already proven salient' in previous CDA research. The final category (split into two 'prongs') is 'pure serendipity', and encompasses 'data-driven and bottom-up approaches using CL software' and 'additional rounds of manual comparative CDA study between the source and target discourses to discover remaining cases of interpreter mediation that have fallen through the cracks' in previous layers. To demonstrate this methodological and analytical framework, Gu offers a range of examples in interpreting from the contemporary socio-political sphere. The approach advocated in this article will provide fresh inspiration for research inspired by the complementary, but often disconnected methodological spheres of CDA and corpus linguistics, to further investigate the influence of interpreter mediation in a wide range of settings.

Fei Gao's article 'Getting the Message in 'Sound' Across at Conference Interpreting: A Case Study on Rendering Prosodic Emphasis' highlights the critical role of 'sound' as a key aspect of meaning-making in interpreting, but one that is still significantly understudied. The focus of this research lies squarely on target text renditions of source text prosodic emphasis, drawing on paralinguistic and verbal data from conference settings. The key innovation of this research is Gao's adoption of acoustic measurements from the fields of phonology and phonetics to investigate the phenomena of 'prosodic-correspondence' and 'verbal-compensation', both of which are used as strategies to render source text prosodic emphasis. The results of this innovative research show that a higher range of speech pitch, intensity and duration will result in a higher likelihood of verbal-

compensation, where formal and structural verbal strategies will make up for the 'lost' prosodic features in alternative ways. Such a strategy tends to take the form of additional 'intensifying words' or explicitation, or more generally some other verbal means of expressing the 'sound' of the source text besides prosody alone. It is clear from this article that this is still an emerging area of research and one that is deserving of far greater attention in future. The clear articulations of the value of approaches in phonology and phonetics will serve as a useful methodological contribution to this area of research and to other studies of multimodality in interpreting more generally.

In their article 'Audio Description and Interpreter Training: A Comparison of Assessment Criteria from the Perspective of Learners', **Jackie Xiu Yan and Kangte Luo** draw attention to the substantial similarities between audio description (AD) and interpreting in terms of both training and quality assessment. Using the case study of a university in Hong Kong, they explore the similarities and differences in training, paying attention to both micro- and macro-level assessment criteria in both practices. In their research, they find that AD and interpreting share three macro-criteria (accuracy, language and delivery), but a range of micro- and macro-criteria were exclusive to one or other practice. Yan and Luo attribute these differences to the interlingual nature of interpreting and the intersemiotic nature of AD. As part of this research, they also collected data on learners' perceptions of assessment criteria. They found that some criteria were more difficult to achieve in AD or in interpreting, and also that some criteria were seen to be more important in one practice than the other. With the growth of modules incorporating training on AD either as part of wider translation programmes or on more dedicated interpreting programmes, the analysis and results of this research provide useful perspectives to help trainers to better understand the needs and expectations of interpreting students undertaking specialist training in audio description.

Yifeng Sun's article, 'Yan Fu's Translation 'Principle(s)' and Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*', focuses on one of the best-known, but at times misunderstood 'exports' of Chinese Translation Studies: Yan Fu's so-called translation 'principles'. In Yan's preface to his translation of Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*, he wrote that there were three 'difficulties' (難 *nán*) in translation: *xìn* (信), *dá* (達), and *yǎ* (雅), often rendered as 'faithfulness', 'expressiveness', and 'elegance' in English. These conceptual distinctions and their interpretation are addressed critically in Sun's article, in which *dá* is posited as the 'central axis'. Sun argues, moreover, that the common translation of 'expressiveness' fails to encapsulate the wide-ranging denotations of *dá*, noting that Yan himself suggested that it could be translated as 'accessibility', for instance. Indeed, the more relevant concept of *dázhǐ* (達旨), Sun suggests, better reflects the long-standing discrepancy between form and content in China. The article traces discussions of *dázhǐ* to propose that Yan Fu was in fact one of the earliest proponents of what we now refer to as *skopos* theory. The selection of material for translation from Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* underscored Yan's commitment to the underlying purpose of his translation: namely the enlightenment of the Chinese public. The article also brings to light a number of intriguing questions relating to the translator's identity and relationship with the source text author, including debates around the very notion of translation in light of the 'unorthodox' nature of Yan's 'translation-as-commentary' approach. Using a number of examples from Yan's translation, Sun demonstrates Yan's manipulation of the text and the 'dethroning' of the source text's author, while also highlighting the

fact that such practices are not new in Chinese cultural history. Ultimately, the article serves to characterise the complex nature of Yan Fu's thought and disentangle some of the many misinterpretations of these 'principles', as they are often (misleadingly) dubbed, with a view to re-examining the very notion of translation itself and prompting further discussion of Yan's elaborate thinking on translation.

