

## **Editors' Introduction**

Over the past decades, translation and interpreting research has compelled scholars and practitioners to take numerous factors in the provision of linguistic services into account, be these services in written or spoken forms, and addressed to people who hear and read what is being communicated, and/or to people who do not. For this reason, we find in *Translation, Interpreting and Intercultural Studies*, a recurring focus on the critical examination and deconstruction of complex relationships between interpreting and translation alongside issues of power, agency, representation, and ideology. At the centre of cutting-edge research, a variety of disciplinary approaches and praxes have emerged to capture shifting relations of power and ideology at play in contexts of translation. Such constantly dynamic scenarios within a world in constant flux inspired NV20, a Special Issue of *New Voices in Translation Studies* which focuses precisely on Power and Ideology in Translation and Interpreting, as did the International Postgraduate Conference on Translation and Interpreting Studies (IPCITI) conference held in Manchester, UK in October 2018. IPCITI 2018 welcomed two keynote speakers: Prof. Ji-hae Kang (Ajou University, South Korea) whose keynote lecture focused on power, agency, and text trajectories in institutional translation, and Dr. Elisabet Tiselius (Stockholm University, Sweden) whose contribution shed light on issues of interpreting ethics and discretionary power. The conference attracted 23 high-calibre speakers whose topics focused on theories of power and ideology; methodological endeavours; expertise and professionalism; conflict and cooperation; censorship, media control, politics, and activism.

IPCITI, as an annual postgraduate conference is the result of a long-term collaboration between Dublin City University, Heriot-Watt University, the University of Edinburgh and the University of Manchester. This conference is held in order to provide the opportunity for PhD and early career researchers in Translation and Interpreting Studies to share their research in a intellectually stimulating environment. Echoing the themes of IPCITI 2018, NV20 thus takes four broad fields of inquiry as its point of departure. The first overarching theme is the intertwined concepts of power and agency in translation and interpreting. The second theme is how ethical professional, and institutional imperatives have shaped, and continue to shape translators/interpreter responses vis-à-vis other social actors and organisations. The third is that of representation - political participation, social inclusion, recognition, restorative justice,

well-being, and equality - in the many linguistic, textual, social, and economic discourses that translators/interpreters encounter, mediate and affect. Finally, the fourth focus is that of ideology, namely the role of agentic expression in manipulating and mediating systems of beliefs, norms, and tacit understandings, including in view of media control and censorship. These different facets of translation and interpreting showcase a fascinating and thriving research field. NV20 also aims to contribute to this field with ground-breaking papers from early career researchers which shed light on the importance of investigating issues of power, ideology, representation, and agency and inspire future research in different settings.

As we write this introductory note, U.S President Donald Trump's interpreter is making headlines in global news as she faces the prospect of subpoena, asked to breach norms of confidentiality under external conditions of power and privilege; the race is on for 2020 Tokyo Olympics volunteer interpreters, tasked with the linguistic and cultural representation of Japan; the blame game begins as Google Translate and simultaneous interpretation apps threaten to strip language experts of their professional agency; local and global communities of translators engage with ideology, social activism, and human rights advocacy. These developments of people, professions, norms, and ideas demonstrate the urgency of pursuing research in the interpreting and translation fields.

As Guest Editors, we would like to thank all those who made the conference and this issue possible: The Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies and University of Manchester for supporting the organisation of 2018 IPCITI; the reviewers for their valuable contribution and their collaborative work with the authors. Finally, we would like to express our deepest gratitude to the editors of *New Voices in Translation Studies* for hosting this Special Issue and guiding the guest editors and the authors to publication.

As we shall see in this Special Issue, a wide range of theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches are represented which address interesting and pertinent issues relating to power, ideology, agency and representation, cutting across different modes and genres of translation and interpreting (e.g. literary translation, subtitling, political and diplomatic treaty translation) in various language combinations and geographical locales.

