Theory of Translation Studies: Do We Have It? Do We Need It?

Ljuba Tarvi
Tallinn University

Abstract

This paper argues that, as an academic discipline, translation studies can hardly claim to have theory. Instead, the theoretical situation in this field can be described as an expanding conglomeration of various conceptual paradigms by at least three reasons to be specified below. To this end, translation studies are considered in a broad association with two closely related disciplines of a longer research history – linguistics and literary studies – which translation studies are sharing the majority of their paradigms with. Suggestions as to how to accommodate translation theory into the relevant university curricula are made by following Holmes' differentiation between foreign-language teaching and translator training, as well as by introducing the notion of Translation Industry.

> In the humanities, in *litterae humaniores*,
> theory is intuition or common sense
> grown impatient.
> George Steiner

1 Theory by Definition

The word 'theory' has a number of distinct meanings in different fields of knowledge, depending on their methodologies and the context of discussion. In *A Dictionary of the English Language* by Samuel Johnson (1755), theory is defined as "speculation, not practice; scheme; plan or system yet subsisting only in the mind." (1979: no pages indicated, as in the original.) In the *Universal Dictionary of the English Language*, the definition of theory is given in opposites (1932: 1255, emphasis added):

a *theory* (a general principle, a supposition, advanced to explain a group of phenomena; esp. one which has been tested, and is regarded as supplying an acceptable explanation)
vs.
a *hypothesis* (an assumption not yet verified);

a *theory* (general principles underlying a body of facts)
vs.
practice (e.g. theory of music); and

a *theory* (as contemplation, speculation)
vs.
actual *experience* (e.g. Foreign travel is all very well in theory).

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

1

Both the Oxford (1989) and Longman (1984) dictionaries underlie the 'function' or 'action' side of theory (emphasis added): "a conception or mental scheme of something *to be done*, or of the method *of doing it*; a systematic statement of rules or principles *to be followed*" (1989: 902) a belief, policy, or procedure proposed or followed as the *basis of action*" (1984: 1557).

Both dictionaries define theory as a complex multilevel phenomenon: "a scheme or system of ideas or statements held as an explanation or account of a group of facts or phenomena; a statement of what are held to be the general laws, principles, or causes of something known or observed" (1989: ibid.); "a body of theorems presenting a concise systematic view of a subject." (1984: ibid.)

In terms of the above definitions, a theory can thus be described as a claim or hypothesis, a certain portion of data chosen to both demonstrate and support the validity of the suggested hypothesis, and a certain method of inquiry, interrelating the former with the latter. Therefore, any academic discipline within the humanities that aspires to claim that it has a theory can be described as including in its theoretical framework at least the following blocks:

1) subject of study, body of facts (data),
2) methodological toolkit (concepts, paradigms, methods),
3) theoretical framework: claim based on (1), processed with (2), and supported by earlier theoretical findings,
4) relevant text genres,
5) canon (record of history).

We shall proceed now to briefly discuss the major characteristics of each of the outlined blocks.

1.1 Subject of study

All the interrelated humanitarian disciplines under consideration – linguistics, literary studies, and translation studies – pertain to textual studies. The major difference is in the scope of the subject matter: linguistics studies the structure, functioning, and interpretation of linguistic codes, and is itself a part of the general theory of signs; literary studies investigate the structure, functioning, and interpretation of linguistically coded products (texts); translation studies research the structure, functioning, interpretation (and comparison) of linguistically re-coded products (translated texts). Therefore, all these disciplines are concerned with studying textual products of various types from a wide range of viewpoints.

1.2 Methodological Toolkit

As regards the analytical tools used in the disciplines under consideration, they may be viewed as sharing the following traits.

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

2

1) They use the same language for both creating, interpreting, and investigating linguistic products.
2) They share certain concepts and assumptions.
3) They have covered the same 'paradigmatic' path in the 20th century: from the a-historical, structuralistic, and synchronic micro-optics to the broad diachronic cultural perspective, "A development [that] can be traced from a focus on a conceptual ideal towards a concern with the real." (Chesterman 2004: 94.)
4) They have passed through the period of reconsideration since the 1960s, when the notion of 'text' was broadened to increasingly embrace various types of message: from a grocery list through a conventional text to a hypertext.
5) They have been affected by the dramatic increase in mass media and mass popular culture, as well as by globalization processes.
6) They have developed into interdisciplines and began incorporating into their analyses a growing scope of various disciplines and approaches, such as semiotics, linguistics, interpretive theory, structuralism, psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, deconstruction, phenomenology, hermeneutics, etc.
7) They claimed at a certain period that they have had theories.