Yan Wang's contribution offers further engagement with the concept *dá* (達, expressiveness) in her article '*Da* (Expressiveness) – The Implicit Thread of Traditional Chinese Translation Theories'. While *xìn* (信, faithfulness) is regarded as a core concept in traditional Chinese translation discourse, Wang argues that the *dá*, as a conceptual thread (popularised within Yan Fu's *xìn-dá-yǎ* conceptualisation mentioned above), runs throughout four key stages of Chinese translation theories dating back to the mid-second century CE. Indeed, it is argued that *dá* is the uniting principle at the heart of this conceptual trinity, a claim supported by a number of scholars. Wang suggests that reading Yan Fu's translation principles without understanding the central 'binding' role of *dá* will ultimately result in a failure to 'capture the essence of translation'. The article develops this argument further with reference to Fu Lei's conceptualisation of *shén* (神, spirit) and insights from the study of painting and art, which offer interesting resonances with translation. Wang also teases out understandings of *dá* in Qian Zhongshu's notion of *huàjìng* (化境, transformation of realm), wherein *dá* (expressiveness) is elevated to a metaphysical level. Through a combined reading of the articles by Yifeng Sun and Yan Wang, it becomes clear that Chinese thinking on translation is still giving rise to deeply philosophical and ontological (re)interpretations of concepts at the heart of historic and contemporary translation studies, and that this area of research complements (and is beginning to counterbalance) not only the largely Western hegemonic domination of translation theory, but also misconceptions and oversimplifications of Chinese thought on translation in Western theoretical discourse.

In their article 'Defining National Translation Capacity: A Comprehensive Framework for Analyzing Translation at Country Level', **Wen Ren and Juanjuan Li** draw on studies focusing on National Language Capacity, the State-sponsored Translation Program in China, and institutional translation more generally to propose a framework for National Translation Capacity (NTC). The underlying aim of this proposed framework is to provide a means to analyse translation activities on a national level and to explore how sub-components of translation-related activities interact with one another. The framework aims to cover the overall capacity of relevant actors in the translation industry within a given country (including individuals and institutions), within the wider context of that country's infrastructure for translation activities (including the provision of translation services, promotion of translation work, and other related activities). The concept of NTC that Ren and Li propose incorporates four 'sub-capacities': 'translation management', 'translation services', 'translation dissemination', and 'translation development', with a view to broadening the intended scope of Translation Studies to encompass the ways in which a country's translation capacity can contribute to its cultural and wider economic power. It will also allow for a better understanding of the value of translation and translation-related activities and the role of translation in the promotion of national, regional and even global linguistic and cultural diversity. With the growing interest in the translation industry within Translation Studies, and in particular sociological enquiries into the 'soft power' of translation in wider international

and cross-cultural flows, this article provides an important framework as a basis for analysis of a country's capacity for translation on a wide variety of levels. With further development and country-specific studies using this framework, it could in future allow for meta-analyses of global translation capacity if adopted by TS researchers around the world.

Yuan Ping's article 'Investigating Translation Style in English Translations of Chinese Editorials and Commentaries from the *HK Economic Journal*' provides an insight into journalistic translation in a Chinese context. Traditional research on translator style has typically focused on the translation of literature and poetry, but this article offers a unique analysis of translator style in Chinese-English translations of editorials and commentaries in the *Hong Kong Economic Journal* (HKEJ). Using corpus-based methods, including analyses of sentence length, reporting verbs, and high-frequency words, among others, Ping interprets the findings with reference to translators' personal attributes and their wider socio-cultural context with a view to pinpointing contributing factors to their stylistic choices and differences. His findings show that translation style is heavily influenced by source language linguistic features and target language conventions. But they also highlight the fact that translated news involves the input of a wide range of different agents and each of these agents leave their own collective traces upon the translation style. The shifts in style can in fact reflect the editorial stance and the target readership of the news outlet. In moving the study of translator style away from the literary realm, Ping's article makes a novel contribution to the field of translatorial stylistics, an area which is still somewhat lacking in substantive exploration. In light of the potential influence and even interference of ideological factors in editorial choices, this article foregrounds the potential to use translation data as a springboard for exploring mediation and intervention in a wide range of national and transnational journalistic contexts.

