

Intercultural communication as reflected in translation studies terminology: rethinking the basics?¹

Tatiana A. Volkova

Liliya A. Nefedova

Abstract

This paper provides a terminological review born of the following simple idea: contemporary translation studies as a discipline is often expected to be treated as intercultural mediation since translation is viewed as intercultural communication. However, a lot of the terminology used by the discipline, at least in current Russian tradition, stems from the linguistic translation theory. Terminology analysis shows that, on the one hand, the core terms of equivalence, adequacy, adaptation and mediation already cover the important aspects of intercultural communication, each in its own right. If viewed accordingly, existing terms can be integrated into a broader conceptual framework. On the other hand, the profession itself may not be ready for certain shifts that change our perception, locally and globally, of how we do our job and train novice translators and interpreters. Embracing the fact that traditional terminology keeps us grounded, for the sake of translation theory, practice and training, as well as increasing mutual awareness and making an often neglected effort to explain theories and terminologies across the disciplines within one academic culture and across national research paradigms should help us consolidate core terminology and gradually pinpoint terminological differences, in both cases contributing to the development of the shared metalanguage we speak.

Keywords: *translation studies, intercultural communication, equivalence, adequacy, adaptation, mediation, metalanguage, terminology, discourse*

Introduction

Perception of reality is sometimes shaped by (seemingly) unmotivated or borrowed concepts, and it is one of the translator's tasks to find an appropriate solution for each case. It is interesting, however, how similar cases might be perceived in terminological realities of shared international research, questioning or sometimes hindering further developments. With the linguistic approach to translation at the base of the Russian tradition, we have by now certainly embraced most of the later functional and communicative paradigms. Skopos theory and follow-up works are viewed as the fundamental conceptual framework for the development of a larger trend that has entered Russian translation studies as a "communicative (functional) approach," and expanded questions of "who does what for whom and for what purpose" into a whole set of translation theories.

This paper is not intended to confront or criticize particular paradigms or theories. Stemming from and developing in a larger field of linguistics, the discipline of translation studies in Russia is not expected to disengage from linguistics completely anytime soon, no matter how interdisciplinary current research on translation may be. However, in line with international research trends, translation in Russia has recently been perceived as intercultural

¹ This study was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (project No. 34.6111.2017/БЧ, "Translating Media Texts within the Context of Modern Tendencies in Mass Communication").

communication², and it has in a way become obvious and self-explanatory that intercultural communication and translation are inseparable: "... research into cross-cultural communication has in recent years been particularly vigorous, a development from which translation and interpreting studies have no doubt benefited considerably" (Hatim 2001: 69). For further confirmation one can refer to a seminal work by Komissarov (1991), or Snell-Hornby (1997) and Samovar (2011), or an engaging series of works by Ter-Minasova (2008a, 2008b, 2011), or a more recent volume on intercultural communication and its various applications (International Communication 2015). For a discussion on terminology see, for instance, Koskinen (2015).

Taking it a step further, Pym sees "translation [as] a relatively high-effort high-cost mode of mediated cross-cultural communication, normally suited to short-term communication acts" (Pym 2004: 7), and with a reference to some other works postulates that "cross-cultural communication... marks the points of contact between cultures, although it alone will not join up the points to form any kind of line" (Ibid: 2). Pym introduces "professional interculturalities" as compared to cross-cultural communication (Pym 2004: 17-18) and argues that "membership of interculturalities presupposes some knowledge of at least two primary cultures. Translators would thus by definition be members of interculturalities, without betraying or annulling membership of their primary cultures" (Ibid: 19). "Defining a translation coincides with certain culture-bound conceptions but should not exclude other culture-bound criteria, of whatever nature," i.e., "if a term other than 'translation' is required, that can be arranged" (Ibid: 9). Turning to translator training, Pym points out that "the people we train will do more than translate" (Ibid: 23).

Both Russian and Western scholars seem to have decided quite a while ago that adequacy and equivalence in their purely linguistic senses neither embrace nor reflect the wide variety of real-life translation. However, in the Russian tradition we employ both concepts in research and translator training, making sure we explain now and then how both terms are to be understood. The terms are sometimes reinterpreted in the process, given the variety of definitions at hand, but scholars still seem to find them somewhat safe and reassuring both in research and teaching. In a pursuit of interdisciplinarity, researchers quite rightly try to incorporate discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics and intercultural communication (as a discipline) into translation studies. Per contra, a lot of terminology used in contemporary translation research (that is now clearly supposed to incorporate intercultural communication) was introduced in the twentieth century by linguistic translation theories that, to put it simply, place language before culture and linguistic signs before communicative functions.