All these developments have resulted in an increased methodological luggage and the redistribution of sciences in the humanities pool, and, hence, in university curricula.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

In terms of the structure of a theory, Kuhn, for instance, distinguished between at least four basic levels of interrelated 'commitments' in normal sciences – "conceptual, theoretical, instrumental, and methodological." (1970: 42.) Kuhn also believed that there existed only three foci for factual scientific investigation, or three classes of problems, none of which either always or permanently distinct: "… determination of significant facts, matching of facts with theory, and articulation of theory" (ibid.: 34) which exhausted, in his opinion, both empirical and theoretical literature.

The central point of the scheme suggested for discussion here is the notion of a paradigm. According to the *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary* (Robinson & Davidson 1996: 998), the term 'paradigm' was borrowed in the 15th century from Greek *paradeigma* in the meaning of 'pattern'. Since the 1960s, the term 'paradigm' has been used in the meaning of a set of assumptions, concepts and practices that constitute a way of viewing reality for the community that shares them, especially in intellectual disciplines: "In its established usage, a paradigm is an accepted model or pattern, and that aspect of its meaning has enabled me, lacking a better word, to appropriate 'paradigm' here." (Kuhn 1970: 23.)

Such a free association of the terms 'model' and 'paradigm' within one definition is not a rare case. A theory is often defined as a model or framework for describing the evolution of a related set of phenomena. Hermans, for instance, believes that "Theoretical, or conceptual models are hypothetical constructs which are derived from an established field of knowledge and then tentatively projected onto a new, wholly or

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

3

partly unknown domain." (1998: 155.) Hermans then gives the list of translation studies 'models': linguistic, semiotic, literary, sociocultural models, later supplemented by gender studies, cultural studies, system theory and deconstruction's new conceptual models in the study of translation (ibid.). Within the approach suggested in this paper, the enumerated entities are considered to be paradigms rather than models.

Thomas Kuhn believes that a paradigm is characterized by at least three features (1970: 200): it is used by a group of researchers (social facet), who share the same conceptual values (theoretical facet), and the same rules and standards for scientific practice (empirical facet). A paradigm is, in Kuhn's opinion, "the resort to shared values rather than to shared rules governing individual choice." (ibid.: 186.) Kuhn also specifies that "Rules […] derive from paradigms, but paradigms can guide research even in the absence of rules" (ibid.: 42), and "Within the new paradigm, old terms, concepts, and experiments fall into new relationships one with the other." (ibid.: 149.)

As could be suggested, the basic difference between a theory, a paradigm, and a model lies in the scope of the description: a *theory* may be described as systematic and all-embracing; a *paradigm* as a research pattern that for a certain period of time unites a group of scholars with a common set of concepts based on the chosen parameters of the compared codes (linguistic, social, cultural, etc.) and results in a number of models; a *model* as one of several empirical manifestations of a certain paradigm, a peculiar research pattern.

Within such an interpretation, therefore, the general scheme could be presented as a sequence of an increasing scientific weight, *model*(s) → *paradigm*(s) → *theory* (*theories*) → *scientific laws*. Franz Pöchhacker (2004), for instance, makes use of a similar hierarchy in the structure of his book: *model*(s) (Chapter 5) → *paradigm*(s) (Chapter 4) → *approaches* (Chapter 3)).

A continuum between the extremes of the 'micro- and macro-optics' in research opens a broad field for a number of paradigms in each of the three areas of research suggested by James Holmes: product- process- and function-oriented (1988: 72-73). Within each of these areas, there may be several paradigms. For instance, one of the models within the function-oriented paradigm of translation studies is the Polysystem model (Toury 1995) which can be executed in a number of ways differing in their sets of variables and data but sharing the 'values'. An example of a linguistic paradigm within the product-oriented area of comparative translation research is the Token Equivalence Model (Tarvi 2004), one of the few assessment models comparing source and target texts at the level of words.