We hope that this special issue will stimulate more discussions engaging with the topic of convergence and divergence between Translation Studies and Interpreting Studies, across research and practice, and between the East and the West. We would like to express thanks to the chief editor of the journal for his guidance on the editing process and to all the reviewers for their devotion of time and expertise in the double-blind reviewing process, which has ensured the quality of the papers finally accepted for publication.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Binhua Wang is Chair/Professor of Interpreting and Translation Studies at the University of Leeds. He is a Fellow of the 'Chartered Institute of Linguists', Executive Committee member of the 'UK University Council of Modern Languages' and the Interpreters Committee member of the 'Translators Association of China'. He serves on the editorial boards of *Babel, The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, Forum, Chinese Translators Journal* and *Translation Quarterly*. His research has focused on various aspects of interpreting studies and translation studies, in which he has published many articles in refereed CSSCI journals and SSCI/A&HCI journals such as

Interpreting, Meta, Perspectives and *Babel* and in edited collections published by Routledge, John Benjamins, Springer and Palgrave. He has also authored the monographs *Theorising Interpreting Studies* (2019) and *A Descriptive Study of Norms in Interpreting* (2013), edited with Jeremy Munday *Advances in Discourse Analysis of Translation and Interpreting Studies* (Routledge, 2020).

Callum Walker is Associate Professor of Translation Technology and Director of the Centre for Translation Studies at the University of Leeds. He has previously lectured at Durham University, Goldsmiths University of London and University College London. His research interests focus on translation industry studies, project management and information economics, in addition to experimental reception research methodologies in translation studies. His research has been published in leading journals such as *Perspectives* and *Cognitive Linguistic Studies*, and he has published the co-edited book *Eye Tracking and Multidisciplinary Studies on Translation* (2018), the monograph *An Eye-Tracking Study of Equivalent Effect in Translation* (2021), and a recent textbook on *Translation Project Management* (2022).

Jeremy Munday is Emeritus Professor of Translation Studies at the University of Leeds. His specialisms include linguistic translation theories, discourse analysis (including systemic functional linguistics), ideology and translation, and Latin American literature in translation. He is the author of, amongst others, *Introducing Translation Studies* (2022, now in its co-authored 5th edition). He has had executive, advisory or editorial roles for the Chartered Institute of Linguists, the European Society for Translation Studies and the International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies, as well as for journals worldwide. He is also General Editor for the *Bloomsbury Advances in Translation* series. He was the Chair Professor at the CETRA Summer School (2016) organised by the University of Leuven in Antwerp.

ORCID

Binhua Wang http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2404-5214
Callum Walker http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7949-5621
Jeremy Munday http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9870-3668

References

Bowker, L., Cronin, M., Kenny, D., & Pearson, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Unity in diversity. Recent trends in translation studies*. St. Jerome.

Chesterman, A. (2005). Consilience in translation studies. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, *51* (51), 19–32.

Chesterman, A. (2019). Consilience or fragmentation in translation studies today? *Slovo.ru: Baltijskij Akcent*, *10*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.5922/2225-5346-2019-1-1

Chiaro, D. (2008). Is it true? Is it new? Does it matter? Towards a paradigm shift in translation and interpreting studies. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *3*(1/2), 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.3.1-2.05chi

Fang, MZ(方梦之). (2023). A survey on interdisciplinary translation studies with 66 different names (跨学科创学之成败得失——66 种跨学科的翻译学鸟瞰). *Journal of Foreign Languages (外国语)*, *46*(2), 79–87.

Hu, G. S. (2020). *Eco-Translatology: Towards an Eco-paradigm of translation studies*. Springer Nature.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies. Theories and applications* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* John Benjamins.

Valdeón, R. A. (2017). From translatology to studies in translation theory and practice. *Perspectives*, *25*(2), 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1290123

Wilson, E. O. (1998). *Consilience: The unity of knowledge*. Little, Brown and Company.

Wu, Z. (吴志杰). (2018). *Harmonizing heterogenesis translatology (和合翻译学)*. Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press (北京: 外语教学与研究出版社).
Yang, F. (杨枫). (2021). Editorial. Transknowletology: A declaration (卷首语.知识翻译学宣言). *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies (当代外语研究)*, *21*(5), 2–4.