Beginning with the topic of feminism and ideology, which has motivated a plethora of studies in Translation and Interpreting, **Wangtaolue Guo** illuminates translation as a form of feminist activism in his paper “When Vaginas Speak Chinese: Mobilizing Feminism through Translation.” As the title suggests, the author examines two different Chinese translations of Eve Ensler’s *The Vagina Monologues* (2000) against the background of the second wave of Taiwanese feminism which first materialized in 1987. Wangtaolue examines how the first translation, published in 2000 when the anti-sexual harassment campaign and the women’s rights movements were rife in Taiwan, served to support and legitimize the institutionalization of women’s and gender studies programs across Taiwanese universities entering into a dialectical with further translations of key Euro-American feminist theoretical, literary, and activist texts that also served to challenge the patriarchal code in Taiwan. Although this first translation drastically contributed to the popularization of gender equality, it was, nonetheless, criticized by various scholars for a lack of feminist intervention, which, according to Wangtaolue, might have necessitated and motivated the publication of a new translation of Ensler’s play. As such, 2014 saw the circulation of another Mandarin Chinese translation by Ting Fan and Ch’iao Se-fen, which, unlike its forerunner, was frequently adapted for the stage. Wangtaolue, then moves on to examine how the different socio-historical context interact with and perhaps determine the actual translation practices employed by each translator. Drawing on the treatment of vaginal terms and terms/passages about sexual violence against women, the author offers a penetrating response of how different translations can complement or confront each other.

Drawing on the translation of “unequal treaties” signed between China and Britain during 1842-1843, **Zien Guo** (University of Leeds), contributes the paper: “Translating “Unequal Treaties” between China and Great Britain during 1842-1843: Reconstruction of Ideology and Practice of Power.” This paper examines how Britain sought more political gains (or otherwise) through manipulating the translation of treaties, with the ultimate goal of establishing the role of translation in the negotiation of power and the (re)construction of ideological discourse. The author’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) study revolves around three dimensions: lexico-grammar, discourse semantics, and context, focusing respectively on discursive patterns, information delivery, and the sociocultural environment that conditions

translation practice. In her study, interesting translation shifts have been found. These shifts are ideologically salient and seem to reflect the power struggle in the given historical period.

In his paper “Interpreting as Ideologically-Structured Action: Collective Identity between Activist Interpreters and Protesters,” **Mark Halley** (Gallaudet University) explores the work of the American Sign Language-English interpreters who volunteered in the 1988 Deaf President Now protest (DPN). This paper is one of two papers in NV20 which focuses on the shifting dynamics of power and ideology embedded within and via mediators of languages used by *hearing* and *deaf* communities. Drawing from the construct of ideologically-structured action, Halley captures and archives the decision-making of 27 interpreters present at different times throughout the protest, by conducting interviews in which the interpreters reflect on how their beliefs about and relationships with *deaf* people and communities shaped their actions. This paper then discusses the integral role of interpreters alongside the protesters’ mission of challenging the existing power structure by exploring how and why they volunteered their time to push the protest forward. The data collected from the interviews reveal that strong personal and community relationships motivated interpreters to volunteer their services. Halley also argues that the activist interpreters exhibited a collective identity (Polletta and Jasper 2001) with the *deaf* protesters, despite not being *deaf* themselves. Through his analysis of interview data, Halley offers an important exploration of the work of signed language interpreters who experienced a specific localised historical moment that represented a critical turning-point for *deaf* and *hearing* communities within higher education. His findings also provide new insight into how ideology and community ties may guide the actions of interpreters in times of conflict and activism within *deaf* community settings.

**Sijing Lu** (University of Liverpool), uncovers the external and internal power relations of the fansubbing practice in China by adopting a Bourdieusian sociological framework in her paper titled “Understanding the Social Dynamics of Amateur Subtitling: A Bourdieusian Perspective on Fansubbing in China.” Focusing on the role of fansubbers as social agents in the online environment through a netnographic approach, Sijing Lu maps out three Chinese fansubbing communities, showing that fansubbers often aim for self-regulatory practices and autonomy within the field in terms of internal accumulation of capitals, hierarchisations, and the maintenance or challenge of the status quo. These communities, however, are still

constrained by the heteronomous principle that exists within the field of power, such as compliance to the dominant governmental policies regarding Internet censorship and copyright laws.

Moving further back in time, **Uchenna Oyali** (University of Abuja), presents on how the intertwining issues of power and ideology at play in the first English-Igbo Bible translations have had long-ranging impact in Igbo community settings in his paper titled “The Semantic Elaboration and Subversion of *Iko* in Igbo Bible Translation.” As explained by Oyali, before their contact with Christianity in the mid-1800s, several Igbo communities practiced *iko mbara*, an institution where a married person openly had a paramour with the consent of their spouse. This practice was however condemned by the Christian missionaries as reflected in their use of the term during Bible translation from English into Igbo. Therefore, this study poses the following questions: What did *iko* mean prior to its use in the Igbo Bible? In what ways is its use in the Bible different from its use prior to the Bible translations? How has its use in the Bible changed the perception of the term among Igbo speakers? What are the implications of these practices in contexts of translation in Nigeria? To respond to such questions, Oyali compared the traditional Igbo practices which are designated with the term *iko* with the different contexts where the term is used in Igbo Bible translation. His findings show how *iko* was re-semanticized during Bible translation to mean any form of sex outside a monogamous marriage framework, the terms used to do so giving *iko* a pejorative meaning, thereby discouraging Igbo Christians from the practice. Oyali conducted a survey (questionnaire), whose findings show how *iko* is perceived amongst a group of Igbo speakers. Oyali’s study contributes to research on the linguistic impact of missionary translations on African languages and their implications in pre- and post/colonial contexts of translation. Methodologically, it also demonstrates how short questionnaire surveys can complement descriptive analysis which seeks to explore the ideological impact of translations in different languages and cultures.