On the one hand, exploring "where cultural studies and translation studies have failed to connect despite their shared interests" (Conway 2017: 626), Conway postulates that "the paucity of exchange suggests that artificially maintained boundaries remain" (Conway 2017: 627). On the other hand, in line with, inter alia, "a marked tendency towards self-reflexivity", rightfully pointed out by Baker (Baker 2001: 17), it is only natural that we question traditional terminology when developing new and mostly interdisciplinary theories.

The discussion on adequacy, equivalence and other terms originating from the linguistic theory of translation, as well as on their current applications, has been going on for a while. Comparative studies of this kind reflecting differences between Western and Eastern

² We refer to "intercultural" and "cross-cultural" communication as synonyms throughout the paper, and "translation studies" and "translation theory" are also used interchangeably.

(both Soviet and later Russian) approaches and terminology in English and in Russian include (Kazakova 2016), (Kashkin, Shilikhina 2014), (Pym 2012), (Pym, Ayvazyan 2015, URL) and (Pym, Ayvazyan 2014), to name a few³. Reviving the debate may indeed seem somewhat unnecessary, but the list of questions remains extensive. We would like to address the following ones in this paper:

1. With a special significance attributed to the issue of terminology, at least in current Russian research, is basic terminology really the core concern that, once resolved, will change the face of present-day translation studies?
2. Does existing terminology at some point hamper research and, perhaps more importantly, translator training? Or should the intertwined traditional concepts keep us grounded so that no unnecessary wheels are reinvented?
3. Do we give trainee translators and interpreters enough skills in cross-cultural communication, even at the minimum terminology level? Are they not restricted by a traditional understanding of translation and “classic” categories? Or do these categories provide a more solid basis for further development of translation and interpreting skills per se and intercultural competence at large?

We take definitions primarily from the following sources: a classic work by Nelyubin (2003), a more recent one (ОСНОВНЫЕ ПОНЯТИЯ ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИЯ 2010), a comprehensive Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (2001) and the 2014 Routledge edition of the Dictionary of Translation Studies (Shuttleworth, Cowie 2014), for terminology in Russian and in English, respectively.

With a particular focus on the contemporary Russian line of thought, we would like to compare terminology to demonstrate that the existing concepts of equivalence, adequacy, adaptation and mediation already cover the important aspects of intercultural communication, each in its own right. At the same time, there are other factors, both intra- and interdisciplinary, national and international, that act as signals of what the profession has to say. The list we form to compare terminology is by no means exhaustive.

(Re)defining concepts in translation studies

Equivalence is “a term used by many writers to describe the nature and the extent of the relationships which exist between SL and TL texts or smaller linguistic units” (Shuttleworth, Cowie 2014: 49), held to “distinguish translation from non-translation” (Kenny 2001: 80), though this definition of equivalence is “circular” (Pym 1992, in *Ibid*: 79). In Nelyubin (2003) we find a similar definition opening an entry on equivalence (Nelyubin 2003: 253-254, translation ours, here and throughout):

Смысловая общность приравниваемых друг к другу единиц; охватывает отношения как между отдельными знаками, так и между текстами. (*A semantic relationship between units set equal to each other; [equivalence] encompasses the relationships both between individual signs and between texts.*)

This could be an example of a somewhat one-sided linguistic interpretation that is indeed hardly applicable to a larger conceptual framework of current translation studies and

³ For more on Russian traditional approaches and relevant terminology in English, see (Komissarov 2001: 541-549); (Proshina 2008).

that we are not defending in any way. However, in the same entry we find the following interpretation of equivalence (Nelyubin 2003: 254):

эквивалентность текстов выходит за пределы их языковых манифестаций и включает также культурную эквивалентность (*equivalence of texts surpasses the linguistic boundaries and also suggests cultural equivalence*).

Cf. this with an entry on equivalence in (Oparina, 2010a: 221-222):

коммуникативная эквивалентность... операциональная категория, когда главным критерием равноценности ИТ и ПТ считается реакция получателей исходного и переводного текстов; семантическая категория. Большинство исследователей признают относительность реально достижимой эквивалентности перевода. (*communicative equivalence... an operational category based on the equivalence of the source text and target text recipients' reactions; a semantic category* Most researchers deem realistically attainable translation equivalence relative).