1.4 Related Genres

Each of the disciplines under discussion has its own genres. In linguistics, it is sign interpretation proper (as a part of the theory of signs); in literary studies, it is text interpretation within its own literary genres, such as drama, novel, poetry, etc.; in translation studies, it is text re-interpretation when rendering literary genres in

MikaEL   4
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

translation, message interpretation in various kinds of interpreting, and adapting a huge variety of partially linguistic products for use in a target culture in mediation. The term 'mediation' is used here instead of 'multi-media translation' to denote translation products, which are only partly linguistic, with their complementary part being non-linguistic elements as, for instance, HyperText Markup Language (HTML) in software localization, or image and sound in films, etc. Therefore, the terms 'mediation' and 'mediator' are used here in a narrower sense than, for instance, 'intercultural mediators' (Katan 2004: 20).

Besides, there exist at least three 'publication' genres 'as a source of authority: "… textbooks of science together with both the popularization and the philosophical works modeled on them. All these three categories […] have one thing in common. They address themselves to an already articulated body of problems, data and theory." (Kuhn 1970: 136.)

1.5 Canon (**Record of History**)

Each of the three disciplines discussed has, at least at a certain period, claimed to have theory. Linguistics seems to be cautious about using the term 'theory', as, for instance, in Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965), or Halliday's *Explorations in the Functions of Language* (1973) or *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1994). In literary studies, the 'hour of the theory' has passed as is seen in the titles of such publications as, for instance, Docherty's *After Theory* (1996), or in *Post-Theory: New Directions in Criticism* by McQuillan et al. (2000). In translation studies, the 'hour of theory' started with Richards's *Toward a Theory of Translating* (1953) and Nida and Taber's *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969). Nowadays, the presence of theory seems to be established, as indicated by, for instance, such titles as Rainer Schulte and John Biquenet's *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (1990), or Douglas Robinson's *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzche* (1997). The question is: Do we really have theory in linguistics, literary studies, and translation studies?

2 Theory in Action

An abstract (or conceptual) model is a theoretical construct that represents a certain phenomenon or a group of facts with a set of variables and a set of logical and quantitative relationships among them. Out of these two sets, that of assumptions and that of their interrelation, the former is the weakest link: "The hypothesis posits that a set of explanatory factors are in some way necessary for the occurrence of the things explained, such that changes in those factors might bring about changes in the things observed. That is a very problematic notion." (Pym 2006: 4.)

Arguments or theories always begin with some premises, or arbitrary elements, or assumptions, something accepted without proof. It would be incorrect to speak of an assumption as either true or false, since there is no way of proving it to be either (if

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

5

there were, it would no longer be an assumption). Assumptions have to be accepted on faith in a philosophy of science that prides itself on its rationalism.

It goes without saying that any theory is always provisional, in the sense that it is only a hypothesis and there exists no definitive test to prove its validity. No matter how many times the results of experiments agree with some theory, one can never be sure that the next time the result will not contradict the theory. On the other hand, one can disprove a theory by finding even a single repeatable observation that disagrees with the predictions of the theory. In principle, scientific theories are always tentative, partial and situational, and thus subject to corrections or inclusion in a yet wider theory.

2.1 Do We Have Theory in the Humanities?

A theory can be expected not only to accurately describe a large class of observations on the basis of a certain paradigm that contains as few arbitrary elements as possible, but also to make definite predictions about the results of future observations: "… the successful new theory must somewhere permit predictions that are different from those derived from its predecessor." (Kuhn 1970: 97.)

Therefore, theory is expected to DESCRIBE, to EXPLAIN and to PREDICT. Does theory DESCRIBE facts and phenomena? It does, without any doubt. Does theory EXPLAIN some phenomena and accommodate all previous findings? The cautious answer is – yes, sometimes it definitely does. Do the findings accumulated so far allow one to PREDICT possible developments in linguistics, literary studies, and translation studies? The answer is – hardly, and by a number of reasons.

To qualify as a law (or a general rule), a statement is expected (Booth et al. 1995: 113–114, emphasis original) to satisfy the following three criteria: (1) one part must describe the *general kind* of evidence that is offered; (2) the other part must describe the *general kind* of claim that follows from evidence; (3) it must state or imply a connection between them (e.g., cause-effect, generalization, etc.):

When(ever) we have evidence *like* X, we can make a claim *like* Y,
or
When(ever) X, Y.

In the humanities, laws of the above kind seem impossible to deduce because the polysemic nature of the language used for production, interpretation, and analysis of texts makes impossible either their final interpretation or their formalized expression. Whatever the outcome of any research in the humanities, it is expressed in language and, first of all, serves language. This idea of a linguistically 'boomerang' nature of research in the humanities is underscored, among others, by the linguist Firth:

Our schematic constructs must be judged with reference to their combined tool power in our dealings with linguistic events in the social process. Such constructs have no ontological status […]. They are neither immanent nor transcendent, but just language turned back on itself. (1957: 181.)