**Michael Richardson**, (Heriot-Watt University) explores the ways in which power is exercised and negotiated by *deaf* and *hearing* theatre actors in a theatre rehearsal room in his paper titled ‘Negotiating Power and Translation in a Bilingual (British Sign Language/English) Rehearsal Room’. Ten actors, of whom five are self-identified as *deaf* and five as *hearing*, participated in his project. By conceptualising *deaf* and *hearing* as

Bourdieuian *fields*, Richardson conducts a socio-analysis of the power dynamics within two examples of practice. His analysis shows that effective communication within the creative processes of the project is supported by linguistic flexibility and a high degree of functional bilingualism including translanguaging, i.e. language-free communication using gesture and mime, and written materials in simple English. Conversely, effective communication is compromised by practice that places one language in a dominant position. The study also demonstrates that inclusive communication is maintained by favouring the use of intra-group translation wherever possible, rather than having an embedded interpreter. In conclusion, his research suggests that, whilst it is possible to over-ride the impact of hierarchies within such a translation event, more typically societal inequalities that impact negatively on translation processes are maintained.

**Wenqian Zhang** (University of Leeds) explores issues of power and agency in the translation and publishing of Mo Yan's literary work in her paper "Translation Networks and Power: An Archival Research on the English Translation of Mo Yan's *The Garlic Ballads*." Drawing on a Bourdieusian framework and through analyzing the translator's archival materials, she argues that in the translation production process such agents as the translator, the literary agents, editor and publishers all seem to play a role in shaping the translation and there is an interesting and intricate dynamics of power throughout the process. Her article explores how the translation network featuring multiple agents interplayed in Howard Goldblatt's English translation of Mo Yan's *The Garlic Ballads*. Her article shows that, although the translation project was initiated by the translator, it was completed for the mutual benefit of different agents (the publisher often has the strongest power in the translation network). Also, although the translator only played a minor role at the later stages of the translation process, the capital he gained in the translation field provided him with useful resources in the publishing field and this in turn served to further enhance his position in the translation field.

In this issue we also include abstracts of six recently completed PhD theses. The abstracts are titled 'Translation in the Borderlands of Spanish: Balancing Power in English Translations from Judeo-Spanish and Spanglish' by Remy Attig of Saint Francis Xavier University, Canada; 'Cognitive Behaviors in the Translation Process: A Case Study of Student Translators' by Engliana of Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Indonesia; 'The Operational Norms

of Prefabricated Chunks in Chinese-English Consecutive Interpreting: A Corpus-based Approach’ by Yang Li of Northeastern University, China; ‘Interpreting in the Media: Organisational, Interactional and Discursive Aspects of Dialogue Interpreting in Radio Settings: A Study of Spain's Radio 3’ by Pedro Jesús Castillo Ortiz of Universidad de Granada, Spain; ‘Bible Translation and Language Elaboration: The Igbo Experience’ by Uchenna Oyali of University of Abuja, Nigeria; and ‘Texts and Traditions in Seventeenth Century Goa: Reading Cultural Translation, Sacredness, and Transformation in the *Kristapurāṇa* of Thomas Stephens S.J.’ by Annie Rachel Royson of Pandit Deendayal Petroleum University, India.

Once again, we would like to thank the authors who have been diligent, patient and critical and our anonymous referees who have been very dedicated and helpful. We would also like to thank and congratulate our six new PhD holders for their achievement.

Guest Editors:

Deborah Giustini (University of Manchester)

Chonglong Gu (University of Liverpool/University of Manchester)

Editors:

Ruth Abou Rached (Freie Universität Berlin)

Edmund Chapman (University of Manchester)

David Charlston (Honorary Research Fellow, CTIS, University of Manchester)

Kelly Pasmatzis (University of Sheffield International Faculty CITY College, Greece)

M Zain Sulaiman (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia)

Marija Todorova (The Hong Kong Polytechnic University)

May 2019