Demonstrating what can be perceived both as flexibility and inconsistency, definitions of equivalence span from a narrower semantic to a broader cultural or functional perspective. The paradox is probably best summarized by Pym (Pym, 2010):

the narrow equivalence-based conceptualization of translation is closely related to print culture, to the age of the book, and to the corresponding standardization of national languages. Pre-print translation practices are generally far less concerned with servitude to a source; they are more extensive in their range of renditions; they are closer to what is happening now, in the electronic age of localization.

In a later paper Pym emphasizes that “equivalence will no longer help us decide what is right or wrong in translation. We can only observe the things that translators manage to get away with” (Pym 2012).

Clearly “the term, which had originally been introduced in order to define translation scientifically, has become increasingly complex and fragmented” (Shuttleworth, Cowie 2014: 50), and a good many definitions of equivalence and adequacy are synonymous, as has been described in detail in (Pym, Ayvazyan 2015, URL), demonstrating what Kazakova terms «внутрисистемная синонимия» (*internal synonymy*) (Kazakova 2016: 78). Cf. an entry on adequacy in (Shuttleworth, Cowie 2014: 5):

The term... is used sometimes synonymously with, sometimes instead of, and sometimes in contrast with the related term equivalence... In most [definitions] the term has an evaluative, even normative character... However, where the two terms are used side by side, adequacy generally refers to a looser, less absolute ST-TT relationship than equivalence.

Before we move on, however, it should be noted that using the basic notion of equivalence in translator training seems completely reasonable, e. g., to explain the core difference between translation and rendering or to show how a translation may be equivalent but not adequate. We think that, no matter what translation theory underlies a particular curriculum, removing the concept of equivalence from training, at least in the Russian tradition, would make certain things quite hard to comprehend.

In Russian sources *adequacy* is described as follows (Nelyubin 2003: 13):

Соответствие выбора языковых знаков на языке перевода тому изменению исходного текста, которое избирается в качестве основного ориентира процесса перевода; такое соотношение исходного и конечного текстов, при котором последовательно учитывается цель перевода⁴. Адекватность исходит из того, что решение, принимаемое переводчиком, нередко носит компромиссный характер. (*The correspondence between the selection of linguistic signs in the TL and the changes made to the ST, viewed as the point of departure in the process of translation; the relation between the ST and the TT that consistently heeds the purpose of translation. Adequacy proceeds from the fact that a translator's decision is often a compromise.*)

Just like one of the above definition of equivalence, entries for «адекватный перевод» (adequate translation) refer, inter alia, to the TT recipient's reaction. Cf. (Nelyubin 2003: 14):

перевод с учетом широкого контекста с сохранением стилистической характеристики; текст перевода полностью репрезентирует текст оригинала; перевод, вызывающий у иноязычного получателя реакцию, соответствующую коммуникативной установке отправителя (*a translation that heeds the broad context and preserves the style of the ST; the TT completely represents the ST; a translation that triggers a TT recipient's reaction that corresponds to the ST sender's communicative intention*).

Or a similar entry in (Bazylev 2010: 9-10):

Адекватный перевод – перевод, предполагающий соответствие тем ожиданиям, которые возлагают на него участники коммуникации, а также тем условиям, в которых он осуществляется. Адекватный перевод ориентирован на получателя сообщения, созданного переводчиком (*Adequate translation is supposed to meet the expectations of the participants of communication and conform to the conditions of the process of translation*⁵. *Adequate translation is TT recipient oriented*).

Adequate translation may encompass various levels or types (Vannikov 1988, in Bazylev 2010: 10-11):

семантико-стилистическая адекватность, которая определяется через оценку семантической и стилистической эквивалентности языковых единиц, составляющих текст перевода и текст оригинала; функциональная (прагматическая, функционально-прагматическая) [адекватность], которая выводится из оценки соотношения текста перевода с коммуникативной интенцией отправителя сообщения...; дезидеративная адекватность, которая оказывается всецело ориентированной на запросы получателя переводной продукции; волюнтаривная адекватность, которую исследователь усматривает в переложениях...; в этом случае активно проявляется собственная коммуникативная установка переводчика (*semantic and stylistic adequacy that is based on the assessment of the semantic and stylistic equivalence of the linguistic units*

⁴ Also (Alekseeva 2004, in Rarenko 2010: 9).