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

6

Besides, there is an important distinction between models in exact sciences and the humanities: in exact sciences a distinction is made between 'mathematical' models and 'physical' models, with the latter serving as a proof of the validity of the former, while in the humanities, one has to do with abstract or conceptual models which can be neither confirmed nor rejected by comparison with 'reality', whatever the latter might be. What kind of evidence can be used in the humanities to prove or disprove a theoretical point? Given all the limitations listed above, the only means philologists seem to have had is the structure of the argument, a logical framework for interrelating the constituents in every model within each paradigm.

Therefore, theories in the humanities cannot be described as full-fledged theories of exact sciences by at least three reasons: they allow

1) no definitive predictions
2) no formalized expression
3) no empirical support for the models.

Hence, they are at best studies, or partial theories rather than full-fledged theories.

Metaphysics, as a part of philosophy concerned with understanding reality and developing theories about what exists and how we know that it exists, and
epistemology, as inquiry into the nature and grounds of experience, belief and knowledge, both underlie the idea of partial knowledge. The notion of partial knowledge implies that in most cases it is not possible to have an exhaustive understanding of phenomena, and that one has to live with the fact that one's knowledge is always incomplete, that is, partial. Most problems in the humanities have to be solved by taking advantage of partial understanding of the problem context and problem data. That is very different from any typical math problem, where all the data are given and one has a perfect understanding of formulas necessary to solve them. Unfortunately (or fortunately?), there exist no formulas in the humanities.

2.2 Do We Have Theory in Translation Studies?

In the *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, it is admitted that "the use of the term is surrounded with some confusion." (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997: 185.) As observed by Pym, the wide-ranging interdisciplinary nature of translation studies both "deprives this discipline of a sufficiently high vintage point to view all possible facets of translation" (1992: 186), and involves various "external assumptions" brought to bear on translation, concerning such matters as "the nature of God's Word, the supposed equality of different cultures or an ethical duty to convey information." (ibid: 188.) Venuti concedes that "In translation studies, the broad spectrum of theories and research methodologies may doom any assessment of its "current state" to partial representation, superficial synthesis, optimistic canonization." (2000: 1.)

James Holmes is known to distinguish between two types of translation theory in translation studies. Translation theory as such, or general translation theory, was defined

MikaEL
7
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

as "a full, inclusive theory accommodating so many elements that it can serve to explain and predict all phenomena falling within the terrain of translating and translation […] highly formalized and […] highly complex." Having admitted that all that had been achieved was "… little more than prolegomena to a general translation theory" (1988: 73), Holmes, however, believed that instead there had been developed what he called partial theories, "specific in their scope, dealing with only one or a few of the various aspects of translation theory as a whole" (ibid.).

Now, nearly forty years after Holmes wrote the cited paper, general theory of translation studies seems to still have not progressed far enough to claim the status outlined by Holmes. As Gutt observes,

Viewed *from the product perspective*, translation theory faces the problem of a virtually infinite task: since there is no upper limit to the number of different texts a language can produce, and therefore to the number of translations that can exist in a language, corpus-based description of translation will hardly be able to exhaust the domain. *From the process perspective* there seem to be two alternatives, depending on whether the aim is to deal with the evaluative aspect of the translation process or not. (2000: 18, emphasis added.)

Ruminating on the so far partially successful attempts to 'theorize' the field, George Steiner does not conceal his pessimism:

The plethora of diagrams meant to theorize acts of translation, the boxes, arrows, dotted lines between 'source' and 'target' are nothing but more or less pretentious gestures. In the humanities, in *litterae humaniores*, theory is intuition or common sense grown impatient. A serious inquiry into translation is, necessarily, *descriptive*. It draws on documentation subjectively offered and subjectively examined. The main instrument is that of historical narrative. There is no laboratory. What is an always provisional issue, can only be "an exact art" (Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, Eng. trans. 1980). (2004: 5, emphasis original.)

Wolfram Wills, like Anthony Pym, finds the reasons for the controversy behind theoretical backing in the field of translation studies in its interdisciplinary background:

The ensuing problem of objectivization can be explained primarily by pointing out that translation cannot be termed a purely 'linguistic operation' […] but rather must be thought of as a psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic process […] which lends itself to an exhaustive scientific depiction only with the greatest difficulty. (1982: 65.)