⁵ We could also term this “translation process environment.”

that make up the TT and the ST; functional adequacy, also termed pragmatic or functional and pragmatic adequacy, that is based on the assessment of the relations between the TT and the ST sender's communicative intention...; desiderative adequacy that is completely TT recipient oriented; voluntative adequacy implemented in transpositions... and in this case showing a great degree of a translator's own communicative intention).

Interestingly, these adequacy types are in line with an ongoing adaptation debate, and the “translator's intention” statement may be viewed in terms of the discussions about the translator's visibility / invisibility and / or mediation.

The definition of «адекватные замены» (*adequate substitutions*) can be viewed as holistic (Nelyubin 2003: 13):

К адекватной замене прибегают, когда для точной передачи мысли переводчик должен оторваться от буквы подлинника, от словарных и фразовых соответствий и искать решение задачи, исходя из целого (*An adequate substitution is employed when, in order to convey an idea accurately, a translator needs to disengage from the source text, dictionary equivalents and phrasal equivalents and take a comprehensive approach to tackling a translation task*).

Taking it a step further, in an entry on translation pragmatics in (Основные понятия переводоведения 2010) we find the following statement referring to adequacy (Zakharova 2010: 141):

Переводческая адекватность достигается в основном за счет прагматической адаптации текста. При этом есть типы текстов, прагматические параметры которых довольно интернациональны, за исключением жанрово-стилистических особенностей, имеющих в различных национальных языках. ... И есть типы текстов, которые нуждаются в значительной прагматической адаптации, – это художественные и публицистические тексты, рекламные тексты. (*Adequacy in translation is attained mainly through pragmatic adaptation of the text. Pragmatic parameters of certain text types are quite international, with the exception of genre-specific and stylistic features that vary across national languages. ... But certain text types, like literary texts, journalistic essays and advertising texts, require significant pragmatic adaptation*).

In a narrow sense, *adaptation* would normally concern, inter alia, proper names, phraseological units, quotations and allusions (Ibid), as well as realia and lacunae⁶. Revisiting traditional approaches has given rise to more conceptual developments, for instance, in works by Kabakchi (2015) or Proshina (2014).

In a broader sense,

adaptation is a term traditionally used to refer to any TT in which a particularly free translation strategy has been adopted. The term usually implies that considerable changes have been made in order to make the text more suitable for a specific audience

⁶ There is, as it happens, a slight terminological debate here, too: scholars include “non-equivalent vocabulary” (*безэквивалентная лексика*), “exoticisms”, “barbarisms”, “background words” (*фоновые слова*) and “country-specific vocabulary” (*страноведческая лексика*), “connotative words” and even terminology (Oparina 2010b: 167) in the list of culture-bound word groups.

(e. g. children) or for the particular purpose behind the translation. ... According to Vinay & Darbelnet, adaptation is a strategy which should be used when the situation referred to in ST does not exist in the target culture, or does not have the same relevance or connotations as it does in the source context (Shuttleworth, Cowie 2014: 3-4).

Most definitions of adaptation are clearly culture-bound, encompassing various types of translation activities like drama translation or subtitling (Bastin 2001: 6) and registering possible changes in text volume (e. g. when a source text is summarized or annotated for a particular target readership). As covered elsewhere (Volkova, Zubenina 2015), adaptation can be applied both as a translation technique (when applied to an isolated part of a text, cf. local adaptation) and as a translation strategy (when applied to the text as a whole, cf. global adaptation). The most striking feature is the fact that in most definitions, adaptation comes very close to current functionalist concepts of translation per se, except for summarizing and annotating, cf. (Bastin 2001: 8):

We could say that translation – or what is traditionally understood by the term translation – stays basically at the level of meaning, adaptation seeks to transmit the purpose of the original text, and exegesis attempts to spell out the intentions of the author.

Contemporary functional approaches to translation largely perceive *translation* in this second sense, though the degrees of interpretation, explicitness or a translator's visibility still vary between translation and adaptation. As Bastin rightfully points out, “the study of adaptation encourages the theorist to look beyond purely linguistic issues and helps shed light on the role of the translator as mediator, as a creative participant in a process of verbal communication” (Ibid).

To illustrate a broader interdisciplinary approach to translation with just one example, let us briefly look at the applications of discourse analysis in translation studies. In the 2001 edition of the Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies Hatim (Hatim 2001: 68, italics ours) postulates that

while awareness of the conventions governing the appropriate use of this or that genre or text format is essential in translation, it is awareness of what discourse *implies*⁷ that ultimately facilitates optimal transfer and renders the much sought-after translation equivalence an attainable objective.

The literature on the subject is by now quite extensive, with (Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies 2017) probably being the most recent publication in English at the time of writing. Russian translation studies, too, are currently developing around many discourse-oriented pieces of research, focusing, among other things, on institutional, professional or literary discourse with an inherent variety of definitions and research paradigms. It will probably suffice here to say that definitions of discourse across national traditions and within certain national scientific trends still arouse discussion. However, the following statements by Hatim in a way summarize, we think, one of the most productive trends in translation-oriented discourse studies (Hatim 2001: 68, italics ours):

⁷ Implicatures have been covered in detail elsewhere, (Nefedova 2001).

At a general level, genre refers to the linguistic expression conventionally associated with certain forms of writing..., text refers to a sequence of sentences serving an overall rhetorical purpose..., and discourse refers to the material out of which interaction is moulded as well as the themes addressed. Within this three-way distinction, however, discourse has been accorded supremacy and is seen as the *institutional-communicative framework* within which both genre and text cease to be mere earners of the communication act and become fully operational as vehicles of meaningful communication.

The term “institutional-communicative framework” is very much in line with Russian definitions of institutional discourse (cf. Karasik et al.) that underlie quite a few developments in translation studies⁸. Rightly considered productive for translation studies, interacting – “competing” or “overlapping,” as in (Hatim 2001: 68-69) – discourses have seen a lot of attention from scholars internationally. Hatim rightfully points out that “translation scholars have... focused on the constraints placed on the translation process by the sociocultural content of communication” (Ibid: 70).

This broader interdisciplinary perspective leads us to the concept of *intercultural mediation* as addressed in detail in (Katan 2016):

Much of the history of translation theory and practice in the West has revolved around issues of transfer, exactness, replication and hence fidelity to the source text... What is a priori, from the translator’s privileged meta-position, is to account for reader response according to the skopos. This conscious change in perceptual position means that the translator is no longer responsible for faithfulness to the source text or culture, but becomes responsible for the relationship between texts, contexts and their readers, accommodating the text into its new context.

In Russian sources translation has been traditionally understood as a type of linguistic mediation (Nelyubin 2003: 262):

Языковое посредничество – деятельность человека, владеющего двумя языками, обеспечивающая речевое общение людей, пользующихся разными языками... Виды [языкового посредничества]: перевод, пересказ, иноязычное реферирование, общение через языкового посредника путем постановки ему коммуникативных задач и т. д. (*Linguistic mediation is a type of human activity that enables verbal communication between people using different languages... Types of linguistic mediation include translation, rendering, summarizing in a foreign language, communication through a linguistic mediator by assigning them communicative tasks, etc.*)

In this definition, what is “communication through a linguistic mediator” if not intercultural communication? If viewed from a broader perspective, the terminology stemming from linguistic translation theories covers the important aspects of intercultural communication. It is true that translation can no longer be perceived as a text-text relationship, but this is not so much the question of terminology but rather the question of

⁸ We might demonstrate this with a reference to a piece of research focused on various discourse parameters in translation and a way to apply them in a systematic way in a discourse and communication translation model (Volkova 2012), integrating translation modeling, translation analysis and translation strategy (Volkova 2014).

distinguishing areas of research and professional activity. We might picture them as a continuum: translation (with its core notions of equivalence and adequacy), adaptation, transcreation, intercultural mediation – and acknowledge that intercultural communication is reflected in each of these areas, though to different extents.

What the profession has to say

In his thought-provoking paper Katan (2016) demonstrates that “there is a realisation that cultural distance causes misunderstanding, but equally there is an unwillingness to allow the [translators / interpreters] to account for this distance” (Katan 2016). The question is, if “a number of relatively new and emerging professions [in the field] have taken the skopos functionalist theory to heart”, why is it that “the translator has been marginalised through strict adherence to fidelity norms” (Katan 2016)? Let us emphasize three statements that the author makes.

First, with a reference to professional associations of translators, Katan shows that “today, a number of professional bodies are endorsing the importance of [intercultural mediation]” (Katan 2016), but “there are very different interpretations of this agreed component of translator training and practice”, and “the fundamental principles are grounded in the conduit, zero-sum-game view of translation” (Katan 2016).

Second, the “ontological change of perception of [translators / interpreters] as cultural mediators... remains very much more of an academic rather than professional understanding of the role and habitus” (Katan 2016). Katan shows that for professional translators “the specific module on intercultural theory and practice came a low seventh ‘most important module’ in the list of the twelve modules offered. For students and teachers, on the other hand, intercultural theory and practice comes third or fourth” (Katan 2016).