To sum up, what is available in translation theory today, including the so-called 'universals' of translation (e.g., Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997: 193; Laviosa-Braithwaite 1998: 288), is a huge body of findings pertaining to specific cultures and pairs of languages that is still awaiting its systematization (if systematization is possible at all). Therefore, there seems to exist no general theory of translation studies, and the situation can at best be described as a process of accumulating theoretical generalizations as, hopefully, interrelated partial theories. Such a situation prompts a question which is tackled in the final section of the paper.

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

8

2.3 Do We Need Theory in Translation Studies?

Without hesitation, I would answer the above question in the affirmative, augmenting it, however, with two important sub-questions: Who for? What for?

In my view, there are two groups of translation-related individuals and groups who *need* theory: academics who pursue theory professionally to the benefit of the field and students of the relevant educational fields who do it by necessity, following the requirement to produce graduation papers. As a practical translator who came to theory from practice, I would claim, although with caution, that no theory is required for the process of translation, which seems to be mostly based on the skills that are gradually shaped by the process itself.

That is why I fully agree with Holmes, who distinguished between teaching as a 'technique in foreign-language instruction' and as 'translator training' (1988: 77). In our present-day tertiary education establishments, these two types of instruction are generally mixed. Moreover, the requirement to produce MA theses calls for a theoretical course of sorts, as well as for methodological supervision of such 'scientific' papers under production. As a result, the mix of linguistic, translation and theoretical instruction, inevitably in favor of the linguistic part, produces low-grade MA theses, as well as translators and interpreters who see theory as a stumbling block on their way to graduation.

The way out of the situation could be, for instance, trying to define which part of the accumulated theoretical luggage would be relevant for both describing the field in a sufficient detail and producing graduation theses, a sort of an overview 'with a pragmatic bend' meant for executing case studies research rather than solving global problems. Besides, to carry out case study research at the MA level students need to be supplied with a certain relevant methodological luggage.

Another suggestion also stems from my personal experience as translator and teacher, as well as a recent MA student (as my second degree). The major drawback of the partial theories of translation studies developed so far is that they are mostly devoted to translation as such, and have much less to offer in the field of interpreting and practically nothing in the area of mediation. To outline the situation the current situation in the field, I would like to introduce the concept of Translation Industry, which makes it possible to look at the field as if 'from the outside'.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines the term 'industry' as both 'skills' ('craft'), and their application, as well as 'habitual employment in some useful work, especially in the productive arts and manufactures, a branch of productive labour' (1989: 899 – 900). *The Oxford Dictionary for Business World* describes 'industry' as an 'organized activity in which capital and labour are utilized to produce goods, commercial enterprise' (1993: 413). The term, therefore, comprises not only the produced goods (all kinds of translated products in case of translation studies) but also the producers, both on the labour and management sides, and users of these goods. Moreover, as an organized activity, Translation Industry (TI) is both an institution and enterprise, i.e., a functional

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

9

body which regulates and is regulated by the interrelations between 'labour' and 'product', i.e., 'process' and 'result'. As an establishment, TI needs qualified labour force (and is hence interested in educational processes and related theoretical recommendations) to produce quality products (and is hence interested in quality assessment of its products and related theoretical elaborations). Industry is seen here as a broad, although much smaller-scale than culture, framework to describe translation studies. It might be called a 'polyfunction', by analogy with the 'polysystem' approach considering the position of translated texts within a target culture, approach because the final goal of TI, as any other industry, is to produce functional, i.e., being in users' demand, translated products, both nationally and internationally, and, in the long run, to bridge up cultures through shared use of its commercially and critically successful products.

The notion of TI seems to be especially instrumental in the present-day situation of internalization, globalization and the explosion-like proliferation of translated media products. In terms of goods, TI can be described as producing three types of Translation Products (TP), distinct by a number of parameters: InterpretinG Products (IGP), TranslatioN Products (TNP), and MediatioN Products (MNP), each resulting from the corresponding specific type of Translation Activity (TA): InterpretinG (IG), TranslatioN (TN), or MediatioN (MN). The table below is a brief overview of the TPs, a gist from my lecture course on translation theory and industry based on the Holmes-inspired Map-Matrix approach (Tarvi 2006):

Table 1. Types of Translation Products (TP).