Before we move on, it might be interesting to give another example based on a different, namely Chinese, context: in a separate study with a reference to the EU PICT project meant to “facilitate the integration of [intercultural competence] in translation programmes either in the form of a stand-alone course or as a module in an existing translation course” (Li 2016), Li Xiangdong looks at “how... to develop objectives, materials, instructional methods and assessment plans that fit into the *local curriculum*” (Li 2016, italics ours). Li points out that “systematic design of [intercultural competence] teaching in actual T&I classrooms has been rarely reported” (Li 2016), and in an “exploratory case study,” compelling in its own right, comes to the conclusion that intercultural competence module is clearly important for Chinese students in the analyzed training context⁹.

We would tentatively suggest that the situation is quite similar for translation trainers and trainees in Russia. A standard training program normally includes an introduction into the theory of intercultural communication, and the main concepts and relevant cases are usually addressed in various practical courses later on.

Third, with a reference to an “ongoing transcreation survey” Katan lists “reasons why transcreation was not translation [that] point to what is perhaps the basic issue preventing [translators / interpreters] from accounting for cultural distance”: “the

⁹ In order not to expand the scope of this paper too much, we shall not elaborate further on teaching intercultural skills, other than highly recommend two more papers on intercultural communication in translator training in the aforementioned volume: (Cranmer 2015); (Koskinen 2015).

[translators' / interpreters'] aversion to risk" (Katan 2016). At the same time, Katan emphasizes that "globalization is increasing the need for the very human ability to mediate, to account for the implicit, the cultural distance, and all the other factors that are involved in communication" (Katan 2016), and "if [translators / interpreters] are to survive then they must make the transcreational turn" as a way to "account for cultural distance" (Katan 2016).

Therefore, on the one hand, translators are intercultural mediators by default, and that is what we train them to be, and "we have the realization within academia and within some areas of the translational professions ... that 'translation' is not only a linguistic exercise, that translators have always intervened on the text – and that translation *is*, in fact, intercultural communication" (Katan 2016, italics in original). On the other hand, the profession itself is indeed "at the cross-roads" (Katan 2016), at the same time deeply rooted in tradition. Katan's data shows, inter alia, that the profession may not be ready to perceive translation as equal to intercultural mediation (and intercultural communication at large), and we should additionally account for this when dealing with the metalanguage. Cf.: "translation is not all communication, not even all cross-cultural communication, and not all communication is translation, and... Translation Studies, despite the trends, can and should retain a specific object, albeit within Intercultural Studies" (Pym 2010).

Conclusion

We would suggest that the statements below apply to translation studies in Russia, but it might also be the case for current research in translation in general. True, some terms and trends are inherent to a national line of thought rather than spread across the continents, and the differences in terminology are often "horizontal" and synchronic. On a deeper level, though, it is not just about "redressing" the metalanguage of present-day translation studies, it is more about understanding the changes in the field first, looking at "vertical" and diachronic differences.

Addressing the questions posed in the introduction, we shall reiterate them briefly first and then summarize our conclusions. So, should basic terminology be the main concern of current translation studies? May existing terminology hamper research or do traditional concepts keep us grounded? Are trainee translators restricted by a traditional understanding of translation?

The change in terminology, if any, does not have to be radical. If perceived from a broader perspective, the basic terms that we inherited from linguistic translation theories already cover the important aspects of intercultural communication. We should not label traditional concepts as pertaining solely to linguistic theories of translation and therefore strive to remake the whole terminological system. Existing basic terminology is only "purely linguistic" when viewed from a linguistic angle, and it can be integrated in developing interdisciplinary theories of translation if viewed accordingly¹⁰. However, it might be useful to acknowledge that translation, adaptation, transcreation, and intercultural mediation are closely related, but yet specific fields of research and professional activity, each containing intercultural communication as its obligatory component. Consequently, basic terminology pertaining to a specific field should not be extrapolated too freely to adjacent areas. This is

¹⁰ Of course, this does not mean that new terms should not be coined when they are truly needed for a new theory or an emerging field.

even more so because the profession is not yet ready to view translation as synonymous to intercultural mediation.