Translation Activity (TA)	InterpretinG (IG)	TranslatioN (TN)	MediatioN (MN)
PRODUCT (P)	UTTERANCES (IGP) linguistic oral	TEXTS (TNP) linguistic written	COMMODITIES (MNP) partly linguistic oral/written
SENDER	SpeakeR (SR)	WriteR (WR)	ElaboratoR (ER)
INTERMEDIARY	Interpreter (I)	Translator (T)	Mediator (M)
RECEIVER	ListeneR (LR)	ReadeR (RR)	UseR (UR)
FUNCTION	delivering messages	ensuring the required S-T equivalence	guaranteeing profit
TIME/SPACE COORDINATES	on the spot, at the moment	one to several areas, for a period of time	multiple areas, for a period of time

All the outlined products are united by two parameters: they are linguistically coded messages, co-existing in at least two types of coding, in the source and target languages. The major differences outlined in the table, far from being exhaustive, are an argument for including into translation theory-related courses the description of all kinds of translation products, so that the field could be presented in its entirety, as a "house of many rooms" (Hatim 2001: 8).

Therefore, my suggestions as regard university curricula are as follows: besides linguistic instruction, future translator, interpreters and mediators need at least four kinds of courses. Two theoretical courses, concerned with what Holmes called the 'dimensions' of translation studies (1988: 79):

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

10

- the historical dimension, or "a field of the history of translation theory, in which some valuable work has been done", translation theory as an accumulated set of generalizations and paradigms useful for research at the case studies level, and
- the methodological dimension, or "a dimension that might be called the […] meta-theoretical, concerning itself with problems of what methods and models can best be used in research in the various branches of the discipline".

Besides, at least two courses of applied instruction might be useful:
- Translation Industry (TI) as a global description of the field as an industrial market,
- Applied Translation Studies (ATS) as getting acquainted with technical means facilitating the chosen type of translation activities.

It goes without saying that, besides theoretical enlightening, translation students need profound specialization in one of the chosen translation activities – IG, TN, MN. It would hardly be possible until the two types of teaching in translation studies designated by Holmes, 'foreign-language instruction' and 'translator training', are separated, as is practiced nowadays in the commercial sector of education.

2.4 Theory and Metalanguage

Preparing a survey of theoretical books on translation studies published after the year 2000 for my course of lectures, I discovered that the major changes in the theoretical and methodological outlook in translation studies, called in this paper 'paradigms,' were referred to there as 'trends,' 'operational frameworks,' 'schools,' 'conceptual / methodological tools,' 'approaches,' 'discourses on translation,' 'angles,' 'turns,' 'issues,' 'areas', and the list is still incomplete. The problem is that such 'over-terminologization' is a huge stumbling block for a lecturer in translation theory because if a lecturer gives one term by his personal choice, then a list of 'synonyms' is to be supplied so that students could use other theoretical sources; if the whole list is given, then the differences among various terms are to be explained, which is time-consuming.

Why do we not create a database of various translation studies terms that denote the same thing, so that one does not have to make 'research into terminology' every time one starts writing a paper? Why do we not, having considered everything we have so far accumulated, choose one term for one phenomenon and agree to use this 'label' until a better version is suggested? Such an 'inventory' might become the first step towards ordering, if not formalizing, the vast field of translation studies terminology.

Taking the initiative, I would like to suggest a new term to replace the habitual term 'translation'. The situation in the field has changed so dramatically since the time when only translations as such were subjected to research that a new umbrella term to refer to all three kinds of translation processes and products is required. Therefore, to describe the whole field of what is nowadays called 'translation studies', I would suggest the term Language Transfer Studies (LTS), a composite term borrowed from two sources.

MikaEL   11
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

The term 'language transfer' was suggested by the team of the European Institute for Media (Luyken et al. 1991) to describe the translated media products, and it seems to be broad enough to cover the whole field provided the term 'mediation' is used to refer to media products. The term 'transfer studies' was introduced later by Gerd Antos and Sigurd Wichter to establish a new field of research termed 'Transfer Studies' ("Transferwissenschaft") as a field of research covering all aspects of making knowledge accessible in our era of 'information fatigue' (Antos 2001: 5).

<div align="center">

Language *Transfer*

Transfer Studies

</div>

Therefore, the term Language Transfer Studies (LTS), suggested instead of 'translation studies', describes the field of research covering all aspects of producing and making translated products accessible. Language Transfer Theory (LTT) can hence be used instead of 'translation theory', and Language Transfer Industry (LTI) instead of Translation Industry. This suggestion is debatable, but worth while discussing provided other umbrella terms to describe the present-day situation in the field are offered.