Translation studies has clearly outgrown a “pure” linguistic approach in many ways, however, certain concepts remain relevant for translator training. The large picture of present-day translation studies is more of a live streaming video rather than a photograph, and against the backdrop of current vibrant interdisciplinary research traditional terminology does keep us grounded. We need to explore mainstream and emerging paradigms and help trainee translators and interpreters prioritize accordingly. Strong interest in current translation studies meta-research internationally, including the comparative analysis of terminology, is a good basis for further mutual exchange and development. Increasing mutual awareness and explaining theories and terminology across the disciplines within one academic culture and across national research paradigms should help researchers consolidate core terminology and gradually locate culture-specific terminological differences, in both cases contributing to the development of the metalanguage of translation studies at large.

References:

BAKER, Mona. 2001. The pragmatics of cross-cultural contact and some false dichotomies in translation studies. In OLOHAN, Maeve, ed. *CTIS Occasional Papers*, vol. 1, Manchester: UMIST, 2001, pp. 7-20.

BASTIN, Georges L. 2001. Adaptation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 5-8.

BAZYLEV, Vladimir N. 2010. Адекватный перевод [Adequate translation]. In *Основные понятия переводоведения (Отечественный опыт) [Basic concepts of translation studies (Russian experience)]*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh nauchno-informatsionnykh issledovaniy, 2010, pp. 9-12.

CONWAY, Kyle. 2017. Communication is translation, or, how to mind the gap. In *Palabra Clave*, 20(3), 2017, pp. 622-644. DOI: 10.5294/pacla.2017.20.3.2

CRANMER, Robin. 2015. Introducing intercultural communication into the teaching of translation. In *Russian Journal of Linguistics, Vestnik RUDN, Special Issue, Intercultural Communication: Theory and Practice*, 2015, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 155-174.

Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies. 2017. MUNDAY Jeremy, ZHANG Meifang, eds. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Benjamins Current Topics, 94. 2017.

HATIM, Basil. 2001. Discourse analysis and translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 67-71.

Intercultural Communication: Theory and Practice. 2015. *Russian Journal of Linguistics. Vestnik RUDN, Special Issue*, 2015, vol. 19, no. 4, 220 p.

KАВАКЧИ, Victor V. 2015. Реалии русской культуры в Большом Оксфордском словаре [Russian culturonyms in the Oxford English Dictionary]. In *The Humanities and Social Studies in the Far East*, 2015, no. 1 (45), pp. 16-22.

- KASHKIN Vyacheslav B.; SHILIKHINA Ksenia M. 2014. Концептуальный диссонанс при переводе российской лингвистической терминологии [Translation of Russian linguistic terminology: conceptual dissonance]. In *Vestnik of Voronezh State University. Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 72-77.
- KATAN, David. 2016. Translation at the cross-roads: time for the transcreational turn? In *Perspectives*, 24:3, 2016, pp. 365-381, DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1016049
- KAZAKOVA, Tamara A. 2016. Метаязык переводоведения: термины и определения [Metalanguage of translation studies: terms and definitions]. In *Vestnik SPbSU. Series 9. Philology. Asian Studies. Journalism*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 75-85. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu09.2016.406.
- KENNY, Dorothy. 2001. Equivalence. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 77-80.
- KOMISSAROV, Vilen N. 1991. Language and Culture in Translation: Competitors or Collaborators. In *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 1991, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 33-47. DOI: 10.7202/037080ar
- KOMISSAROV, Vilen N. 2001. Russian tradition. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 541-549.
- KOSKINEN, Kaisa. 2015. Training translators for a superdiverse world. Translators' intercultural competence and translation as affective work. In *Russian Journal of Linguistics, Vestnik RUDN, Special Issue, Intercultural Communication: Theory and Practice*, 2015, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 175-184.
- LI, Xiangdong. 2016. The first step to incorporate intercultural competence into a given translation curriculum: a micro-level survey of students' learning needs. In *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 2016, 10 (3), pp. 285-303.
- NEFEDOVA, Liliya A. 2001. *Когнитивно-деятельностный аспект имплицативной коммуникации [Cognitive activity aspect of implicative communication]*. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University, 2001.
- NELYUBIN, Lev L. 2003. *Толковый переводоведческий словарь [Explanatory dictionary of translation studies]*. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2003.
- OPARINA, Elena O. 2010a. Эквивалентность перевода [Equivalence of translation]. In *Основные понятия переводоведения (Отечественный опыт) [Basic concepts of translation studies (Russian experience)]*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh nauchno-informatsionnykh issledovaniy, 2010, pp. 220-224.
- OPARINA, Elena O. 2010b. Realia [Realia]. In *Основные понятия переводоведения (Отечественный опыт) [Basic concepts of translation studies (Russian experience)]*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh nauchno-informatsionnykh issledovaniy, 2010, pp. 166-170.
- PROSHINA, Zoya G. 2008. *Theory of translation (English and Russian)*. Vladivostok: Far East University, 2008.
- PROSHINA, Zoya G. 2014. Дистинктивные признаки вариантов английского языка, неродного для его пользователей [Distinctive features of variants of English as a foreign language]. In *Vestnik of Cherepovets State University*, 2014, no. 3 (56), pp. 123-128.

- PYM, Anthony. 2004. Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation. In *Target 16:1*, 2004, pp. 1-28.
- PYM, Anthony. 2010. Translation après coup: on why Translation Studies has a specific object. In PAGNOULLE, Christine, ed. *Sur le fil: traducteurs et éthique, éthiques du traducteur / Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Translators and Ethics, Ethics in Translation*. Liège: L3, 2010, pp. 10-20.
- PYM, Anthony. 2012. On history in formal conceptualizations of translation. In BURKE, Martin J., and RICHTER, Melvin, eds. *Why Concepts Matter. Translating Social and Political Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2012, pp. 59-72.
- PYM, Anthony; AYVAZYAN, Nune. 2014. The case of the missing Russian translation theories. In *Translation Studies*, 2014. DOI: 10.1080/14781700.2014.964300
- PYM, Anthony; AYVAZYAN, Nune. 2015. West enters East: A strange case of unequal equivalences in Soviet translation theory. Available at: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/online/translation/2015_east_west_web.pdf.
- RARENKO, Maria B. 2010. Адекватность перевода [Adequacy of translation]. In *Основные понятия переводоведения (Отечественный опыт) [Basic concepts of translation studies (Russian experience)]*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh nauchno-informatsionnykh issledovaniy, 2010, p. 9.
- SAMOVAR, Larry A. et al. 2011. *Intercultural communication: a reader*. Thirteenth Edition. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011.
- SHUTTLEWORTH, Mark; COWIE, Moira. 2014. *Dictionary of translation studies*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary et al. 1997. *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1997.
- TER-MINASOVA, Svetlana G. 2008a. *Война и мир языков и культур [War and peace of languages and cultures]*. Moscow: Slovo, 2008.
- TER-MINASOVA, Svetlana G. 2008b. *Язык и межкультурная коммуникация [Language and intercultural communication]*. Moscow: Slovo, 2008.
- TER-MINASOVA, Svetlana G. 2011. *Language, linguistics and life: a view from Russia*. Moscow: Krasand, 2011.
- VOLKOVA, Tatiana A. 2012. *Discourse and Translation Modeling*. Yelm, WA, USA: Science Book Publishing House, 2012.
- VOLKOVA, Tatiana A. 2014. Translation Model, Translation Analysis, Translation Strategy: An Integrated Methodology. In *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2014, vol. 154, pp. 301-304. DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.167
- VOLKOVA, Tatiana; ZUBENINA, Maria. 2015. Pragmatic and Sociocultural Adaptation in Translation: Discourse and Communication Approach. In *SKASE Journal of Translation and*

Interpretation [online]. 2015, vol. 8, no. 1 [cit. 2015-11-11], pp. 89-106. Available at: http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI09/pdf_doc/05.pdf.

ZAKHAROVA, Larisa D. 2010. Прагматика перевода [Pragmatics of translation]. In *Основные понятия переводоведения (Отечественный опыт) [Basic concepts of translation studies (Russian experience)]*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh nauchno-informatsionnykh issledovaniy, 2010, pp. 140-142.

Tatiana A. Volkova
Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor
Department of Theory and Practice of Translation
Faculty of Linguistics and Translation
Chelyabinsk State University
Bratyev Kashirinykh Str., 129, Chelyabinsk, Russia, 454001
e-mail: tatia.volkova@gmail.com

Liliya A. Nefedova
Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor
Department of Romance and Germanic Languages and Intercultural Communication
Faculty of Linguistics and Translation
Chelyabinsk State University
Bratyev Kashirinykh Str., 129, Chelyabinsk, Russia, 454001
e-mail: lan2@mail.ru

In SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]. 2017, vol. 10, no. 2 [cit. 2017-15-12]. Available online <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI13/pdf_doc/02.pdf>. ISSN 1336-7811