To recap, my suggestions would require a joint effort of both interested parties – academics and university instructors. If theoreticians remain in their ebony tower of 'pure science' and continue producing research for research sake, they might become redundant, as is seen to have been happening in literary studies. If translation instructors continue their partially successful attempts to 'paste' a patch of theory onto the vast body of linguistic instruction, the latter would keep on falling off. To this end, it would be productive for both parties to look at the processes occurring at present in the field as at those of Language Transfer Industry, with clearly outlined products, processes and functions.

Bibliography

Antos, Gerd 2001. Trasferwissenschaft. Chancen und Barrieren des Zugangs zu Wissen in Zeiten der Insformationsflut und der Wissensexplosion. In S. Wichter & G. Antos (eds) *Wissentranfer zwischen Experten und Laien. Umriss einer Transferwissenschaft* [Transwissenschaften 1]. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 3–33.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams 1995. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chesterman, Andrew 2004. Translation as an object of reflection and scholarly discourse. In Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert, Fritz Paul in association with Juliane House & Brigitte Schultze (eds) *Überzetzung Translation Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 93–100.

Chomsky, Noam 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts: The M. I. T. Press.

MikaEL   12
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

Docherty, Thomas 1996. *After Theory*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Firth, J. R. 1957. *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. London: Oxford University Press.

Gutt, Ernst-August 2000. Textual properties, communicative clues and the translator. In M. Pilar Navarro Errasti, Rosa Lores Sanz, Silvia Murillo Ornat & Carmina Buesa Gomez (eds) *Transcultural Communication: Pragmalinguistic Aspects*. Zaragoza: Anubar.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Hatim, Basil 2001. *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Longman.

Hermans, Theo 1998. Models of Translation. In Mona Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London: Routledge, 154–157.

Holmes, James 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Johnson, Samuel 1979 [1755]. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Times Books.

Katan, David 2004 [1999]. *Translating Cultures. An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kuhn, Thomas 1970 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Laviosa-Braithwaite, Sara 1998. Universals of Translation. In Mona Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 288–291.

Longman Dictionary of the English Language 1984. Harlow: Longman.

Luyken, Georg-Michael, Thomas Herbst, Jo Langham-Brown, Helen Reid & Hermann Spinhof 1991. *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television.* Manchester: The European Institute for Media.

McQuillan, Martin, Graeme Macdonald, Robin Purves & Steven Thomson 2000. *Post-Theory: New Directions in Criticism*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Newmark, Peter 1988. *Approaches to translation*. Hemel Hempsted: Prentice Hall.

Nida, Eugene A. & Charles R. Taber 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

13

Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Pym, Anthony 1992. *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Pym, Anthony 2006. Introduction. On the social and the cultural in Translation Studies. In Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger & Zuzana Jettmarova (eds) *Sociocultural Aspects of Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 1–25.

Pöchhacker, Franz 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge.

Richards, Ivor A. 1953. Toward a Theory of Translating. In Arthur F. Wright (ed.) *Studies in Chinese Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Robinson, Douglas 1997. *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzche*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Robinson, Mairi & George Davidson (eds) 1996. *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*. Edinburg: Chambers.

Schulte, Rainer & John Biquenet 1990. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shuttleworth, Mark & Moira Cowie 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Steiner, George 2004. Translation as *conditio humana*. In Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert, Paul Fritz in association with Juliane House & Brigitte Schultze (eds) *Überzetzung Translation Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/: Walter de Gruyter, 1–11.

Tarvi, Ljuba 2004. *Comparative Translation Assessment: Quantifying Quality*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.

Tarvi, Ljuba 2006. Translation Models: Any Order in This Medley? In Mike Garant (ed.) *Helsinki Department of Translation Studies Publications II, "Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning*, Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Translation Studies, 133–152.

The Oxford English Dictionary 1989. Second edition, vol. XVII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

The Oxford Dictionary for Business World 1993. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MikaEL   14
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence 2000. Introduction. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1–8.

Wills, Wolfram 1982. *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Wyld, Henry Cecil (ed.) 1932. *The Universal Dictionary of the English Language*. London: George Routledge & Sons.

MikaEL
Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu
Electronic proceedings of the Kätu symposium on translation and interpreting studies
1 (2007)

15